Also, petition of National Association Union Volunteer Officers, relative to Volunteer officers' pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of New York Photo-Engravers, Union No. 1, against section 7 of the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Modern Woodmen relative to the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, favoring vocational education bill—House bill 11250; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of H. H. Hoss, secretary chamber of commerce, Corona, Cal., favoring appropriation for ocean-to-ocean highway; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petition of Powam Lodge, Mesa Grande, Cal., favoring House bill 11864, to aid indigent consumptives, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William J. Lankow, San Bernardino, Cal., and 350 others, protesting against House bills 6468 and 491, to amend postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of San Diego & Southwestern Railway Co., Read G. Dilworth, and E. S. Babcock, San Diego, Cal., favoring amendment to Post Office bill (H. R. 10484); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of A. J. Newsom, Garden Grove, Cal., protesting against training of youths for military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mrs. Ray R. Shore, secretary L. A. N. A. L. C., Branch 91, and 87 others, San Diego, Cal.; Mrs. L. F. Golay, San Diego; and Mrs. Mary B. Ritter, president La Jolla Women's Club, Mesa Grande., Cal., favoring Penrose-Griffin leave-of-absence bills (H. R. 6915 and S. 3081); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. W. Hardy, and three others, Santa Ana, Cal., favoring prohibition in Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Petition of 71 citizens of Multnomah County, Oreg., favoring Christian amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Evidence in support of House bill 17110, for the relief of Thomas R. Henthorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of 10 surviving Volunteer commissioned officers, of Kokomo, Ind., relative to officers' pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petition of Tiffin Missionary Union, against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York, favoring Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, relative to differences between railroads and employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of sundry citizens of Idaho and Oregon, against the Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Idaho, against bills to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Department of Idaho, Grand Army of the Republic, Pocatello, favoring passage of the Volunteer officers' retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill 16442, for pension for Alice Root; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 16935, in case of Jabez Lumbert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *July 26, 1916.*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, July 25, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16460) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we can not proceed right now, with so few Senators in the Chamber, and 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:

Brady	Husting	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Smoot
Chamberlain	Jones	Penrose	Sterling
Clapp	Kenyon	Pittman	Stone
Colt	Kern	Ransdell	Taggart
Culberson	La Follette	Reed	Thompson
Cummins	Lodge	Robinson	Townsend
Curtis	McCumber	Shafroth	Vardaman
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Myers	Sherman	Walsh
Gallinger	Nelson	Simmons	Warren
Gronna	Norris	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Harding	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.	Works

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President——

Mr. KERN. Will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

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

Mr. KERN. I understand that the District of Columbia appropriation bill will be ready for consideration by the time the pending measure is disposed of. I desire to give notice, as the representative of the majority, that immediately after the disposition of the District of Columbia appropriation bill I shall move to take up for consideration the House bill known as the child-labor bill, and ask that it be made the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will state to the Senator that the District of Columbia appropriation bill is ready to be taken up.

Mr. KERN. I assumed that it was.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that at all, except that the Military Academy bill, I understand, will have the right of way immediately after the Army appropriation bill. It will not take very long to dispose of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will simply express my gratification at the announcement made by the leader of the majority. The minority, or a large proportion of the minority, are quite as anxious that the child-labor bill shall be considered as the Senator from Indiana or his associates on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted——

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In connection with the observations of the Senator from New Hampshire, I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will be gratified in like manner by an announcement from the leader on the other side in the course of a day or two, as soon as matters are adjusted, that the immigration bill will likewise be taken up and be made the unfinished business to follow the child-labor bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, reciprocating the observation of the Senator from Wisconsin, I join with him in the hope he has expressed.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE. Just for a moment. On an inquiry addressed to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], he positively assured the Senate that he intended to make a motion to bring up the immigration bill, and I am a little surprised that any other legislation is permitted to take precedence of the immigration bill after the positive assurance made by the Senator from South Carolina that he intended to move to bring it up. But I do not ask for any explanation at the present time. I simply want to record the status of the matter, that the Senate was assured that the Senator from South Carolina would move to bring up the immigration bill.

Mr. KERN. I will state that by the time the child-labor bill is disposed of we will make an announcement regarding the disposition of the immigration bill that I think will be entirely satisfactory to the Senator from Pennsylvania and all the other ardent friends of the immigration bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Does the leader of the majority intend to ask the Senate to act on the immigration bill prior to final adjournment?

Mr. KERN. The majority is entirely independent to act on any bill it desires to act on. It has manifested that independence all through the session I am sure, and it will continue to do so.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Indiana announced his intention regarding the child-labor bill, and I did not know

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

whether he had any objection to declaring the intention regarding the immigration bill.

Mr. KERN. I have no objection to declaring any intention I may now have. The announcement will be made at the proper time, and in my own way.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to submit three amendments on behalf of the committee. They are slight changes in the bill as it has so far been acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 27, strike out lines 21 to 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

For additional 10 per cent increase of pay of officers on foreign service, including officers of the Organized Militia or National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States, $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I offer the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 28, strike out lines 1 to 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men on foreign service, including enlisted men of the Organized Militia or National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States, $1,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be agreed to, without objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before the amendment is agreed to, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if that does raise the pay of the enlisted men?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No. I will state the purpose of the amendment. The way the bill originally read it might be construed as giving 10 per cent additional pay where they were not in foreign service, and it was only intended to increase the pay under the existing law in case they were in foreign service; that is all.

Mr. REED. Let us understand. If the Regular Army is in Mexico, do the enlisted men get additional pay?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They get additional pay, both the officers and privates, when they are in foreign service, whether in Mexico or in the Philippines.

Mr. REED. If the National Guard is engaged in protecting the border, but are on American soil, its members do not get the additional pay.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; neither do the Regulars.

Mr. REED. Of course; but we all understand in its practical operation what it means, because we know that substantially all of the Regular Army will get additional pay because they are south of the Rio Grande.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Not all of them are south of the Rio Grande; only a small part of the Regulars.

Mr. REED. The greater part of them. None of the National Guard will get additional pay, because they are north of the river.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is correct, Mr. President. That is the law as it is now.

Mr. REED. The Regular Army private who is stationed just north of the river and guarding the border will receive less pay than his fellow soldier of the Regular Army who is just south of the river.

I ask the chairman of the committee if it is not a fact that all of these men are engaged in a common work, to wit, the protection of this country against the aggressions of Mexico, some of them being stationed by the orders of their commanders north of the line, some of them south of the line, and all of them liable at any moment to be engaged in conflict? That is the situation. I ask the chairman of the committee if he thinks that is a fair or wise discrimination?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is the law as it is to-day. It was not enacted for this specific occasion. The law already provides that officers and men engaged in foreign service shall be entitled to extra pay. The only reason——

Mr. REED. Now——

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me state to the Senator the only reason for the proposed amendment. I really do not think it is necessary; I am simply acting on the recommendation of the War Department. I do not think it is necessary, but the War Department felt that lines 16 to 23, on page 27, might have a wrong construction placed upon them, and therefore this was inserted for the purpose of clarifying the situation.

Mr. REED. The chairman says that this is the present law, and that is correct, of course. But the present law was enacted for the purpose of meeting the conditions then existing or which could be reasonably anticipated. Some of our soldiers were stationed in China. It was a hardship for them to be put in that far-off country. Some of them were stationed in the Philippines, where they suffered not only the hardship of being separated from their own country but the dangers incident to that climate and to that service. Occasionally some of them have been sent to various islands. Some of them have been sent to Central American countries. Under those circumstances, of course, additional expense is imposed upon the men and the officers.

I can see why the law was drawn in that way; but, Mr. President, we are now proposing to make a law applicable to present conditions. What are these present conditions? We have not invaded Mexico for the purpose of conquest. Every soldier on the Mexican border, or north or south of the Mexican border, whether that soldier be a Regular or whether he be of the National Guard, is engaged in the same work, the work of the man south of the line and the work of the man north of the line being a part of a general plan to protect our country against the invasion of marauding expeditions by Mexicans. Incident to the work of both of these forces, of course, is the pressure that is being brought upon Mexico to establish peace.

Mr. President, I think the chairman of the committee ought to amend his amendment so that it will read: "or engaged in protecting the Mexican border or serving in Mexico," so that it will apply with fairness and justice to all classes of soldiers who are serving along the Mexican border. I ask the chairman of the committee if he will not accept that as an amendment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I do not think it would be just to accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri. The committee has, so far as my knowledge extends, undertaken to place the Regular Army and the National Guard in exactly the same category; that is all. The purpose of this amendment is to do that very thing. Of course, Congress has not any control of the movements of these troops. The President might be induced, at the suggestion of men who are particularly interested in having the National Guard perform foreign service, to bring back the Regulars who are now over the Mexican border and replace them with National Guardsmen, which would entitled them to the increased pay. I do not think the Senator wants that; I do not think the people want that; and yet the President can do that very thing to-morrow. So this applies only to the men who are doing foreign service.

Mr. REED. Well, Mr. President, of course the chairman of the committee will exercise his own judgment, but this proposition is so manifestly fair and equitable that I did hope it would be accepted. However, I have about made up my mind that nothing will be accepted unless some Regular Army officer declares that it ought to be written in the bill.

I move to amend the amendment by adding after the words "foreign service" the words "or under the call of the President engaged in protecting the Mexican border, whether serving within or without the United States."

I will ask the Secretary to read the amendment of the committee as it would read as I propose to amend it.

The SECRETARY. On page 28, line 2, after the words "foreign service," it is proposed to insert "or under the call of the President engaged in protecting the Mexican border, whether serving within or without the United States," so that as proposed to be amended the clause would read:

For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men on foreign service, or under the call of the President engaged in protecting the Mexican border, whether serving within or without the United States, including enlisted men of the Organized Militia or National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States, $1,000,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, against that amendment I make the point of order that it is not estimated for and that it is an amendment of existing law upon an appropriation bill. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that this appropriation bill does not attempt in any way to change existing law. It simply makes provision for payment under the laws as they now are, but the Senator's amendment changes that existing law and allows an increase of pay even when the soldiers are not engaged in foreign service.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if my amendment to the amendment is out of order, then the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon is also out of order. Each is germane to the other. I simply extend the definition so that men engaged in foreign service will be held to include those who are protecting our country against a foreign enemy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the present law of the United States give to enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Organized Militia or National Guard, when called or drafted into the service of the United States, 20 per cent additional pay?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I rather think it does, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not rule on a point of order on any such statement as that.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Well, Mr. President, I do not profess to be absolutely beyond the power of making any mistake. The Almighty alone, so far as I know anything about it, is the only

One who does not make mistakes. I will say this, however, that the men in the Regular Army are entitled to extra-service pay when engaged in foreign service. There is nothing in the law about the National Guardsmen, except that when they are mustered into the Federal service they become a part of the Regular Army. It is for that reason that I stated a while ago that I very much questioned if the amendment was necessary; but that, in order to remove any doubt which might exist upon the subject, the National Guard were specifically mentioned in the appropriation, which was made for that purpose, and estimated for, but the Senator from Missouri wants to go further.

I think, Mr. President, that as soon as the National Guard is mustered into the service, it becomes a part of the regular enlisted personnel of the United States Army, and that in law they are entitled to this extra-service pay. That is a question of construction. In order to remove a doubt we put this language in the bill. It was only to protect the National Guard in case of doubt that it was done; but I do not think it was at all necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wants to get the state of the law, because the ruling on the point of order depends on the state of the law. If it were necessary, in order to fix the status of the Organized Militia when called or drafted into the service of the United States to insert the original amendment, then beyond peradventure it is just as much general legislation as the amendment to it is general legislation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; I beg pardon of the President. In any event, only extra pay is allowed when foreign service is engaged in; but the proposition of the Senator from Missouri is to change the existing law, whether it applies to the Regular Army or to the National Guard, so that they shall have extra pay when engaged in domestic service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But if the present law granting 20 per cent additional pay on foreign service only applies to the Regular Army of the United States, and does not apply to the Organized Militia when called into service of the United States, then, when an amendment is presented which proposes to put the Organized Militia when drafted into the service of the United States under the same provision with reference to foreign-service pay, it must be an amendment of the law, if that be the condition of affairs.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am insisting that the National Guard become a part of the Federal service when they are mustered in and that the law applicable to the Regular Army applies to them. That is a fixed statute; that is an act that was passed by Congress on the 30th of June, 1902.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the difficulty about the contention of the Senator from Oregon is that his contention is not borne out by his amendment, because the amendment is not needed if his contention is right.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Chair that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon only refers to foreign service? The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri refers to the Regular Army and to the National Guard in domestic service, which changes the whole law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, yes; but it must be perfectly plain if the Organized Militia is not now, when called into the service of the United States, a part of the Regular Army of the United States, when the committee attempts to put them upon the same basis as the Regular Army as to pay for foreign service, that is changing the law with reference to the Organized Militia and its pay; and it must be perfectly apparent that if the committee do that, then any Senator has a right to move to amend the law and to introduce an additional amendment, so far as the Organized Militia is concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment, as found on page 28, was reported from a committee and it has been estimated for. If that be the case——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Estimated for by whom?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It has not been estimated for by anybody.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought it had been estimated for by the department.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The amount in the committee provision has been estimated for.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I mean.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. But I say that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri will require a very much increased appropriation—probably double the amount of the appropriation contained in the bill—and no estimate has been made for that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is without the record.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to ask the Senator from Oregon if there had been an estimate made based upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri? If there has not been, then, of course, it is increasing the appropriation; and, furthermore, it has not been reported from a standing committee.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It has not been.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, that will not do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a plain statement now from the Senator from Oregon that the $1,000,000 appropriation was not estimated for.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No, Mr. President. I say that the proposed amendment of the Senator from Missouri involves an expenditure that has not been estimated for. The amount in the bill has been estimated for, based upon the enlisted men in the National Guard and the Regular Army who may be in foreign service.

Mr. SMOOT. That is as I understand it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let us get this right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks he has it right.

Mr. REED. Very well, if the Chair has it right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is not any contention that the specific appropriation here of a million dollars for additional pay to enlisted men on foreign service, including the Organized Militia, has been estimated for. There is not any contention that it has been estimated for by the department or anybody else. The suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, who knows about these matters—and the Chair does not dispute his statement—namely, that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri will call for additional appropriation is doubtless true—the Chair does not want to put it in that way, and will say it is true; but it appears outside the record. All that the Senator from Missouri is seeking to do is to change this amendment so that it will apply to the troops on the Mexican border.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I should like to call the attention of the Chair to a point wholly apart from those we have been discussing. The rule is perfectly plain that any amendment involving any increase of appropriation, unless reported from a standing committee, is out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not doubt that.

Mr. LODGE. This undoubtedly involves an increase of appropriation, an additional charge on the Treasury.

Mr. REED. When a standing committee comes in with its recommendation we can then amend it, and that is the situation here.

Mr. LODGE. The rule so provides.

Mr. REED. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, the Chair would be impressed with the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts if there was anything on the face of the record to show that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri involves an increase in the appropriation. That is outside of the record, unless there is an admission on the part of the Senator from Missouri that it is going to take more than a million dollars.

Mr. REED. I make no admission of the kind; I do not know.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Well, the Chair, to end the discussion so far as the Chair is concerned, is of the opinion that when the committee seeks to change the law, any Senator has the right to offer an amendment also changing the law.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire, then, to say a word on this matter. I care not whether it is the National Guard or the Regular Army that we are considering, this slight increase ought to be made. Let us consider the Regular Army. These men are ordinarily located in the States, at fortresses, at barracks, and places where they have their accustomed habitat, a place in which to live, and where they can buy food and all the little extras which they use at the ordinary prices charged other citizens, and, indeed, at less prices, because the commissary department of the Army furnishes such things at much less than usual prices. So that now when they are called into Mexico and put to additional expense there is nothing unjust or inequitable in giving them a slight increase in compensation which will make up for the loss they sustain.

Applying the question to the National Guard, the argument made is not only sound but the reasons advanced are multiplied a hundredfold. I have here on my desk letters from the relatives of men who left employments that were paying them seventy-five to a hundred dollars a month to go to the border to serve their country.

I have letters showing that in some instances these men left families almost destitute, because, like other people in this country living upon wages, they had not laid by any considerable sum of money. I could read you letters that would touch the sympathy of any man who has a heart. These men are serving on the Mexican border at $15 a month. It will scarcely buy their tobacco. It is true they are serving just north of the river. What for? To repel the marauding expeditions of Mr. Villa and other banditti. If they were just south of the river they would be doing identically the same thing, only at a point a few miles farther south. If they were just south of the river,

under the amendment proposed by the chairman of the committee they would get the extra pay. If they are just north of the river they do not get it. Their hardships, their expense, their danger in one place is substantially the same as it is in the other place.

Mr. President, I shall take but a minute, but I want to say this: If we want to build up an army in the United States, if we want to keep the service in our Army from becoming so obnoxious, so oppressive, that no young man will enter it, then we must start upon a new policy, or a modified policy. You can not get the live and energetic young men of this country to go into an army at starvation wages. If you mistreat the National Guard, now that it has been called forth and has by a ready response rendered a splendid service to the country, you will find the evil result of that mistreatment following you for many years.

Let us see what happened. We had some trouble with the Mexican authorities, or with the alleged Mexican authorities. We found that our border was being invaded. We found that the soldiers of Mexico were recklessly firing across the line. We protested, yet the outrages continued. The President of the United States exercised the patience and faith of the saints, but at last a condition arose that made it necessary for us to make a display of force. We sent all of the Regular troops we could muster into Mexico or along the border.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. REED. In a moment. There were 1,500 miles of border to protect. It was found that the Regular force was too small, although we denuded all parts of the country in order to make as large a force as possible, whereupon the President called on the National Guard. Who were they? They were young men engaged in every avocation in life. There were lawyers, there were physicians, there were mechanics, there were laborers, there were farmers. They were living in their quiet homes, surrounded by their families, and were engaged in occupations that enabled them to make good livings. Within a few hours' time after the order was issued these young men abandoned their avocations and their homes and met at the places appointed for mobilization. They responded on the instant. In my State nearly the entire number were in their various armories within six hours after the order was issued; and I do not claim that Missouri did any better than other States. They arrived at the border as quickly as the War Department could prepare to move them. The delays incident to their movements, if there were delays, are chargeable to the Regular Army organization and not to the volunteers. Some of them could not be moved at once.

I am informed that when a New Jersey regiment went to get its guns it was discovered that the Regular Army officers had sent the guns to Plattsburg. I am informed that shoes could not be furnished in some instances. Such conditions can not be charged to the National Guard. It must be charged to those officers of the Army whose business it was to have on hand the necessary supplies to move troops.

These young men went down into the Mexican country or along the border. Their families, their dependents, they themselves were deprived of the ordinary wage and income which had been received. Whenever you say to the young men of this country that under circumstances of that kind our Government will exact from them great sacrifices, and that it will in no way respond to the call of humanity or to the voice of equity, you will make it impossible to maintain such an organization as the National Guard. You will be relegated for your support in the hour of emergency to the Regular Army of the United States, service in which is already so obnoxious to our people that it has been found impossible, in something like three or four months' time, to get 20,000 recruits. You can not maintain an army by such policies. You men who vote away millions of the people's money for cannon, for fortresses, for ships, for rifles, and for munitions, will, if you continue to pursue this narrow and archaic policy that has been abandoned by every civilized country on earth toward our men, find yourselves with guns but without men ready to handle them, with cannon but without men prepared to use them, you will have fortresses empty of men.

The Senator from California rose a little while ago. Does he desire to interrogate me?

Mr. WORKS. It seems that for the present, at least, the war in Mexico is over. Peace has been declared. I wanted to ask the Senator whether he does not think it would be far better, in the interest of the country and of these militiamen as well, that they should be allowed to return to their homes and their business?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, of course that question is entirely aside from the one I am discussing, and it invites me into a very broad field.

Mr. WORKS. Notwithstanding that, I should like to have the Senator's views upon that subject.

Mr. REED. The point of the question now under consideration is that these men are now engaged in this service. The length of time they may be engaged in the service is indefinite. The question I am discussing is how we should treat these men while thus engaged in the service.

Mr. WORKS. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. REED. Just a moment. I am not discussing the question how long they ought to be kept there, nor am I discussing the general Mexican policy of the administration. But since the Senator has asked me this question, I answer him that I am unable to answer the question, as I think the Senator is unable to answer it, as I think every other man in the Senate is unable to answer it, because in the nature of things we do not know and can not have up-to-date information with reference to just what is transpiring in Mexico.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. REED. Let me finish this answer to make plain what I have said. To my mind this is apparent: That our Mexican neighbor, involved as it was and still is in the turmoil of war, rapine, murder, and anarchy, nevertheless had cultivated an idea that it was big enough and potential enough to set at defiance the Government and people of the United States. Our President did not want to go to Mexico and slaughter its people, as he could have slaughtered them; neither did he want to sow the seeds of that hatred which springs from war and from conquest. Perhaps there were many other evils he desired to avoid. But in order to prevent a continuance of the outrages being perpetrated and to bring Mexico to its senses he made a show of force, and with the further thought undoubtedly that if Mexico did not come to its senses, and if worst had to come to worst, we would be prepared to strike with promptness and deadly effect.

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

Mr. REED. No; I will not yield until I have finished, and then I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All right.

Mr. REED. What has been the result of the President's rigorous action? Mexico has shown a disposition to yield. It looks as though Mexico is coming to its senses. Nevertheless it may be necessary to keep our troops along the border for some time in order that we may complete our negotiations, and it may be advisable even beyond the period of negotiations to keep our troops in Mexico or in proximity to the Mexican line, so that our negotiations will bear the fruitage of action and consummation. My own private judgment—I have spoken thus far solely my own personal views—but even in a more confined sense expressing my own private opinion, I think that it may very likely be necessary to keep troops along the Mexican border for some little time in the future. What will transpire in that country I can not tell, but if I were myself charged with this responsibility I would not withdraw a man or a gun until I was satisfied that we were substantially through with the Mexican trouble.

But, Mr. President, that is all aside from the question. The men are there. It is the settled policy of this country to pay our men in foreign service a 20 per cent increase. This bill provides for it. All that I am asking is that the man who is just north of the Mexican border, guarding our people, their property, and their homes, shall be treated as though he were just south of the Mexican line. The Regular Army officers and the Regular Army men who are south of the Mexican line are doing just the same kind of service that the militia officers and the militiamen are doing just north of the line. Neither are engaged in actual war. Each and all are engaged in the protection of our country against the marauding expeditions and the unlawful acts of the Mexican people. Both of these classes of our soldiers have been taken from their homes or from their barracks. They have an additional expense imposed upon them, and the fact ought to be recognized and some slight recompense made.

Mr. President, I have here the regulations of the Canadian Government for the payment of its troops. I also have tables showing the pay of the British troops going from Great Britain. The first thing you find is that in Canada they pay their men more than we pay our soldiers. I read a letter, so that I may

get the figures correct. It is signed by the lieutenant colonel commanding the One hundred and eightieth Battalion of Canadian troops:

I have your note of the 25th instant, and inclose you memorandum of pay and allowance regulations of the Canadian Army, which explains itself. * * *

In addition to the pay and allowance set out herein, allowance to the various branches is as follows:

	Per month.
Lieutenant colonel	$60
Major	50
Captain	40
Lieutenant	30
Sergeant	25
Private	20

In the case of a married man or where a man is the sole support of mother, the above rates apply, so that a private soldier in the field would receive $1 per day, 10 cents field allowance per day, and $20 per month to his wife or mother, if he is sole support.

In addition, the country has been organized into various districts, in a patriotic fund, where the citizens have donated funds for needy soldiers' families, based approximately on $3 for each child up to 16 years of age. This is outside of the Government, however, although it is universal.

* * * * * * *

Yours, very truly,

R. H. GREER,
Lieutenant Colonel Commanding
One hundred and eightieth O. S. Battalion.

Now, here is the table:

Regimental rates, Canadian forces.

	Pay.	Field allowance.	Separation allowance.
			Per month.
Colonel	$6.00	$1.50	$60.00
Lieutenant colonel	5.00	1.25	60.00
Major	4.00	1.00	50.00
Captains	3.00	.75	40.00
Lieutenants	2.00	.60	30.00
Command pay (in addition to rank)	1.00	.....	.....
Adjutants (in addition to rank)	.50	.....	.....
Paymasters	3.00	.75	40.00
Quartermasters	3.00	.75	40.00
Chaplains, medical officers, and veterinary officers (pay of rank as above).			
Nursing sisters	2.00	.60	.....
Warrant officers	2.00	.30	.....
Quartermaster sergeants	1.80	.20	25.00
Orderly-room clerks	1.50	.20	.....
Pay sergeants	1.50	.20	25.00
Battalion sergeant majors	1.85	.20	25.00
Company sergeant majors	1.60	.20	25.00
Company quartermaster sergeants	1.50	.20	25.00
Sergeants	1.35	.15	25.00
Corporals	1.10	.10	20.00
Privates	1.00	.10	20.00

Mr. President, that is what is being done in Canada. For the information of the Members of the Senate who are here considering this bill I have here a table showing the pay of the British Government for English soldiers, which I will insert. I also insert table showing the additional pay granted Australian and New Zealand troops.

A table showing the average weekly allowance made by the British Government to the families of all classes of English soldiers in active service is given below. These figures represent the allowance to families not living in public quarters. The families who do live in public quarters receive approximately one-half as much:

	Per week.
Wife only	$4.27
Wife and one child	5.49
Wife and two children	6.32
Wife and three children	6.76
Wife and four children	7.27
Each additional child	.24
Each motherless child	1.20
CANADA.	
Wife only	3.47
Wife and one child	4.62
Wife and two children	5.37
Wife and three children	6.33
Wife and four children	7.05
NEW ZEALAND.	
Wife only	3.05
Wife and one child	4.24
Wife and two children	5.08
Wife and three children	5.59
Wife and four children	6.05
AUSTRALIA.	
Wife only	3.19
Wife and one child	4.38
Wife and two children	5.23
Wife and three children	5.72
Wife and four children	6.19

In addition to the extra pay and special allowances above shown, Mr. President, the British Government by an act of Parliament has created what is known as the statutory committee of the Royal Patriotic Fund Corporation. This organization has branches or is empowered to establish branches in all parts of the Empire, or at least of England proper. Very briefly, the commission is directed to make inquiry into the condition of the families of all the soldiers, and out of the public funds as well as out of private subscriptions and donations to take care of these families according to their necessities.

What I am asking now is a very small thing. It is that the volunteer soldier serving on the Mexican line and just north of that line shall receive the same pay that he would if he were just south of the line. He is, in fact, engaged in the foreign service, for he is, in fact, defending us against a foreign people; but his service happens to be limited to patrolling the northern side of the Rio Grande. It seems to me the question is not open to dispute; the justice and equity of the proposition ought to commend it to all men.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a case in Topeka, Kans., where the family of a soldier are living on one meal a day. Corpl. Walter F. Beltz, who has always been regarded as a steady young man and was employed by the Santa Fe Railroad Co. for a salary of something like $75 or $80 a month, is in camp at Eagle Pass, Tex. His wife recently wrote to him as follows:

I don't know what we will do if you can not get away and come home, for everything goes wrong. Virginia is crying. I only get one meal a day. Jess and I eat bread and coffee; Virginia and Leroy [the two children] an egg. We can not get things to eat. No money coming, and I can not get work. I tried laundries and restaurants, but this town is full of help. Next week maybe I can get work. I hate to leave the kids, but will have to. The laundries pay 90 cents a day and dinner.

The Topeka Capital, commenting on the young man, says that—

Corpl. Beltz is regarded as one of the steadiest young men in the organization. He said this morning he had been working at the Santa Fe shops regularly for seven years before the guard was called out. He and his wife have been paying for a small home at 100 East Florence Avenue, rural route 27. The payments were $25.25 a month. Beltz's salary from the Government is $30 a month. He figures he can send most of it home.

He said in an interview relative to his situation:

I want to see this thing through, but now the building and loan association has notified my wife that if the payments are not made promptly we will lose our home, and one meal a day. If this goes on, I don't know what I will do. They told me in Topeka before we came here that Topeka would take care of my wife and children.

But, Mr. President, the home communities should not be required to take care of soldiers' families. The Government should do this, and not permit them to be left as objects of charity. We have a chance in a small way now to relieve the distress which exists in many communities by a slight increase in the salaries of soldiers. The young man I have mentioned is an officer receiving $30 per month, while the privates receive only half this amount, which is less than Canada and England are now paying, when we can well afford to pay more.

In my heart I feel that we ought to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri as a matter of simple justice, not only to the soldier serving in the field, but to the family at home. I therefore hope that the amendment will prevail.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Missouri a very simple question, whether it would not be better, as the war seems to be over in Mexico and peace has been declared, to return these militiamen to their homes and their business? The Senator declared that he could not answer that question, neither could any Member of this body. I think that is precisely true. I do not believe anybody can give any reason why these men should be maintained where they are now. I do not believe anybody can give any good reason why 16,000 or more of the regular troops are kept in Mexico under existing conditions.

I maintained when the reorganization bill was under consideration that the whole scheme of federalizing the National Guard and compelling them to take an additional oath of allegiance to the Federal Government was in violation of the express terms of the Constitution. I have not changed my mind on that subject.

I agree with the Senator from Missouri that if these men are to be maintained in the service they should be better paid and their families should be cared for.

It is no fault of theirs that they are where they are to-day, in a service that, I think, is unnecessary and a burden of expense to the Government.

I have seen so much of politics in the Executive Department of the Government and in the Congress of the United States that

I am afraid that I have become oversuspicious of any movement that is made like the one that is going on in the Mexican situation. I am firmly convinced that the Regular soldiers are kept in Mexico and that the militia have been called to the border for political reasons. I hope, Mr. President, I am mistaken.

We have witnessed something here this morning that leads me to that same conclusion. We have been talking here off and on about the child-labor bill. That bill has been hanging on here during all the present session of Congress and I believe at previous sessions. Suddenly, and just near the close of the session, the President of the United States comes down to the Capitol and demands, we are told, that that bill shall be taken up by the Congress and passed. And it is a bill that the President of the United States has in the most solemn way declared to be unconstitutional legislation. Why is action upon it demanded at the present time?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator has——

Mr. WORKS. I decline to yield to the Senator for the moment, as he was not willing to extend that courtesy to me. I will yield in a moment, however.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. WORKS. Why this haste in calling for this particular bill that has been before the Senate for so long, and just at a time when both the President and Members of Congress are anxious that this session should close? There can be but one answer to that question. Everybody knows on both sides of the Chamber what the object of it is. It is well understood that that sort of legislation is demanded by public sentiment and that the passage of the bill will be popular with the voters of this country.

I am not saying this, Mr. President, in any sense of opposition to the child-labor bill. I have very grave doubts myself as to the constitutionality of that kind of legislation. I am very much in favor of the principle involved in it, and it is a question which may be legitimately submitted to the courts of the country and left to their decision. I have felt all along disposed to support it and leave the courts to determine whether it is constitutional or unconsitutional. If I were clear in my own mind, if I were perfectly satisfied, that this was unconstitutional legislation I should feel that it was my duty to oppose it and vote against it, and I think every Member of this body who sincerely believes that that sort of legislation is unconstitutional should do his duty as a Member of the Senate and cast his vote against it, whatever might be the consequences.

I am sorry to say that I have not given the matter that careful study and consideration that I think every Senator should give it in order that I may be able to satisfy my own mind as to whether it can be sustained in the courts or not.

Mr. President, we are going to great lengths not only in the use of the Army—a part of which I think belongs to the States—but we are piling up an enormous debt and an expense that the taxpayers of this country will have to meet, and somebody, sooner or later, will be called upon to answer for it. Perhaps the chairman of the committee, who must be in the confidence of the Executive Department, and who, I have no doubt, knows more about the necessities of the case than I or any other Member of the Senate, could answer the question that I have asked the Senator from Missouri, who has declared his inability to answer it, as to whether it would not be better for the country and for the members of the militia that they should be allowed to return to their homes and to their business? Can the Senator from Oregon answer the question?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I do not think any Senator, as the Senator from Missouri has stated, can answer, nor do I think the President himself can answer, whether it would be necessary to call the troops home, or proper to call them home, for no man in the Senate, I conceive, knows exactly the situation there and the delicacy of the situation. I doubt very much if the President himself could say that it would be proper at this time to bring the troops away. Personally I should be glad to see them come away to-morrow.

Mr. WORKS. I have no doubt of that, Mr. President. Does the Senator from Oregon know why and for what purpose the large regular force is still kept in Mexico?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am only advised about it, as is the Senator from California, by what the newspapers say.

Mr. WORKS. Well, Mr. President, we are legislating here with respect to the enormous expenses that are created by just that thing—the keeping of the regular soldiers in Mexico and the necessity growing out of it, the guarding of the border by the militia. It seems to me that the Senator from Oregon, who is urging this legislation and these large appropriations, should have some idea as to why and for what purpose these appropriations have become necessary and why they should be continued.

Now, if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] desires to submit any questions, I shall be glad to yield for that purpose. [A pause.] Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is otherwise engaged, and I have said nearly all I desire to say at present on this subject.

I am feeling the situation pretty strongly myself. My mind revolts against some of the things we are doing. I think we have gone beyond all reason in the appropriations that we are about to make. I do not think this Congress will ever be able to justify itself for these appropriations in the minds of the people of this country. I think Members of Congress can hardly justify themselves in their own judgment and conscience. There is a force behind them, pressing for legislation of this kind; a force that I think is illegitimate, based upon false grounds and false reasons that I think ought not to control the action of Congress; but I am certain that it does.

I suggested a moment ago that I should be glad to submit to any question which the Senator from Missouri desired to ask.

Mr. REED. My question is a very simple one. Before I ask it, however, I want to say to the Senator from California that I hope he did not misunderstand my declining to yield to him at a particular moment as a discourtesy. It was not so meant. There was a certain thing which I was saying, and I only wanted to conclude it. I yielded to the Senator as soon as I was through with that particular statement. I am sure the Senator from California will understand that it was not out of a failure to have a proper regard for him that I declined to yield on the instant.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has always been courteous to me. I have no reason to complain of his failure to yield at the time to which he refers.

Mr. REED. The only question I desired to ask the Senator from California was, whether, when he made the statement that the President had declared the child-labor bill to be unconstitutional, he referred to the statement which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] had put into the RECORD on July 21 of this year.

Mr. WORKS. I have not read the statement as it was placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Idaho, but I read what was stated by the President in his book, and I presume it is the same, though I do not know.

Mr. REED. Very well. That was all I desired to ask.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, what is the matter now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have an amendment to offer, but there being an amendment pending, I shall withhold my amendment for the present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want to prolong this debate, yet I can not allow to go unnoticed the statement of the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] that soldiers are being kept in Mexico for political reasons only. That is an ungenerous statement. It is one that I should not have been surprised to have heard from some sources, but I am surprised to hear it from the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I said that I hoped I was mistaken. If the Senator from Missouri can now convince me that I am mistaken, I shall be glad to correct any statement that I have made; but I understood the Senator to say that he was not able to answer the question with respect to what was going on down in Mexico.

Mr. REED. When I said I could not tell what the present conditions were I referred to the negotiations that are going on. I was dealing with the particular present situation and to the attitude of the Mexican authorities. As to those matters I said I was not informed. That, however, did not imply that I was utterly ignorant of some plain and bald facts.

The Senator from California states that he will change his opinion, as he expressed it a few moments ago, if he is convinced. I do not undertake to convince the Senator, but I do undertake to demonstrate that the charge that the troops were sent to the Mexican border for political purposes is an unfair charge.

What was the situation? For months the Mexican leaders had been showing a constantly increasing disregard of the rights of this country.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. WORKS. As the Senator from Missouri is attempting to prove that I have been unfair, he certainly should be fair

himself in stating the proposition. I did not refer to the sending of the troops to the border at a time when it might have been fairly stated that it was necessary. I was talking about the present condition of maintaining them on the border.

Mr. REED. So that the Senator now agrees—and therefore I omit what I was going to say on that point—that there was a necessity for sending the troops to the border; that that was a patriotic act, for, if the necessity existed, the act must have been patriotic.

Mr. WORKS. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. REED. And it was a just act, for if the necessity existed, then it was just to send them. And it was a wise act, for if the necessity existed, then it was wise to meet that necessity.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I insist upon it that the Senator from Missouri shall be fair about this matter. I made no admission; I have not agreed that it was necessary to send the troops there in the beginning. My remarks applied to another and a different time. I have not said anything about the necessity of sending them there.

Mr. REED. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator from California does not admit that it was necessary to send the troops there in the first instance, I shall have to try to show that it was. I was engaged in doing so when the Senator from California rose and made the statement which led me to conclude that he made the admission.

Beginning just where I left off, this constantly increasing menace from Mexico culminated in an invasion of our country by a Mexican force and in the firing upon United States troops and the killing of women and children. This occurred at Columbus, N. Mex., at Big Bend, Tex., and at many other places circumstances of the most aggravating nature transpired. I do not propose to argue that, under such conditions, it was right and proper for the President to send a sufficient force of men to protect our border. Opinions may differ as to how far he ought to have gone beyond the border, or as to whether war should have been declared or not; but opinions among patriotic American people can not differ as to his right and duty to protect the border.

I come to the other question. If these troops are not immediately called back, the Senator from California suspects that politics are being played. Why should they be called back? That is a question that a man ought to be ready to answer before he charges a base motive to the President of the United States. Are conditions in Mexico those of established peace and order? Have the banditti of that country been yet suppressed? Are Villa and his rapers and burners and murderers yet annihilated or captured? Is there a living man who can guarantee that, if the forces of the United States were withdrawn to-night, by to-morrow morning Mexican marauders might not be ravishing American women and burning American property and murdering American men? And until some Senator can stand on this floor and demonstrate that those conditions will not obtain, it ill becomes him to charge the President with playing politics merely because he keeps a force along the Mexican border.

The Senator further charges that the President is playing politics because a few days ago he suggested to the Democratic leaders the wisdom and desirability of passing at this session of Congress a child-labor bill. That was not made for the first time the President expressed himself in favor of the child-labor bill. It is well known that the President has for many months, if not for a longer period, been urging the passage of a child-labor bill. It is also well known and understood that the majority on this side have been in favor of the enactment of a child-labor bill; but that there were many other measures which some of the Senators thought of equal importance and therefore desired to get through before this session of Congress should come to a close. Accordingly it had been tentatively agreed between some of the Senators on each side that the child-labor bill and the immigration bill should go over until early in the next session and be set down for action upon a day certain, and this not because of any lack of interest in the child-labor bill, for the action that was contemplated would have insured a speedy result. Yet so anxious was the President for action upon the bill that he did substantially what he has done on other bills—he came here and said, "If you can possibly do it, include this bill in your budget for this term."

Now, this strange thing happens. The Senator from California, if he can be catalogued politically, would be classed as a Progressive; he would be included with that great number, more than 4,000,000, who repudiated the old party standard and who marched out under a new banner, which was to lead to the heights of legislative achievement and reform. The protection of children was one of the avowed principles of the Progressive element of the Republican Party, now unhappily innocuous, dead, and almost forgotten. The President has been for child-labor legislation ever since he was convinced that it could be constitutionally enacted. Other men who had doubts as to its constitutionality have been studying the question and changing their minds. It would seem to me that an earnest champion of child-labor legislation, one whose heart bleeds over the wrongs of children, one whose tender soul is wrought with agony because of the oppression and the crushing of the young lives of children, would welcome the earnest advocacy and support of the President and would be willing to ascribe to him the same high motives, the same earnest desire to aid the children of the land, as have inspired those who belonged to the Progressive element of the Republican Party. We would hardly expect such an act in such a cause to be charged to the base motive of politics, yet the Senator from California makes it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The RECORD shows that the Chair had announced that this amendment was agreed to. Without objection, the vote will be reconsidered. The question now is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. 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:

Ashurst	Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Harding	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Husting	Overman	Smoot
Brady	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Sterling
Broussard	Jones	Page	Taggart
Bryan	Kenyon	Penrose	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kern	Poindexter	Thompson
Chilton	La Follette	Reed	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Robinson	Wadsworth
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Walsh
Curtis	Lippitt	Sherman	Warren
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Weeks
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	Works

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the temporary absence from the Chamber of my colleague [Mr. TAGGART] on official business.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHAFROTH] on account of death in his family.

Mr. BECKHAM. I wish to announce the temporary absence of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senate has now assembled, and if its Members will bear with me one minute I will state the amendment we are about to vote upon, and I shall not take the minute.

The law as it now stands provides extra pay of 20 per cent to soldiers engaged in foreign service. Under that law those of our troops, Regular or militia, who are south of the Mexican border will get a 20 per cent increase. Those who are guarding the Mexican border, but happen to be north of the line, will not. My amendment puts them all on the same basis and gives them the 20 per cent additional pay while serving under the orders of the President along the Mexican border.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to, on a division.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in reference to the vote just taken, I hope the Senate will increase the appropriation so as to cover it, because there is absolutely not enough money to meet the increased charge.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the chairman of the committee if he can suggest to the Senate how much that proposition will increase the expenditures of the Government?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me say that in the estimates which were made by the department to cover the Regular Army, before the National Guard was mustered into the service, the pay of officers on foreign service was estimated at $300,000. That was sufficient to pay the Regular Army officers the 10 per cent increase granted by law when engaged in foreign service. Subsequently, when the National Guard was called into the service, a revised estimate was sent up, on the assumption that the National Guard officers and the enlisted men, too, would be called into service in Mexico. That estimate was $1,000,000 for the Regular Army, assuming that all of the Regular Army officers would be called out, and for the National Guard officers—practically double the number of the Regular Army officers—$2,178,240. So that if we

are going to do as the amendment proposes, pay them on the border just as if they were in foreign service, the amount contained in the bill is entirely insufficient.

I have addressed myself so far only to the officers. Now, with reference to the enlisted men, the estimate made for the enlisted personnel of the Army engaged in foreign service on the basis of the Regular Army, before the National Guard was called into service, was $800,000. That was the amount fixed by the department. Then, later on a revised estimate was made when the National Guard were Federalized, and it was assumed that they would be put into the foreign service. The revised estimate for the Regular Army was $3,000,000—it was increased, you see—and for the National Guard, $11,469,024. Now, changes have been made in these figures, because the National Guard have not been sent across the border, so that if they are going to be paid for service on the border just as if they were called over the border increases will have to be made in the appropriation, or there will be no money with which to meet the increased expenditure.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator, if he has considered that matter, whether the amount would not have to be about quadrupled, or more?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. For the enlisted men it would have to be increased to $14,469,024.

Mr. WARREN. And how much for the officers, if the Senator has it there?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It would be $3,178,240.

Mr. WARREN. I think it ought to have been apparent to anybody that the carrying of this amendment greatly increased the expenses of the Army; and, of course, if we make a law that this allowance be paid we must appropriate the amount to meet the requirements of that law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is not any question about that, Mr. President. The National Guard is larger, of course, than the Regular Army; and if we are going to give those at home foreign-service pay, in the very nature of things it must follow that there must be an increase in the appropriation.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I have no objection to this legislation. I do not care personally. I have simply followed the law, and so has the committee, in undertaking to make these appropriations, just exactly as it exists to-day; that is, that there was to be an increase for foreign-service pay both for the officers and for the enlisted men. Now, if we change that and allow men in the continental United States foreign-service pay, it must follow that the appropriation will have to be increased. I am only suggesting to the Senate that in view of the action of the Senate just now we ought, in order to be just to these men, to increase the appropriation to meet the requirements.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think it is the duty of the chairman, in behalf of the committee, to enlarge the appropriation sufficiently to cover the legislation which precedes it. Doubtless the chairman will offer an amendment to cover this. We have now on Mexican soil perhaps nine or ten thousand men, and we have on the border on this side probably 130,000 or 140,000 or perhaps 150,000 men all told.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if we are to give added pay to the National Guard who are on American soil on the border, I will ask the chairman of the committee whether or not there will be a clamor for added pay from the National Guard who are in mobilization camps throughout the country? They have left their gainful occupations and are mobilized. The climate in which they are may be a little more healthful or it may not be as desirable. It seems to me that this will be a discrimination against the National Guard in the mobilization camps that will cause a fresh agitation. I should like the chairman's opinion on that point.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have not any question but that requests will be made to Congress to grant it, Mr. President.

If I may do so in this connection, I think it is proper for me to say very briefly that as an economic proposition there is not any question but that there is very much of force and reason in the insistence that the National Guard ought to be paid more; but in making provision for extra pay for the National Guard we ought to bear in mind the fact that unless we make the same provision for the Regular Army, in the very nature of things we can not have a Regular Army. That is a fundamental proposition. I admit the small pay of these guardsmen. I admit the hardship that is perpetrated against their families because of their absence. It has been sought to alleviate that hardship by allowing those who have dependents to go home. Now, Mr. President, I appeal to such a distinguished soldier as George Washington to establish the fact that it is absolutely unwise and uneconomic to treat one branch of the service differently from any other branch of the service. If you treat the National Guard on better terms than you treat the Regular Army, you must abandon the Regular Army, because no man will enlist in it. On the other hand, if you treat the Regular Army better than you do the National Guard, the National Guard will go out of existence, because it has been said by abler men than I that a country can not defend itself on its patriotism. The patriotism of a people will not defend the people.

I am not protesting against the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I cheerfully accept the proposition of the Senator; but I appeal to the Senate that it should treat all branches of the service upon terms of exact equality and justice.

Mr. President, I did not expect to have to refer to it, but I am going to refer to the statement of Washington on that subject and the difficulties which he encountered because of the fact that different branches of the service were being treated differently.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator claims that the amendment as now drawn will not apply to the Regular Army man serving on the Mexican border the same as it does to the militiaman serving on the Mexican border?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have not the amendment before me, but I understood the amendment applied to the National Guard.

Mr. REED. I think it applies to all of them. I simply inserted in the language of the Senator's own amendment certain words which would include in the extra-pay premium those soldiers who are serving along the Mexican border under the orders of the President. I think he is discussing a question out of the record.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If I am discussing out of the record, I have not departed very far from the example of my illustrious predecessor.

Mr. REED. I know that is true; I seldom keep in the record, but the chairman of the committee always keeps in the record.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I try to do so.

Mr. REED. Therefore I thought I was doing him a kindness if I asked him if the language——

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to it, and I will try to keep within the record. I hope the Senator will, too.

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the Senator's amendment is:

For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men on foreign service——

Mr. REED. That is your amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was trying to read it with the Senator's included. Here is your amendment:

or under the call of the President engaged in protecting the Mexican border, whether serving within or without the United States, including enlisted men of the Organized Militia or National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States.

It seems to me that that is limited to the National Guard.

Mr. REED. If the chairman please, the purpose of the amendment that you offered was to furnish the additional pay for Regulars serving in the foreign service and for the National Guard sent into the foreign service. The Regulars already get it. You propose to include the Militia or the National Guard.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. So that they will get it.

Mr. REED. Now, all my amendment does is, in substance, to say that anyone serving along the Mexican border shall be treated as in the foreign service.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Whether Regular or National Guardsman.

Mr. REED. I did not mean to limit the amendment so that it would cut out a Regular serving either north or south of the line, and I am perfectly willing to submit to any amendment the chairman may suggest that will clear that difficulty.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is barely possible that I am mistaken in the point I made that the Senator's amendment only applied to the National Guard. If it is the purpose of the Senator to include the Regular Army, I am not going to make any protest, but I think an increased appropriation will have to be made. I will suggest that later.

Mr. REED. I suggest to the chairman to tell us how much we need.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will.

Mr. REED. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to offer an amendment. On page 74, after line 5, I move to insert:

For the acquisition of land near or adjoining Fort Taylor at Key West, Fla., $150,000, or so much thereof as the Secretary of War may deem necessary.

This was recommended. First an appropriation was made for additional land at Fort Taylor in 1906. At that time the department recommended $200,000, and $100,000 was appropriated. Since then for the fiscal year 1910 an estimate for an additional

$150,000 was submitted and a recommendation was made, but no appropriation was made.

I have a letter from the Secretary of War to the effect that the acquisition of this land is necessary for military purposes, and it is estimated that the sum of $150,000 will be required to procure the land needed.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. FLETCHER. The date of the letter is January 7, 1916.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator read the letter?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; I will have it read.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator if that estimate was made through the Treasury Department in the regular way?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was not estimated for the year 1917, but it was estimated before and the department required this appropriation. I will state that Key West is a very important point. It is a tactical point. If an enemy should occupy Key West he would have complete control of the Gulf and it would be right close to Guantanamo and almost in the immediate vicinity of the Panama Canal. The department feels and has felt the necessity of this appropriation ever since 1906. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WARREN. The reason why I asked the Senator was, not along the lines he is pursuing, but in the division of the work of the Senate committees. When the military appropriation supply bill was taken from the Appropriations Committee and turned over to the Military Committee that committee retained, under Senate rules, for itself the consideration of all the enlargements and the extension of posts, except for shooting galleries and matters of drill of that kind. I wanted to see what this particular addition was for. It should have gone to the Committee on Appropriations for the sundry civil bill, but it is too late to put it there now.

I wish to know whether this is an emergency or if there is any reason why it should go in the bill this year.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do think it is. The people there think so and the department has thought that it is needed, and that it is a very important matter. I suppose myself that perhaps it belongs in the fortifications bill or the sundry civil bill, but it was not proposed in either of those bills, and not having been taken care of there I have offered it now. I find that the last appropriation for some additional land at Fort Taylor was in the act of March 2, 1907, making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908. So it has appeared heretofore in this bill and I am following that precedent in offering the amendment at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to ask the Senator what is the extent of the work at that point. How large a garrison have we there, how much land have we, and what is the purpose in obtaining the land to be acquired?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is shown especially on a drawing which I have and which I am unable to describe in detail but I will hand it to the Senator. The area indicated in this map by the red is the present land owned there and the land intended to be covered by the amendment is that included in the red lines.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. What I wanted to get at was the size of the post. What is the size of the post?

Mr. FLETCHER. They have a small garrison there now because they have not room and quarters for more. They need more.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. For an enlargement of the garrison?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the claim. There are strips of land between the present holdings that ought to be owned by the Government so as to make it a solid holding.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It is a little curious to me, in view of the importance the Senator attaches to it, that this has not been taken care of before. I have understood that there is a very small garrison there that did not require very much room.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to say to the Senator from Wyoming that in former days there were always two batteries of Artillery stationed there, and I do not believe they have quarters for a much larger force.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; and one of them has been withdrawn on account of the lack of facilities.

Mr. DU PONT. It was withdrawn for service on the Canal Zone, which has swept the Atlantic coast of its garrisons. So that the size of the garrison is no indication of the importance of the post.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to read into the RECORD just one paragraph of the letter of the War Department which has been cited by the Senator from Florida giving the reason why an estimate was not furnished and, to my mind, a reason why, if this appropriation is made, it should go elsewhere:

In view of the impracticability of covering all military needs in the estimates submitted for a single fiscal year, and of the existence of other and more urgent necessities than the acquisition of additional land at Fort Taylor, no estimate for that purpose was submitted to Congress for the fiscal year 1915. It may be said, however, that the acquisition of this land is necessary for military purposes, and that it is estimated that the sum of $150,000 will be required to procure the additional land needed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to have the letter read or printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will ask for a division. I will first ask to have the letter read which I sent to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 7, 1916.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Referring to your letter of December 24, 1915, relative to the plans of the department as to the acquisition of additional land at Fort Taylor, Fla., I beg to inform you that for a number of years past it has been the view of the department that additional land should be acquired at that fort in order to permit the erection thereon of accommodations for the Artillery garrison for the coast fortifications at Key West.

As you are aware, the hurricane of 1909 destroyed so many of the buildings at Key West Barracks that it was necessary to reduce the garrison to one company, which is practically only a care-taking detachment for the armament. Under the adopted policy of the War Department, 6 of the 10 companies required to provide one manning detail for the fortifications at Fort Taylor should be composed of regular Coast Artillery troops and the remaining four companies of militia Coast Artillery troops. Because of the nature of the site at Fort Taylor and of the location of the batteries, it is impracticable to build a post on the present reservation at Fort Taylor, with due regard to its ultimate development for the complete regular garrison required.

Under date of December 15, 1906, an estimate was submitted for $200,000 for the purchase of land adjacent to Fort Taylor upon which to erect buildings for a Coast Artillery post. The amount appropriated, however, was but $100,000, which was found sufficient to acquire only the land shown in solid red on the accompanying tracing. To acquire the additional land needed, which is that outlined in red on the accompanying tracing, an estimate for an additional $150,000 was submitted for the fiscal year 1910, but no appropriation was made by Congress at that time or subsequently.

In view of the impracticability of covering all military needs in the estimates submitted for a single fiscal year, and of the existence of other and more urgent necessities than the acquisition of additional land at Fort Taylor, no estimate for that purpose was submitted to Congress for the fiscal year 1917. It may be said, however, that the acquisition of this land is necessary for military purposes, and that it is estimated that the sum of $150,000 will be required to procure the additional land needed.

Very sincerely,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. DU PONT. I desire to say that the conditions which existed then are very different from the conditions which exist to-day, and it seems to me important that this land should be purchased, because——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will the Senator allow a question? What particular difference is there in the conditions now and when the letter was written?

Mr. DU PONT. When the letter was written the general feeling of lack of preparation, commonly known as "preparedness," had not made itself fully felt in the country.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Of course the Senator did not fail to notice the date of the letter.

Mr. DU PONT. The 7th of January.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The 7th of last January. Not such a great length of time has passed.

Mr. DU PONT. Not a great length of time, but the feeling had not reached its apogee at that date. I think a letter written to-day probably would be a little more earnest. Be this as it may, the fact remains that we have the fortifications; we have the guns mounted and no garrison to serve them, and no room to make proper accommodations for the quartering of the necessary troops. It seems to me to be a most unwise course to spend enormous sums for coast fortifications and then make no provision to meet the needs of those who are to garrison them.

Mr. FLETCHER. I call attention to the fact that the Secretary of War stated in this letter that this additional land is needed there, that it is important it should be provided for, and that an estimate of $150,000 has been made for that purpose. I hope the Senate will allow it to go into conference.

Mr. GALLINGER. What is the area? How many acres of land?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am unable to state the precise area. The drawing attached to the letter of the Secretary of War which I have here shows the situation. The present holding is in the shape of a small area disconnected by private holdings, and they wish to connect up the reservation so that it will be one solid body, and that they may utilize it as such.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator know how the Government happened to get into the possession of land situated in that way, with private holdings between the Government property?

Mr. FLETCHER. I really do not know how that happened. The department recommended an appropriation of $200,000 away back in 1906. Congress allowed only $100,000, and I presume they bought to that extent and had to quit. I do not know what else it was, but Congress allowed only $100,000, and the department has since recommended $150,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. It occurs to me that if the men who made that purchase were as wise as men ordinarily are they would have purchased a compact piece of land and not gone scattering around and purchased pieces disconnected with each other. I know nothing about it, however.

Mr. FLETCHER. I presume they expected that an appropriation would be provided later so as to complete their plans, but it has never been done up to this time, and that is the object of the amendment I now offer. They recommended it in 1910, *as I said*, and they have since stated that it is necessary for their requirements there.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me a rather peculiar circumstance that we propose to appropriate $150,000 to buy land and do not know how much land we are going to buy.

Mr. FLETCHER. They know.

Mr. GALLINGER. It may be that is the way the Government does business.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not want the Senator to imagine that the department is as ignorant on that subject as I am. I can not state how much land they intend to buy. They furnished a diagram showing precisely what the land is, but I can not figure from that diagram the precise number of acres.

Mr. GALLINGER. Would not a telephone message to the department get us that information?

Mr. FLETCHER. Undoubtedly precisely what the area is that they require can be ascertained. Then, another thing. It may be that when they go to purchase this land if, as this amendment will allow them to do, they can procure what they need for less than $150,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, we do not expect that they will do that if we make an appropriation.

Mr. FLETCHER. If they find that they can get more for $150,000 than they at present contemplate, they will not use the additional amount.

Mr. GALLINGER. We need not anticipate that. We simply pay $150,000 for whatever land is mapped out on this chart.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am sure I can not say as to that; but they estimate that $150,000 will purchase the land which they need there. That is all I know about it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have on several occasions tried to keep the deficit from becoming so large that it would swamp the Government, but I have not had great success in my former efforts, and I will content myself with what I have said on this matter. Of course, the amendment is subject to a point of order. I am not going to make it if the Senators having charge of the bill do not choose to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was rejected after a division.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I have had my clerk make an estimate as to the amount of increase necessary, but I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that while this change is being made in the law there is no reason why it should not apply to officers as well as the enlisted personnel. I am going to suggest an amendment applying the rule he has adopted with reference to enlisted men to the officers as well.

Mr. REED. I have no objection to the Senator putting that in now or putting it in in conference.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know whether we could do it in conference, because it changes the law. I think it had better be done here. I offer as an amendment what I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it the same amendment that was agreed to?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; this applies to officers. I ask to have reconsidered the vote by which the former amendment was adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out on page 27, lines 21 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

For additional 10 per cent increase of pay of officers on foreign service or under the call of the President engaged in protecting the Mexican border, whether serving within or without the United States, including officers of the Organized Militia or National Guard, when called or drafted into the service of the United States, $3,178,240.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will state that I followed the exact language the Senator used in reference to the enlisted men, and that raised the appropriation from $500,000 to $3,158,240. That covers the officerial arm of the National Guard.

Mr. REED. The officers and men. I have no objection to that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask a question of the chairman of the committee? Is it his interpretation of that language that it will give to the National Guard officers whether or not they are on the border foreign-service pay?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think it covers them all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion that has gone on this morning. My impression was in the midst of that discussion that it was the object of the Senator from Missouri to give foreign-service pay to Regulars and National Guardsmen who were engaged in protecting the border.

Mr. REED. That was my purpose, and I think that is the language employed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am in entire accord with the purpose of the Senator from Missouri, but my impression is that this language will give foreign-service pay to National Guard officers and enlisted men who are still in their State camps.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am inclined to think so myself.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not think that was the object of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The amendment I prepared will not do it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me read it to the Senator. Here is the way the original amendment I suggested reads:

For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of officers on foreign service, including enlisted men of the Organized Militia or National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States.

That is the original amendment.

The Senator proposes to amend that so that it would read as follows:

For additional 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men on foreign service or under the call of the President engaged in protecting the Mexican border, whether serving within or without the United States, including enlisted men of the Organized Militia or National Guard when called or drafted into the service of the United States.

I think it covers all, Mr. President. I hardly thought that was the purpose of the Senator, but it does that.

Mr. REED. It was not my purpose to include all. I prepared the amendment in some haste, because the Senate will remember that the chairman of the committee had sent up an amendment written, I think, in pencil. I got hold of it and undertook to amend it by interlineation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. We can probably fix it in conference.

Mr. REED. My sole purpose was to cover the members and officers of the National Guard who are actually called into the service along the Mexican border or in Mexico.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I suggest to the Senator instead of using the language "when called or drafted into the service of the United States" in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Missouri we strike out those words and say "when engaged in such service along the border."

Mr. REED. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think Congress ought to make appropriations for these men, because all of them, even those who are in camp in their States, may be called to the border, and we ought to be prepared to meet their pay as well as if they are called to the border for service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is perfectly true, and we probably ought to have the money ready if the troops that are still held back in the States are ordered to the border. I understood the purpose of the Senator from Missouri was to give foreign-service pay to National Guardsmen who are actually engaged in protecting the border. Will the chairman of the committee accept that amendment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator from Missouri accept an amendment to that effect?

Mr. REED. If I understand the amendment I accept it. There was some confusion and I could not quite hear the Senator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If it is in order at this time, Mr. President, I move to strike out from the amendment as perfected by the amendment of the Senator from Missouri this language, "when called or drafted into the service of the United States," and to substitute therefor "when engaged in protecting the Mexican border, whether within or without the United States."

The rest is a duplication of the language of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I think that is satisfactory. If it is not it can be remedied in conference. We both have the same object in view.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Missouri accepts this amendment, and that the Sena-

tor from New York offers it, because the more inclusive provision should be left in the bill.

There is no question that the men who are in camp in response to the call of the President are just as much taken away from their usual avocations and their capacity to earn money for themselves and their families as though they were on the Mexican border. There is not the slightest difference in the condition of those men, except that the men in the State camps have perhaps a little better climate. They have their home climate, and in some cases it is better and in some cases it is worse. While I understand the climate on the Rio Grande is hot in the afternoon, it is a dry heat and the men do not feel it as we perhaps feel the sultry conditions here in Washington.

But, however that may be, when a man answers the call of the President and gives up his business and suffers all the losses that are thereby incurred, so far as recompense is concerned, he ought to be liberally taken care of. I can not see the line of differentiation that is proposed by the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

While I am on my feet I want to challenge a statement made by the chairman of the committee [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] just now. He stated that any differentiation between services would kill one or the other service. Well, Mr. President, I do not know where he is quoting from Gen. Washington, because I know Gen. Washington has been misrepresented a great deal in reference to the militia question; but differentiation between services has not killed the National Guard of the United States, because they have been differentiated against more completely and more absolutely than has any other service that can be named. While every other service was paid, they were not paid. The passage of the new law of June 3, taking the place of the Dick bill, will hereafter give the guard for ordinary service a small pay. If you could possibly kill a service by not paying it, while you do pay other similar service, the Organized Militia would have been dead long ago. But if an institution or service has vitality in it; if it is American, it will live, and this service of citizen soldiery for the protection of this country is an American institution, and so has lived.

Senators on the other side talk about Americanism, and yet are they not opposing the most thoroughly American institution that we have, namely, that of an organized and disciplined militia, when they refuse to compensate that militia, or did so through the past years; and is not the committee opposing an American institution, standing as it does in opposition, wherever it gets a chance, to any compensation for these troops of a commensurate sort, and that in the face of the sacrifices these men are making?

Mr. President, I have here a copy of a bill which was introduced and passed in the other House, and which went to the Military Committee of the Senate on the 3d of July, providing for some support for the dependents of the National Guardsmen who have made all these sacrifices for the country. Whatever there may be that is awkward in this proposed amendment—leaving out the guard in the camps and putting in other members of the guard—it is all due to the committee refusing to act on that House bill.

The House bill was passed on the 1st of July, and, I believe, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate on the 3d of July. It is a well-balanced measure; it excludes all sort of extreme liberality, and it is limited to less money than Canada gives her soldiers; and yet the Committee on Military Affairs has seen fit to lock up that bill from that day to the present. That is where the real trouble is, Mr. President. Giving these men this 20 per cent increase is simply an attempt on the part of the Senate to get around the obstructions of the committee. The Senate does not necessarily want to increase the pay of the officers; it may be well to do so; but that is not the real object.

The real object is to do something—even if you only give to the enlisted man $5 more a month—to enable him to support his dependents at home.

Mr. GALLINGER. Did the House pass the bill?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It passed it overwhelmingly, and it has been locked up in the committee here since the 3d of July.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The House passed the bill by only two dissenting votes.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. There were only two dissenting votes in the House of Representatives on this subject. It does not lie in the mouth of the committee or of its chairman to complain about any little irregularity in the action of this amendment, because the Senate has to catch at this legislation as it passes by, and, in amending it, may not be able to do the thing as completely and as smoothly as it was done in the House bill in providing for taking care of these dependents. So, Mr. President, I certainly hope that at an early date the committee will be liberal enough to give the Senate a chance to vote on that bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator from Maryland will permit me before he sits down, I desire to say that I have pending here an amendment to be voted on by the Senate which will provide for exactly what the House bill provides for, which bill was sent to the Committee on Military Affairs on the 3d of July. I propose to offer that proposition at an opportune time, when the Senate can have a chance to straighten out that very question.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I hope the Senator will secure the support of two-thirds of the Senate for that amendment. I believe that there is a very rapid improvement going on in the minds of Senators as to that subject.

Attention is proper, in this connection, to one other feature, Mr. President. Whenever you have a great citizen army or a great army of any kind, you have got to provide for the dependents when you call that army out. That is the universal experience in Europe, and it is inevitable. Of course, if you can have a small professional army, recruited from special classes, as is the Regular Army of the United States recruited; men of such relations in life that they have no dependents, there are no dependents to provide for when such men go to war. But that class is an extremely limited class in a prosperous country like the United States. That is why in our present military system the Regular Army can only go ahead 1,000 men a month. That is the reason why our present military system, so far as the Regular Army is concerned, is practically breaking down, except for the support it gets from the National Guard. Little by little it is coming home to the understanding of the American people that the great difference between a professional soldier, of whom we can get very few, and a citizen soldier, of whom we can get a many as we want, is that when you call the citizen soldier into the service of the country you have got to take care of his people at home. It is recognized by the General Staff of this country; it is recognized by everybody who knows anything about military economy; it is recognized in the law of every country of the world except the United States and Mexico, as I showed yesterday. Our neighbors on the north, the Canadians, are now paying their enlisted men $1.10 a day on the average, with an additional allowance of $20 a month for the maintenance of their dependent families.

Mr. WARREN. What is the regular pay of the Canadian soldier?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am not able to inform the Senator further than as shown in the report, which is in the RECORD, to which I referred yesterday, as having been received from our consul general at Ottawa.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator think those soldiers are receiving the same pay or higher pay or lower pay than are the American soldiers?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The average enlisted man in the Canadian Army receives $1.10 a day, with an additional allowance of $20 a month for his dependents.

Mr. WARREN. Does he receive that in money? Does he receive it in cash, aside from his subsistence?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. This report does not specify how he receives it, but I presume the $1.10 and the $20 are received in cash. Of course, in addition to that, his complete equipment and maintenance are furnished by the Government, as is the case with all soldiers.

Mr. WARREN. I have not the matter before me to which the Senator refers, but I think the Senator will find upon investigation that that statement is not exactly accurate.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am absolutely certain, Mr. President, that that statement is correct.

Mr. WARREN. For instance, the amount which the French Government gives its soldiers for use of their dependent families is $6 a month, with a few pennies more for each minor child.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Of course, the Senator knows that the standards of living in Europe are different from what they are in Canada and the United States. That is exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. WARREN. Canada is under the same Government as England, and matters in Canada differ from matters in the United States quite a bit.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Well, if the Canadian standard of living is lower than that in the United States, it would imply that our soldiers should get even better pay than the Canadians. All I am asking or suggesting, and all that the bill which passed the House, in which the Military Committee of the Senate, of which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is so distin-

guished a member, have locked up since the 3d of July, provides for is only $50 a month.

Mr. WARREN. Well, the figure of speech of "locking up the bill" is entirely unnecessary. The bill is in committee, as are hundreds of other bills. Has the Senator from Maryland figured what paying $50 a month would amount to, and how long $1,000,000 would last? The bill comes over here with $2,000,000 in it, and it is stated that that sum possibly might last 30 days, and it might last for a shorter time than that.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I read here yesterday an interview, which purported to come from Gen. Funston, in which he stated 3,000 as being the number of men who may soon be excused by him from service by reason of having dependents; but I do not know that that is accurate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. REED. I wanted to answer the question as I understood it, though I could not hear very accurately what the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] asked. As I understood, it was whether the pay of the soldiers included their subsistence. I have here the regulations of the British Army, from which I read this:

> The soldier will himself be rationed in kind, or will draw the usual ration allowance, now 1 shilling and 9 pence a day.
>
> In respect to his family he will draw the same allowance at the rate shown for separate allowance, without allotment in Table A, paragraph 2.

I have already put into the RECORD this morning the pay that is given to the families; and in the case of Canada the pay given the men is $20 a month, an additional allowance for service in the field, and, in addition to that, a stipend for the wife and an additional stipend for each child. I have not the figures in my mind, but they run approximately from $4 to $6.

Mr. WARREN. Has the Senator from Missouri the basic pay of a private which is paid in cash in addition to all of his allowances?

Mr. REED. I put in the RECORD this morning a letter from a Canadian officer in reference to that matter. I think there is no doubt in the world——

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator from Missouri remember what it was? If he stated it, I might have been out of the Chamber.

Mr. REED. Twenty dollars a month was the basic pay. Then, in addition to that, were these other sums. I do not think there can be any error about it. I am not one of the cocksure men when dealing with information which I get in that way.

Mr. WARREN. I shall be glad to look the matter up in the RECORD, as the Senator has put it in.

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to hand the Senator, if he desires me to do so, this book of regulations.

Mr. WARREN. I will say while on my feet, responding to a statement made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] in regard to my being on the Military Committee—the committee having locked the bill up, and so forth—that I have always felt in legislation, as in private business, that if you are going to purchase a bill of goods you should provide the method of paying for it, and if you are inaugurating a rule or law to create a certain expense you should provide for that expense.

A few moments ago, following the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, I asked the chairman to take notice of the necessity for an increase of the appropriation because of the change in the law as to the pay and as to officers and that he offer an amendment increasing the appropriation for extra pay for officers, as he will undoubtedly do concerning the pay of the men, the appropriation for which may probably have to be increased to perhaps $15,000,000.

In regard to the House bill to which the Senator referred, when that bill came to the Senate providing an allowance of $50 a month to the dependent families of soldiers called into service—which, of course, is more than any other country ever thought of paying—it only provided a total appropriation of $2,000,000 for that purpose. The sum was utterly inadequate. That was one difficulty with that bill.

Then came the order of the War Department—sent to all the generals, I understand—that soldiers with families should be excused from service. The committee thought it was necessary to find what the effect of that order would be and whether all of the soldiers with families would retire to their homes, leaving in the service only single soldiers, or whether a certain number of soldiers with dependents would remain in the service; but the facts have to be ascertained in order that when the measure may come up a sufficient appropriation can be provided to carry out the purposes in view.

We could not do it offhand in the way the matter came from the House. The Senator will realize that if he will reflect a moment. We have to know as nearly as we can what percentage of soldiers with dependent families are going to remain in the service. We have been getting information along that line. I myself have been in correspondence with several responsible authorities about it. On the other hand, as I have said, the House bill only provided an appropriation of $2,000,000, when the actual amount required would be nearer $200,000,000. I do not give that, of course, as the exact sum, but it would be nearer that than it would be $2,000,000.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the communication from our consul general at Ottawa, Canada, to the State Department, which is found in yesterday's RECORD, at page 13229, showing a payment of $1.10 per diem to the privates, including, of course, clothing, equipment, and maintenance, and in addition a separation allowance of $20 a month to the dependent families of the soldiers.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator to ask what pensions are paid in case of the death of the soldier, or whether there are any such pensions provided?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do not know, and that is something that we are not interested in now. We are dealing with conditions that create an army during a war. We are looking to making a force for a purpose, and we are not dealing with the question of national gratitude after the war is over. That is entirely a different proposition.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LEE of Maryland. With pleasure.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me, I had always supposed before this discussion arose that patriotism counted for something in the matter of enlistment in the Army. It seems now from the discussion that enlistment is entirely a matter of dollars and cents. I protest against any such view as that.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I desire to place as large a negative as I can possibly express against the statement of the Senator from Minnesota. He served four years in the Civil War, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has just suggested to me aside, and he is entitled to the grateful congratulations of his countrymen for that service; but, Mr. President, when he comes here and says a man's duty to his country in a comparatively insignificant trouble involves his leaving his family at home without support, then he is putting himself up against the ties of the human heart, the ties of manly duty and obligation in a way that places the Senator for the moment outside of the class in which he generally stands.

Mr. President, as I said a little while ago—I believe before the Senator from Minnesota entered the Chamber—in dealing with questions affecting the citizen soldiery or large armies, we have got to make provision for the dependents at home. Wars nowadays can not be fought as they used to be by boys and tramps. War is a wholesale procedure under modern conditions, and for that reason it is necessary to make preparation upon a wholesale basis.

The bill to which the Senator from Wyoming has referred, which passed the House and came over here and went to the Committee on Military Affairs on the 3d of July—and if the Senator does not like my using the expression "locked up," I will withdraw that and say "unacted upon," so far as the RECORD discloses. That bill was an emergency measure; that bill called for immediate consideration by the Senate committee; it was a bill which the experience of all the military nations of the world approved; it was a bill that should have commended itself to the Military Affairs Committee in the interest of preserving the discipline of the National Guard on our frontier. The committee must well recognize that to have this man and that man excused from duty on an allegation that he can present himself is not good discipline for any force; and the United States, having enlisted these men, having accepted them after examination, having placed them in camps, having mustered them into the Federal service, having permitted them to take the new oath as militiamen, having sent them to the border, and paid the expense of that trip, the Committee on Military Affairs and the United States Senate are in no position to say that those men can be economically, properly, or in any military sense rightfully sent home, providing, of course, their families and dependent ones are taken care of.

The Senator from Wyoming has questioned the adequacy of the amount provided in the House bill. Gen. Funston's figures indicate that from three to six thousand men would probably

have to be sent home under the order releasing men with dependent families; but suppose we allow 10 per cent of the members of the guard now on the Mexican border—and I imagine that would be ample—and granting the full allowance made by the House bill in each case of $50 a month, the total amount required would be only $500,000 a month, or $1,500,000 for three months, which is well within the limit provided for by the House bill. Obviously this matter has not received the attention at the hands of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs which as an emergency bill it should have received.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OWEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs is a somewhat ancient committee of this body, and has generally been credited with doing its duty as well as other committees do theirs. It considered it its duty in this instance to be thoroughly acquainted with the conditions—I am speaking for myself, but I know others felt the same way about it—and when the bill, or a joint resolution, came over to the Senate—for if I remember correctly it was a joint resolution—appropriating $2,000,000, we had no information then as to what amount of money it would take for the purposes covered by the proposed legislation. We have been seeking information since. That measure has neither been locked up nor pigeonholed, but the question is under examination, and information is being sought. We will know better after the pending bill is passed what it is necessary to do with that bill.

Of course, Gen. Funston does not give the number of married men in the guard as 10 per cent, as the Senator puts it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Much less than that; he does not make it more than 3 per cent.

Mr. WARREN. I think the number is very much greater than that. Not only that, but many changes have occurred. For instance, the National Guard organizations now in camp are filling up to war strength, and only single men are taken; they are excusing the married men and reducing in that way, and properly so, the dependent families who might be calling for help.

Nobody was starving, and there was no reason why we should, between 6 o'clock and half past 6, seize that resolution providing an appropriation of $2,000,000—which would last only a half a month or a month, or possibly two months—and pass it at once. I could see no reason for that, and I doubt if the Senator can give us any.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I do not see how the Senator from Wyoming can refer to the present enlistments, which are not made up of men with dependents, as relieving the committee of the responsibility of bringing in a bill which the House had so overwhelmingly passed for the relief of the men with dependents who had been previously enlisted and sent to the border. The matter is one that nobody can estimate, Mr. President, because there are no records, so far as I have been able to ascertain, in the War Department or anywhere else, showing the number of enlisted men in the National Guard who have dependent families. There is no way of getting at this thing, except to make inquiry in given commands and to try to ascertain upon inquiry here and there what percentage of the men have dependent families.

I believe, Mr. President, as I have already stated the fact on the floor, that I am probably the only man in this body who has made any such inquiry or attempted to make any such inquiry. I found that it ran somewhere along about 10 or 15 or 20 per cent, varying according to the different commands. In some commands there were practically no men with dependent families, while in others there were a great many men with dependents; and one of the remarkable features of it was the large number of noncommissioned officers—who are the backbone of any company or regiment—who have dependent families. This is a matter which ought to have been attended to by the committee promptly.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator gives himself credit—and I do not object to that—that he is the only man who has done certain things.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I have tried to do them.

Mr. WARREN. The committee had been seeking that information, and are probably as well advised as is the Senator. The Senator is so well advised that he can only give the percentage as varying somewhere between 10 and 20 per cent.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Precisely; but when you have an emergency proposition like this, if you are opposed to doing something, you will sit down and wonder about the percentages; but if you want to do something, you will put through the bill that the House put through and let the future take care of itself.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, there is no question of emergency about it. It is with regard to the pay of the Army. You might call this whole bill an emergency measure. However, the Senator sees an emergency in everything that does not agree with his particular idea. He ought to be liberal enough to recognize that different Senators might have different minds about the same subject.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I will submit to this body whether the question of excusing from 10 to 20 per cent of the enlisted force of an army on a frontier and telling them that they can go home with honorable discharges under present circumstances is not one of the most extraordinary propositions that has ever been advanced with reference to an army in the field, and whether when such an extraordinary proposition is pending it is not an emergency question to be handled promptly by the military authorities of the country and the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate?

Mr. President, I have averred, without the slightest fear of responsible contradiction, that the returning home of these men, as so many of them have had to return home, for domestic reasons, because of the pull upon their hearts, due to the condition of their families, has had a demoralizing and must have a very demoralizing effect upon the discipline of the commands which were involved. That difficulty should have been provided for promptly; that situation should have been grappled with; and I regret very much that the committee has seen fit to keep back the House bill for this length of time without reporting it to the Senate one way or the other and giving the Senate a chance to act upon it.

I believe, Mr. President, that the public sentiment of this country is being aroused on this subject, and it is a great, fundamental one. It is not only a question of attending to the needs of the National Guard on the frontier to-day but it is a great, fundamental question that will go right down through our history: Are you going to have any citizen soldiery or not? If you do not want a citizen soldiery, of course, then you will naturally say to every American with any obligations that he can not be a soldier, because you will not take care of his family when he is ordered into the field. Failing to provide for these dependents is not only a blow at the National Guard and its discipline but it is a blow at the whole system of citizen soldiery, upon which this Republic should now and hereafter depend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I want to give notice that I reserve this amendment for a separate vote in the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, has the increased appropriation been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The $3,000,000 appropriation has been.

The SECRETARY. Three million one hundred and seventy-eight thousand two hundred and forty dollars.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is for the officers. Now, turning to the appropriation for the enlisted personnel, on page 28, from lines 1 to 4, I desire to have that language modified by inserting the language just adopted on motion of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment having been adopted by the Senate heretofore, without objection, it will be reconsidered and, without objection, will be agreed to as modified.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The appropriation there now is $1,000,000. That contemplated the 20 per cent increase of pay of enlisted men while on foreign service. In view of the amendment which has been adopted, that amount will be wholly insufficient to meet the requirements; and I desire to move to reconsider that and to offer as an amendment the insertion of "$11,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out "$1,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$11,000,000"; and where the words appear above, "called or drafted into the service of the United States," it is proposed to insert "when engaged in protecting the Mexican border, whether within or without the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the item will be reconsidered and agreed to as proposed by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to say, in reference to this, that I doubt very much the wisdom of the proposition; but the Senate has seen fit to adopt these amendments, and for that reason I am suggesting these increases of appropriation, be-

cause without the increases the provisions which have been adopted by the Senate could not be carried out. That is my purpose in proposing an increase in these appropriations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I spoke to the Senator from Oregon, in charge of the bill, in regard to cases in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army. There are some cases where members of the Medical Reserve who hold Government positions are ordered out, and I think they ought to have the same protection which is extended to members of the National Guard who hold Government positions, as provided on page 13 by the House bill. All I wanted to ask, the Senator having kindly said that he would be willing to take it into conference and consider it, is to insert on line 8, page 13, after the words "National Guard," the words "and of the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, line 8, after the words "National Guard," it is proposed to insert "and of the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the committee amendment as amended and agreed to, on page 9, lines 17 to 23, following the amendment already agreed to at that place, it is proposed to add the following paragraph:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, for the United States of America, the land formerly leased to the United States for aviation purposes at College Park, Md., and such other land adjacent thereto as in the discretion of the Secretary of War may be necessary for use by the United States for aviation maneuvers and other military purposes; and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $300,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for said purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, this was a proposition offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. I hope the chairman of the committee will not object to its going in and being given consideration in conference.

This property has been leased by the Government for aviation purposes. It is considered, by those who know it, as one of the most desirable tracts for that purpose; and this amendment only asks that it be looked into and acquired by condemnation or by purchase. It is within 30 minutes of Washington, where the demonstrations can be seen by Members of the House and of the Senate; and I think it is a matter that should receive the serious consideration of the conference committee. I hope it will not be objected to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator having the bill in charge whether the department has recommended an appropriation for the purchase of this land?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; there has been no recommendation of the kind.

Mr. SMOOT. Has it been considered by the committee at all?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Not this particular tract; no.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will ask the Senator from Maryland if he does not think that, if the department wanted to purchase this land, they would have called it to the attention of the committee and would have made an estimate for it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It has been called to the attention of the committee, and, as I understand—I will not say positively—I think the department, or at least some members of the department, have favored it. I do not know. The conference committee can look into it and find out. It has been leased by the Government for that purpose, and I feel that it is a matter that should be considered by the conference committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it leased at the present time by the Government?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not know whether it is or not. It has been leased for quite a while by the Government. I do not know whether they have it now or not; but it has been leased by the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Maryland simply asks that it go to conference. From the statement made, I do not think the conference committee will agree to leave it in. If I did think so, I would make a point of order against it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Let them consider it.

Mr. SMOOT. But at the request of the Senator I will not make the point of order against it, although I am quite sure it ought to be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I spoke to the chairman of the committee about a proposed amendment, to which I think there is no objection. Yesterday provision was made for paying the transportation of soldiers who had gone to the front and there had been mustered out. I think we ought to make the same provision for those members of the militia who have been sent to the front and then were mustered out after the order was made by the War Department to the effect that married men or men who had families dependent upon them could be mustered out. I think those men should also have their transportation home paid. Where they have dependent families and the families are in need, the cases are quite numerous where these men have not money to pay their transportation home. For that purpose I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, which I think probably should go at the end, after the word "War," in line 6, on page 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 39, line 6, after the word "War" and before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following words:

Provided further, That when members of the National Guard who have been mustered into the service of the United States have been discharged under the order of the War Department which provides that members of the National Guard with dependent families may be mustered out, transportation from their position on the Mexican border to their homes may be authorized by the Secretary of War.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not know whether that is just the place where it ought to go or whether it ought to follow one of the amendments of yesterday, which I have not been able to find; but the conference committee can arrange that as it sees proper.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, after line 23, and after the amendment already agreed to at that place, it is proposed to insert:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint and place on the retired list of the Army, with the rank of major general, any officer on the retired list who served not less than one year in the regular or volunteer forces of the United States during the Civil War prior to April 9, 1865, and who was honorably discharged therefrom, who has since served not less than 40 years as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army and who was the last Civil War veteran on the active list of the Army for over two years before retirement and had ranked every general officer on the active list in length of service when he retired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLETCHER in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following:

All qualified voters of the United States who shall be in actual military service of the United States, as part of the Organized Militia or Volunteer Army, on the days duly appointed by law for the choice of electors of President and Vice President of the United States and for Members of Congress of the United States, shall be entitled to exercise the right of suffrage for said officers at the several posts, camps, and places where the regiment, battery, or artillery, or part of a regiment not less than one company, or part of a company under a separate command, may be, on said days, as fully as if such voters were present at the places in their respective States where such elections may be held and where such person would be entitled to vote; any provisions of law now in force to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided*, That this section shall not extend to or include any person in the Regular or Standing Army of the United States.

To carry into effect the provisions of this section, elections may be held at the several posts, camps, or places in said section mentioned in the manner following: The vote shall be taken by companies. The three ranking officers in each company, troop of Cavalry, or battery of Artillery shall act as judges of election to preside at the elections held under the provisions of this act. In case of the absence, inability, or refusal to act of any of said officers, their duties as such judges shall be performed by the officers next in rank. The officer highest in rank so acting in such company, troop, or battery shall be chairman of the board of judges and shall act as moderator at the election. Said judges shall appoint a qualified voter of the company to act as clerk. The judges of election of each company shall make a canvass and statement of the result in writing of the votes cast by such company, troop, or battery as hereinafter provided. The regimental and staff officers of each regiment shall be entitled to vote at the polls opened in any company of the regiment in which they belong.

Previous to receiving any ballots said judges and clerks shall severally take an oath or affirmation that they will support the Constitution of the United States and that they will perform their duties according to the law and will studiously endeavor to prevent all fraud, deceit, or abuse in conducting the election. This oath or affirmation shall be

subscribed by the person taking the same, and may be administered by either of said judges, and shall be returned with the result of the election as hereinafter provided.

The polls of the election shall be open at such an hour as the judges of election, or a majority of them, shall determine, and shall be closed at an hour determined upon by majority vote of the voters present, provided that time shall be given for all voters in the company, troop, or battery to vote, and that notice of the time of closing the polls shall be given at least one hour before the closing of the same.

Each ballot cast at the election held under the provisions of this act shall have upon the same the name of the person voting and the name of the town, ward, precinct, and State and county in which he is entitled to vote; and the judges shall refuse to receive any ballot not thus prepared. Each ballot shall also have printed or written upon it the person or persons voted for, with a pertinent designation of the office which he or they may be intended to fill. The ballot thus prepared shall be upon one piece, and all the ballots of one company, troop, or battery shall be deposited in one box, and it shall be the duty of the judges to be satisfied that each person offering to vote would be entitled to vote in the town, ward, precinct, county, and State which is shown upon the ballot. It shall also be the duty of each of said judges, and the privilege of each voter, to object to the right of any person offering to vote when he shall know or have reason to suspect or believe that such person is not a qualified voter; and to every person whose right is thus objected to one of the judges shall administer an oath that he will true and full answer make to all questions touching his residence and qualifications as a voter, and such questions shall be put and proceedings had as may be deemed advisable by said judges, and the case of each person shall be decided by a majority of the judges. It shall be the duty of said judges to provide suitable places or booths wherein such voter may prepare his vote in private; before entering such booth the voter shall be supplied with a ballot of each political party containing the names of the presidential electors and candidates for Senator and Representative in the Congress to be voted upon in his respective district; immediately upon receipt of such ballots such voter shall enter the booth provided, and as soon as he has prepared his ballot shall deposit it in the box provided for such purpose, the ballots not used by him shall be returned to the judges of election. The Secretary of the Senate of the United States shall seasonably prepare and have printed all necessary blank forms to carry out the provisions of this act and furnish the same to the commanding officers of each company, troop, or battery.

The clerk shall keep correct lists containing the names of the voters and their respective places of residence, which lists shall be certified by the judges, or a majority of them, and by the clerk to be correct. After the polls are closed the judges shall canvass the ballots cast and shall make a statement of the result in writing. A copy of such canvass and statement duly certified to be correct by the judges or a majority of them, and by the clerk, shall be transmitted as soon as practicable to the governor of the State wherein such company is entitled to vote, a copy shall also be transmitted to the secretary of such State, a copy shall also be transmitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate, and a copy shall be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States. The said judges shall also cause all the ballots cast to be sealed up and duly transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States. The aforesaid statements, lists, and ballots shall be examined and the votes counted as if duly cast within the respective precincts, wards, towns, counties, and States of the voters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I make the point of order against the proposed amendment, first, that it is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

Mr. REED. I think the point is well taken. I spoke to the chairman of the committee about this amendment, and I had hoped that he would let this go to conference. It puts no burden upon the Government. It takes no money from the Government. It is the only chance to give these men an opportunity to vote.

I say frankly to the chairman of the committee that I have not had time to make that exhaustive examination which I should like to make to determine whether the law can be made effective without the aid of State statutes. Such examination as I have been able to make leads me to the conclusion that it is within the power of Congress to pass the act. I hope the chairman will let the amendment go in and go before the conference committee, and I shall then submit to the conferees a brief on the matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator is speaking on the amendment to grant the right of suffrage to the guardsmen at the front?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a great interest in that, Mr. President. I took up the matter with myself some weeks ago, but, not having a knowledge of law, I consulted some of my associates on this side of the Chamber and asked them to work it out for me, which they promised to do, but they did not do it. I was greatly delighted to see that the Senator from Missouri had undertaken that task and had prepared what, I apprehend, is a provision that will meet the requirements of the case.

These young men ought to be permitted to vote at the front if they can not go to their homes. The Northern States legislated during the Civil War, giving the soldiers the right to vote for State officers, and it was exercised, and no harm came to anyone. I hope the amendment may be allowed to go to conference.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I told him when he mentioned this matter to me that the general proposition involved in his amendment met with my approval, and I hoped that we might even go further a little later on and arrange so that Senators and Representatives and traveling men who have fixed homes and families might have the law so framed that they might all be able to vote without going two or three thousand miles. But the vice of this thing—and what I object to about it—is that it is injecting into the bill that same discrimination against the Regular Army. I am willing to let this amendment go in if the Senator will eliminate that part of it, but I am absolutely opposed upon principle to consenting to any discrimination against the Regular Army.

Let me call the Senator's attention to this fact: I know the son of a Senator of the United States who is serving in the United States Army as an enlisted man. I know half a dozen young men in my own State who were not able to go to West Point, and the ambition of their lives was to win a commission in the Army, and they enlisted in the Army. Why should those young men be discriminated against, Mr. President. That is the reason why I oppose this.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope that the chairman of the committee will not deny these citizens who are temporarily absent from their homes the right to vote because the right is not conferred upon the soldier of the Regular Army. Now, let me point to two things very briefly.

First, I question whether the soldier in the Regular Army has any residence except in the Army. He enters the Army for a given period of time. He understands when he goes in that he takes himself out of civil life. I think you would arouse in this country a great deal of fear if you proposed to give the ballot to the professional soldier.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator mean to contend that the officers and men of the Regular Army are disfranchised by being in the Army?

Mr. REED. I did, in effect, make that statement, but the Senator is correct.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course the right of suffrage is procured from the several States, and if an enlisted man or an officer in the Army comes within the qualifications prescribed by the law of his own State he is a voter in his State, and if he can get to the polls on election day he can vote. He has the voting privilege; he is not disfranchised because he entered the service.

Mr. REED. To all practical effects and purposes he is disfranchised because he is away and not at home.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, in practice, in the Navy particularly, the officers and men have not the capacity of voting, because they are not in the places where they have the right to vote, but there are men—I know of cases—stationed in my State both in the Army and Navy who have been there long enough to get a residence or perhaps were residents of the State before and who have exercised the franchise. I am sure they are not disfranchised anywhere; that is, if they comply with the qualifications of the voters in the States of which they are residents. Many of them do not have those qualifications.

Mr. REED. They very seldom vote.

Mr. LODGE. Very seldom.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. They are in exactly the same position as the National Guard down in Texas. The Senator wants to correct the inability in the case of the National Guard. I think it ought to be corrected in the case of the Regular Army soldier also.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will venture a suggestion, and I will withdraw it if it does not appeal to the Senator from Missouri or other Senators. It is that the proviso should read:

Provided, That this section shall not extend to or include any person in the Regular Standing Army of the United States unless the name of such person is on the voting list of his place of legal residence.

Most of these soldiers have no legal residence, they do not claim to have, and they never have asked the privilege of having their names placed on what we call in the North the check list; it may pass by some other name in other parts of the country; but if they have a legal residence they ought certainly to be permitted to vote.

Mr. REED. What does the Senator suggest?

Mr. GALLINGER. My suggestion is that the proviso should read:

This section shall not extend to or include any person in the Regular Standing Army of the United States unless the name of such person is on the voting list of his place of legal residence.

Mr. REED. I accept that amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Pardon me a moment. I respectfully suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that that amendment is not necessary under the first line of the amendment, because it provides "that all qualified voters of the United States who shall be in the actual military service of the United States," and so forth.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very likely that does cover it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. So if that provision were eliminated entirely it places all in the same line, and that is all we want to do.

Mr. GALLINGER. If that is the fact, I cordially withdraw the amendment I suggested.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. REED. I should like to make a statement and then I will yield. My attention has just been called to section 10190 of the General Code which provides that—

Nothing therein shall be construed to prevent any officer, soldier, sailors, or marine from exercising the right of suffrage in any election district to which he may belong, if otherwise qualified according to the laws of the State in which he offers to vote.

That, of course, makes it perfectly clear.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then withdraw the proviso.

Mr. REED. I withdraw the proviso from this amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me suggest to the Senator, in this connection, that his amendment is limited to the Organized Militia or the Volunteer Army of the United States. If the Senator would make it consistent he should strike out the words "as part of the Organized Militia or Volunteer Army."

Mr. GALLINGER. By striking out the words "as part of the Organized Militia or Volunteer Army" it would include all qualified voters of the United States who shall be in the actual military service.

Mr. REED. I will ask the clerks at the desk to strike out those words.

The SECRETARY. After the words "United States," in line 2, page 1, strike out the comma and the words "as part of the Organized Militia or Volunteer Army," and the colon, so as to read:

All qualified voters of the several States of the United States who shall be in actual military service of the United States on the days duly appointed by law for the choice of electors, etc.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to suggest this to the Senator from Missouri: What is a qualified voter of the United States?

Mr. REED. He would be a man who would be qualified under the laws of the State in which he proposes to vote.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not think that is proper language to describe that status. It seems to me it should read "all qualified electors of the several States."

Mr. REED. If the Senator suggests that as an amendment to the amendment, I have no objection to it. It conveys my idea.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think it is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the word "voters," in line 1, and insert the words "electors of the several States," so as to read "all qualified electors of the several States of the United States who shall be in actual military service," and so on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the point of order is withdrawn. The amendment will be so modified. The question is on the adoption of the amendment as modified.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to say that while I am perfectly willing to let this go to conference if it be the wish of the Senator from Missouri, I think that there are many things left in it that are undetermined and ambiguous. I think it is very hastily drawn, but if the conference committee are going to give it their attention and consult with the Judge Advocate General of the Army about it and then submit some modification of it, well and good. I should not want to give my consent to it as it stands, but I do not wish to waste time now to call attention to quite a number of ambiguities and defects in the amendment. It does not provide for the furnishing of ballot boxes. It does not——

Mr. REED. I hope the Senator will not object, but let it go through, and if there are some things necessary to perfect it he will suggest them to the conferees.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I may not be admitted to the conference between the two Houses. I may not have a chance to suggest them to the conferees. I simply want to say there are quite a number of defects in the amendment. It does not provide as to the type of ballots, or what names shall be printed on the ballots, or whether they shall be of uniform type or of different kinds. It leaves to the voters themselves at the voting places the decision by a majority vote as to how long the polls shall be kept open. It is defective in the provision for the swearing in of election officials. There are 20 suggestions that I would want to make if the Senate were passing it in a final state, but I am willing to let it go to conference as it is, without making a point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. On page 36, after line 12, I move to insert:

Provided, That $250,000 of the appropriation provided for in this paragraph shall be expended in the purchase of material and the construction of tent floors, framing for screens, and screens, to be added to the equipment of the tents now being used by the National Guard on the Mexican border.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I ask the Senator if that increases the appropriation?

Mr. WEEKS. The appropriation should be increased, and I will suggest that the figures be changed so as to cover the amount expended for this purpose. The regular troops serving on the border have tent floors which they purchased out of their company funds, but one of the greatest troubles that men on the border have is due to the fact that they sleep on the ground and there are a good many insects that are troublesome might be avoided if they had floors; and it would be very much cleaner, their clothing could be kept cleaner. There are no screens to prevent flies and mosquitoes from troubling them which would be the case in many places.

This is not a large appropriation. I have had an estimate made by the Quartermaster's Department that for 100,000 men the flooring, framing, and screening could be provided by expending $242,000. It seems to me that this will add sufficiently to the comfort of those men to well warrant the expenditure.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And to the sanitation.

Mr. WEEKS. And to the sanitation as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEEKS. I move that the figures on page 35, line 11, be increased $250,000.

The SECRETARY. Change the total sum "$12,000,000" so as to read "$12,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the situation which arises by the discharge of the men in the National Guard. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether there is any provision in the bill for an appropriation which can be used for paying the expenses back home of the men who are discharged because they have dependents?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; there was an amendment adopted this morning for that purpose. Then there was another amendment adopted yesterday providing pay for the transportation of men who have been discharged on the border for physical unfitness.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And those who are invalided and sent home?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. My attention has been drawn to the fact that the funds provided in the fortification appropriation act are available until expended. Last year's fortification bill did not contain this prohibition affecting the Taylor system, over which we had a little contention yesterday. This year's fortification bill, which was approved by the President on July 6, did contain this language. The Chief of Ordnance is still operating the very features of the system at the Watertown Arsenal prohibited by the language.

It seems to me that it is manifestly unjust and it is vitiating and destroying the act of Congress. In order to prevent this possibility, I desire, on page 90, line 21, after the word "act," to insert "or any other act shall be hereafter available."

And then, on page 91, line 2, after the word "this," to insert "or any other act be hereafter available."

My point is that the money that the Secretary of War may have as an unexpended balance shall not be used to vitiate or violate the principle we followed in abolishing the Taylor system.

Mr. GALLINGER. How much is the unexpended balance, I will ask the Senator.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can not state that, but evidently the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] knows.

He cited the Watertown Arsenal. There is no doubt the Taylor system was there in vogue, and it has been kept in vogue.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that on page 90, line 21, he is dealing with an amendment which appears to have been stricken from the bill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No; but the Senate yesterday corrected that. The Senate committee amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I understand the Senator—and I will, by way of parenthesis, suggest that this unexpended balance can not be very large——

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can not say, for I do not know.

Mr. GALLINGER. No great harm would come from allowing that to stand; but I understand the Senator now proposes to amend an act already passed.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I took the act as it now reads:

Provided, That no part of the appropriation made in this act or any other act shall be hereafter available.

Mr. GALLINGER. I make a point of order against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment changes the existing law, and it goes out on a point of order.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment. On page 14, after line 5, I move to insert:

Provided, That hereafter the proportion of privates of first class to privates in the Signal Corps and in the Medical Department may be the same as the proportion of privates first class to privates now authorized by law in the Quartermaster Corps.

I see no reason why in the Medical Service or the Signal Service that might not be done. At all events, I think the conference committee might with propriety consider it so as to give a uniform right to the different corps in regard to the employment of first-class privates as compared to privates.

I should like to have inserted in the RECORD for the information of the conference committee a table showing the relative ratios in the Signal Corps, the Quartermaster Corps, and the Medical Corps.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The amendment changes the act of June 3, 1916, and I do not think it ought to be inserted here without having been called particularly to the attention of the committee. Offhand, I will say that it would increase the force of the Medical Corps from 25 to 45 per cent of the privates of the first class. I do not think that ought to be done. I will state to the Senator that the Medical Corps has been more generously provided for than almost any other corps in the service, and I do not think this ought to be done without very thorough and careful attention.

Mr. OWEN. Might I ask the chairman of the committee why the Quartermaster's Department is permitted to have 45 per cent of first-class privates as compared with the employees in the corps, and why the medical service should be denied that?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Quartermaster Corps is a very much more active corps than the Medical Corps. I do not recall now what animated the commitee in making the difference in apportionment as to these different corps, but we went over it very carefully. We went over it after hearing each of the different corps, and the results of our deliberations were embodied in the act of June 3, 1916.

If this change is going to be made on the floor of the Senate, I think it would be a mistake. I think it ought to go to the committee and let the committee have an opportunity to consider the whole matter in conjunction with the other corps.

Mr. OWEN. I only thought, Mr. President, that the matter might be considered by the conferees, and if it did have merit, they might dispose of it in accordance with what would seem to be the best policy of the service. I do not personally know what the argument is which justifies 45 per cent for the Quartermaster Corps and a very much smaller sum for the Medical Corps. I had thought that the service in the medical department a more important service, as it deals with the health of the soldiers than merely the Quartermaster Corps, which deals with material substances that are not quite as important as the health of the men.

There must be some reason for it that I do not know about, or perhaps there may be no reason for it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am willing to let it go in and be considered in conference.

Mr. OWEN. I thought that course might be well, and if it is not well founded let it go out.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the matter indicated by the Senator from Oklahoma will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Signal Corps.

[Par. 13, p. 12, act June 3, 1916.]	Per cent.
Master signal electricians	2
Sergeants, first class	7
Sergeants	10
Corporals	20
The number of privates, first class, shall not exceed 25 per cent of the number of privates.	
Privates, first class	15
Privates	46

Quartermaster Corps.

[Sec. 9, p. 6, act June 3, 1916.]	Per cent.
Quartermaster sergeants, senior grade	0.5
Quartermaster sergeants	6
Sergeants, first class	2.5
Sergeants	25
Corporals	10
Privates, first class	9
Privates	45
Cooks	2
Total	100

Medical Corps.

[Sec. 10, p. 8, act June 3, 1916.]	Per cent.
Master hospital sergeants	0.5
Hospital sergeants	.5
Sergeants, first class	7
Sergeants	11
Corporals	5
Cooks	6
Total (without privates)	30

100—30 equals 70 per cent to be filled by privates.

Provided further, That in said department the number of privates, first class, shall not exceed 25 per cent of the number of privates.

This, then, makes the table read as follows:

	Per cent.
Master hospital sergeants	0.5
Hospital sergeants	.5
Sergeants, first class	7
Sergeants	11
Corporals	5
Cooks	6
Privates, first class	18
Privates	52
Total	100

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, on page 9, line 23, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, after the amendment heretofore agreed to, insert:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept for the United States from any person such tract or tracts of land suitable and desirable, in his judgment, for permanent mobilization, training, and supply stations; and he is directed to investigate and report to Congress as soon as practicable what additional tracts are necessary for said purposes for use by the National Guard and by the Regular Army and the probable cost of the same.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, we are considering a very important measure. I think we ought to have a better attendance. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota suggests the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Brandegee	Gronna	Owen	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Jones	Page	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Penrose	Smoot
Chilton	La Follette	Poindexter	Sterling
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Ransdell	Taggart
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Reed	Thompson
Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	Tillman
Dillingham	Newlands	Sheppard	Walsh
du Pont	Norris	Sherman	Weeks
Fletcher	O'Gorman	Shields	Williams
Gallinger	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. HARDING, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BRADY, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. STONE, Mr. BROUSSARD, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. BORAH answered to their names.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] are detained from the Chamber on account of important business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is

on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, that amendment only authorizes the Secretary of War to accept donations to the United States in the way of land for maneuver purposes. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

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

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

The SECRETARY. At the end of page 58, it is proposed to insert the following:

To provide for the necessities and comfort of those in the military and naval forces in time of war or when war, in the opinion of the President, is imminent, $500,000. This appropriation shall, in whole or in part, as the President may determine, be transferred to the American Red Cross to be expended under its direction. A report in detail of the expenditures of this appropriation shall be made to Congress on or before December 1 annually.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, it seems to me that appropriations have been made under each of these heads that would cover the very item proposed to be covered by this amendment. In addition to that, the Senator proposes to extend this appropriation to uses for purposes of the Army to uses for purposes of the Navy. I should like to understand why the appropriations carried in this bill are not sufficient to cover this matter?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the reason I have proposed this appropriation is this: The Red Cross is all the time doing very much work and expending considerable amounts of money in matters which are purely military or purely naval and which should be appropriated for by the Government. For instance, there was brought to my attention this morning a circular which is being distributed in Massachusetts, being an appeal for money to build a base hospital, the money to be turned over to the Red Cross—something like $200,000 for that purpose. It does not seem to me that citizens ought to be assessed in that kind of irregular way for money to be expended for matters which should be appropriated for by the Government. If this half million dollars is set aside for the purposes which the amendment stipulates, it does seem to me as if it could provide for many things which are strictly within military lines or within naval lines. I am willing to strike out the reference to the naval forces if the Senator so desires, but this expenditure should be made by the Government instead of by individual citizens.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts who is to expend this money? Is the matter to be determined by the officials of the Red Cross or by a proper and responsible officer of the Government?

Mr. WEEKS. The President is to determine when the money is to be turned over and in what amounts; then it is to be expended under the direction of the Red Cross.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I dislike very much to make a point of order against this amendment, but it does seem to me that the Senate has been extremely liberal in making ample provision for every necessity and for every emergency that can arise in such cases.

Mr. WEEKS. Now, let me call the attention of the Senator to a letter which I have in my hand. This is an appeal for money to a citizen of Massachusetts. It reads:

The story is this: The authorities in Washington have asked this State—

That is, Massachusetts—

to provide for four base hospitals. Senator Murray Crane is taking care of one in the western portion of the State. The eastern portion of the State is asked to collect $200,000 to supply the equipment for three base hospitals, three ambulance corps, the equipment for hospital trains, and possibly a naval hospital.

I have been told—though I have not checked it up—that New York is to supply seven base hospitals, and Chicago has raised $250,000 to provide for probably four others.

Then the letter goes on to describe the necessity for these base hospitals. If there is a necessity for them, certainly they should be provided for by the Government instead of by individual citizens, and this is being done at the request of the authorities in Washington.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President another objection which I have to this proposition is that it is charged in part against the Army appropriations. The Army appropriation bill has usually been loaded down with matters that do not affect the Army. If the Senator from Massachusetts will separate it, if possible, as the naval appropriation bill is still before the committee of conference——

Mr. WEEKS. I am quite willing to strike out the words "and naval," so that it will apply only to the military forces. I think the word "naval" inadvertently and improperly put in.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will do that, I shall not make any objection to the amendment; and then we may let it go to conference if the Senate accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts as he has modified it.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate by a very decisive vote refused to strike out a provision on page 90 of the bill relating to the so-called Taylor system. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] in rather lurid language denounced that system as being inhuman and in every way unjust to the laboring people of the country; and the Senate, as I say, by a very decisive vote refused to strike that provision from the bill.

It has seemed to me that the prejudice against this system has been largely because of the fact that the stop watch is used as a part of it. Possibly that prejudice is well founded, and I shall not stop to discuss it; but it has occurred to me that to refuse to allow the Government factories, as it is allowed in private factories, the right to pay premiums or bonuses or cash rewards to employees who have done superior work is going beyond reason. The provision in the bill not only makes a declaration against the use of the stop watch, but likewise goes to the extent of saying that no premium or bonus or cash reward shall be paid to any employee who, in the judgment of those in charge of the establishment, is deserving of that recognition.

Mr. President, I feel that it will be wise to amend that provision of the House bill by striking the part of the proviso from the bill which is covered by my amendment. I do not think I shall call for the yeas and nays, unless some other Senator desires to have them, although I should like very much to get a record vote on the amendment I am about to offer, if Senators could be informed about it; but, as was suggested yesterday, Senators are now absent from the Chamber, as they were on yesterday, and when they come in they will have no knowledge of what has been transpiring, and they will vote as other Senators make suggestions to them. Beyond a doubt the vote under those circumstances will be adverse to my motion.

I move, on page 91, line 1, after the word "work," to strike out the remainder of the proviso; and I will ask the Secretary to read the words which I propose to strike out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, in the first line, after the word "work," it is proposed to strike out the following:

Nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the truth is, that a great many of these employees are getting additional pay to which, in the judgment of those having charge of the factories, they are entitled. If this language remains in the bill they will be deprived of that additional pay which they think they have earned and which those in charge of the establishments feel that they have properly earned. I do not see that any harm can possibly come to anybody by striking that language from the bill and allowing those in charge of the Government factories—the arsenals and other workshops of the Government—to continue that part of the system. The amendment, if agreed to, will go to conference and receive the consideration of the conferees on the part of both Houses, and I hope that the Senate will agree to strike that language from the bill.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I trust that the Senator from New Hampshire will not insist on that amendment. The laborer is worthy of his hire; there is no doubt about that. There is in every organization, in every plant, some man who, by special genius or because of a spurt of strength, may accomplish a fraction more than the man who stands beside him at the bench. There may be some disadvantages under which a man who works beside him labors.

It seems to me that this proposition would tend to make discontent and dissatisfaction. On yesterday I quoted from a report—I can not now recall just what report—the statement that the bonus system and the stop-watch system tended to create discontent.

God knows the struggle for bread and butter and for labor is hard enough. Do not burden it with anything more. I am satisfied, and the department generally is satisfied, that these men are working earnestly and honestly; that the Government is getting a full day's work for all the Government pays. Why press down harder on labor?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from New Jersey that the laborer is worthy of his hire; and that is exactly the point I am trying to enforce. I have

no disposition to press down either hard or harder on labor. What I want to do is to help labor.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. The Senator is trying to give some man——

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator must not interrupt me without my permission. That is the point I am trying to enforce—that the man who earns the additional compensation ought to be given it. That does not affect the man who does not earn it; in other words, there is no reason why the incompetent or the unskillful or the man who has not acquired the habits of industry which the man standing beside him has acquired, should be given the same consideration. I do not see that any injustice will be done to either the man who gets a little additional money because of greater efficiency, and which he has earned, or the man who does not get it because he has not earned it.

However, Mr. President, I have no disposition to discuss the matter. As I said a moment ago, unless some other Senator calls for the yeas and nays, I shall not do so, but shall content myself with a division of the Senate on the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I trust that the amendment will not prevail. It is not that one man is more industrious than another——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have yielded the floor. The Senator now can have the floor in his own right.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will not further occupy the time of the Senate.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that, unless this amendment prevails, there will be taken from 321 operatives at the Watertown Arsenal an average of about eight dollars and a quarter a piece weekly, and that would amount to something like a total of $2,500 each week, which those men now make in bonuses and premiums which they have received for the last two or three or four years. Any possibility of their receiving that money will be taken from them unless the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is adopted.

The Senator from New Jersey talks about bread and butter. This will give these employees $3,500 a week's worth of bread and butter, which will be taken from them unless the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It may give bread and butter to one or two, Mr. President, or a comparatively small number, out of a great number of employees; it may give a small number an excess; but it tends to create discontent and dissatisfaction; it makes a class among the laboring men. These employees are working just as industriously and just as earnestly at their toil as some other man who may accomplish a fraction more.

Mr. WEEKS. There are 321 men working under the bonus system at that arsenal, and all of those men, with one exception, receive a bonus; so that it is not the case of one or two men; it is the case of practically every man who is working under the system.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. How many men are employed at the Watertown Arsenal?

Mr. WEEKS. There are about 600 men, and about half of them are working under the bonus system.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the vice of the proposed system is not found, in my judgment, in the matters that have been suggested. The vice of the proposed amendment is that it involves the laying out to each man of a specified amount of work for each day and the payment of a bonus when he exceeds that amount of work, and I presume that involves the right to impose a penalty if he does not perform the task within the allotted time. That involves, first, that somebody shall lay out the work and specify the amount; second, that the men shall be paid a premium who complete the work in a shorter time; and, third, that men shall suffer a penalty who do not complete the task within the prescribed time. Given those three elements, and you have the Taylor system. That is substantially all there is to it.

After we have once fought out the battle and after the Senate voted to keep in the whole section as it came from the House, and by keeping it in to abolish the Taylor system—because that is what it means—the Senator now proposes to keep the heart and soul of the proposition in and to only have taken out certain phraseology which contains no vice except for the part the Senator from New Hampshire now seeks to keep in the bill.

If you keep the scheme, if you keep the system, there is no use legislating about stop watches, because if a man is working on piecework and getting bonuses if he does the work in less time, of course you have to time him in order to know how much bonus is to be paid. So the part of the section which remains would prohibit the use of a stop watch, but of course it would mean that there would be some other kind of watch used or some other method devised in order to determine the bonus. All there is to it is that our friends who want to perpetuate the Taylor system, and who have a right to their views, having been once defeated, now propose to save all they lost in the fight of yesterday except some immaterial matters, which are not necessary at all to the carrying out of the Taylor system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senate on yesterday, by a decisive vote of 15 to 36, as I remember, decided against the Taylor system. The proposition submitted in the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire is to retain enough of the Senate provision to enable the conferees to fight for the insertion of the entire Taylor system.

It does not make a particle of difference, Mr. President, whether you eliminate the words "stop watch" from the proposition or not, for, as so well suggested by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], wherever the bonus system exists there must be a measure of the amount of work that can be performed by men within a given period. A bonus system is based upon what can be done within that period, whether a stop watch be held on the man or whether you say that he shall do so much in a given period and forbid the use of the stop watch.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is exactly the same proposition whether the stop watch is eliminated or whether the task is fixed by hours or by a day's work.

Mr. President, it is nothing but a "sweating system." It drives men to perform a given number of motions within a fixed time. It offers a premium to men who can do that thing; it subjects men who are by nature differently organized mentally, physically, and nervously to a strain under which they are broken down.

It has been enunciated by Mr. Taylor, as a basic principle of his system, that they take into account only the men who can perform a certain given number of motions within a limited space of time, and the system has no concern whatever for the 80 per cent of men who can not come within that limitation. Mr. President, the fixing of the task imposes precisely the same stimulus, precisely the same exaction, precisely the same taxation upon nervous and physical ability without the stop watch that it does if a stop watch is held over the men.

I have no doubt that there are some workmen who desire that this system shall be established. Human nature is just the same, whether it be among United States Senators, men engaged in industrial and commercial enterprises, men who work at the bench or at the forge, or men who run engines. It makes no difference. You will always find a certain number of men who are more or less selfish and who, by reason of their temperamental organization, are able in any contest to win a higher wage, a bonus for themselves. They take no account of the 80 per cent of men who can not come up to that standard.

I remember well, Mr. President, when I stood some years ago upon this floor appealing to Members of this body to pass a bill fixing 16 hours as the limit of time that men engaged in conducting the train service of the country should be permitted to work without interruption, there were engineers and conductors and other trainmen who objected to having any limitation put upon the number of hours that they might be permitted to operate a train, because there were a comparatively few who could run a train 36 hours, 40 hours, 50 hours, perhaps 72 hours, and keep awake, keep their faculties concentrated upon their work, and earn a larger sum each month. They did not want any limitation put upon the number of hours that they should be permitted to operate trains; but, Mr. President, the public has some rights in these matters; it has some rights in every question which involves labor generally.

It had in that particular case some rights in addition to that; it had some rights as to the safety of interstate transportation. Against the wishes of some of the engineers and conductors and trainmen of the country, I remember I, with some others upon this floor, stood here and fought for a limitation upon the hours of service of the men operating the trains of the country. The great body of the trainmen were in favor of a limitation. The great body of the trainmen to-day are in favor of a much greater limitation than the 16-hour limitation which, after a long struggle, we succeeded in putting upon the hours of train-service men.

Mr. President, it is like all other questions that affect labor. It is like the limitation of hours which the Supreme Court of the United States has sustained upon the length of time that

women can be compelled to serve in any of the industries of the country. The public is interested in conserving the labor of this country and in protecting it, not only with regard to the work hours of women but with regard to the hours of labor of men; not only with regard to the hours of labor but with regard to the strain, the tension, the ordeal, the tax to which men and women shall be subjected in performing their daily occupations.

It has been demonstrated, sir, in investigations which the Supreme Court accepted, that, as the hours of labor are increased, the strain and tension upon the men who serve in the great industrial life of this country is intensified, there results not only the earlier breaking down of these employees but all the concomitant evils that go with such a breakdown that before the crash actually occurs.

For instance, sir, it has been found, as a result of a carefully systematized investigation of accidents, that in the afterpart of the day, from 3 or 4 o'clock on, when this ordeal of concentration has been sustained for a considerable period of time, when the ability to concentrate is lessened, when the nerve wear and the muscle wear begin to tell upon the individual operatives, accidents increase; that is the time when there is the largest loss of fingers and arms. In the late hours of the day the accident death rate is always the highest.

Mr. President, in these times it behooves us to conserve the industrial vitality of this country. We have had a demonstration of one of the great powers of Europe that has made the first consideration in its program of preparedness that it shall look out for the upbuilding of the industrial life of the people who serve and toil; that it shall protect them upon every possible side; that it shall give them every protection with which legislation can hedge them about, to the end that their powers of production and the length of their service may be maintained during all their active years so that the number of them that may be maimed or killed shall be reduced to the lowest point. To all those things, that great Government of Germany has given special attention.

We are rushing madly here, as it seems to me, along with a program of preparedness—I want to speak with entire propriety—without giving to it sufficient consideration. Germany's preparation did not consist simply in the building up of a military and a naval force. Germany's preliminary preparation consisted in conserving, economically and in every other way, humanely, all of the vital forces of the people who labor in her industries. And, Mr. President, because she laid her foundations broad and strong, because she cared for the men who toiled in her industries, she has an industrial system underlying all of her military preparation superior to anything of the kind in the world. And, sir, permit me to say that it has its other side. It appeals to the patriotism and the loyalty of the German citizen. Germany did not find it necessary because of the prevalence of an industrial system which ground the life out of the employed, to lower the standards of enlistment, the number of inches that a man must stand in order to go into the military service, his weight, and the other physical conditions, as in England, which has an industrial system somewhat like that which some men would impose upon the people of this country. But, sir, Germany is able to call to the service of her standards men who come up to the old measurements. Their industrial life has not been shriveled up as in Great Britain; and, furthermore, they are willing and responsive.

Mr. President, it behooves us not to stand for any of the exactions upon labor which would grind the last ounce of work out of the toilers of this country by any process of sweating. I care not what may be used, whether the stop watch be held over the operative or whether men who have the coordination of mental, nervous, and muscular organization to enable them to win are tempted by a bonus system to strive for the prizes and drive their competitors, their fellow workmen, to the breaking-down point.

Mr. President, I understand the author of the Taylor system, in his book, says that he takes no account of the 80 per cent who can not come up to the high standards. Those who install this system say to a manufacturer or business man, "Permit us to install our system. For $100 a day our experts will teach it to your operatives and to your managers. By adopting this system, which takes account of every movement a man makes and exacts of him the highest possible speed, you will be able to reduce the unit cost of the output of your product 20 per cent." Capital seizes upon that, sir. Capital takes no account of what may happen to the men who are thrown out of employment because they can not make the given number of motions within the limited period.

Mr. President, let us, as we did on yesterday, by a decisive vote hold to the position taken and say to the House of Representatives, "We agree with you. There shall be nothing left in disagreement between the Senate and the House upon this proposition."

We will not permit to be put into this bill a line, a word, or a syllable that will give the conferees the opportunity to work out some legislation that shall be framed up by six men and shall come in here in the conference report in a form that has to be accepted by the Senate.

Mr. President, one of the iniquities of our legislative system is that we turn over to conferees almost, if not quite, the absolute power to make legislation. I am going to call to the attention of the Senate later this afternoon an example of that sort, an instance of the radical change of a legislative policy that had been pursued by this Government for generations, made in a conference report, and put through the Senate without a suggestion to the Senate as to its awful import.

Mr. President, I hope that we shall early adopt a rule that conference reports shall be open to consideration in their items and be open to amendment on the floor. Mr. President, a system of rules giving into the hands of a conference committee the power to make legislation is destructive of democracy. Why, sir, the Senate is practically powerless when considering a conference report. It has to consider and accept or reject the report as a whole. Legislation about which there is a wide difference of opinion between this legislative body and the one at the other end of the Capitol goes to conference, and out of the conference committee will come a proposition that has almost no relation to the opinion expressed by the other House or the opinion expressed by the Senate when the original measure was under consideration.

This new proposition may be embodied in a report covering scores of pages. Every Senator knows that when a conference report comes in, particularly in the latter days of a session, its details receive no consideration. It is passed without discussion of each of the many subjects it may cover. Maybe one single item in a conference report will be taken up and discussed; but, Mr. President, the Senate knows from long experience that when such a report comes in it is a hopeless proposition to undertake to deal with it in detail; and so, I say, it lies with the conferees to make our legislation.

I recall, sir, that when the emergency currency bill was pending in the Senate in 1908 I offered many amendments to it. The then Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Aldrich, rose in his place and accepted those amendments one after another. I had some reason to believe, therefore, and the Senate had some reason to believe, that those amendments were to go into the bill. One I recall with distinctness, and there is not a Senator on this floor who at this moment will not say that it was of vital importance.

We had just gone through the great so-called panic of 1907—a panic which I have always considered was artificial. In that panic the reserves of the local banks had been drawn from these banks to New York City, Chicago, and one or two other centers of speculative finance. When the strain of that panic came upon the country New York had the money of the country banks. New York was using it for speculative purposes. Interest rates increased.

Local demands called for the return of the reserves to the country banks. The great centralized banking institutions refused to respond to the legitimate demands of the local bankers and return these reserves to meet the commercial demands of the different localities. Time was of the essence of that situation. Legally, they were bound to return them; but legal processes are well understood. The law's delay prevents them from resorting, in a situation like that, to legal redress. Week after week those demands were repeated by the local banks that were being driven to the wall. So that when we came to consider financial legislation in 1908 to correct these evils and to protect the reserves, the keeping of the reserves in the local banks was one of the burning questions.

Mr. President, I offered an amendment to compel the retaining of a certain measure of those reserves in the local banks. The Senator from Rhode Island, in charge of the bill, rose and said: "That is a very proper amendment, and I accept it." He did that with many amendments that I offered. Mr. President, that bill passed with that and other vitally important amendments in it, one of them being that the officers of a national bank should not be permitted to speculate with the funds of the depositors of that bank. The acceptance of the amendments shortened debate. That is a process sometimes resorted to by gentlemen in charge of bills.

Mr. President, one of the things that I had contended for from the time I came into the Senate was that there was an uncertainty about the value of these railroad bonds; that they had been issued at the will of the men who built the railroads; that the only restraint or limitation upon it was the market which

they could find for the bonds; and I contended, sir, that there should be a railroad valuation, so that the people of the country might know what was behind the railroad bonds and stocks. Now, that bill contained a provision that railroad bonds—mark the scope of it—should be accepted by the Treasury Department as a basis for issuing emergency currency. No standard was prescribed as to what was back of the bonds—that is, no vital, thorough-going, economic standard. There was a standard imposed with regard to what the railroads had been able to exact from the public as a dividend on the stocks; but, Mr. President, you can see that that was an India-rubber proposition. The railroads could exact enough, regardless of the money value back of the bonds and the stocks, to pay interest on the bonds and dividends on the stocks; and that was to be the only guide of the Secretary of the Treasury.

I made very careful preparation to argue to the Senate whether or not railroad bonds should be bedded into the currency system of this country.

Well, Mr. President, I made weeks and months of preparation to discuss that bond proposition in the Senate; and 20 minutes before I rose on the floor to make my attack upon it, the Senator from Rhode Island took the wind all out of my sails and out of my preparation by announcing the withdrawal of that proposition from the bill. I took the floor. I argued the bond proposition just the same, and predicted that when the conference report came in the railroad bonds would be in the bill as a basis of currency issue. And, sir, let me tell you what occurred when that bill came back into the Senate in the form of a conference report; it not only made railroad bonds but railroad stocks a basis for currency issue.

The history of the struggle between the conferees in that matter is interesting. The bill went into conference some six to eight weeks before the probable time of adjournment. The conferees met. A campaign had been made over this country extending over a period of years such as we have seen in regard to few pieces of legislation. A commission had taken testimony in this country and Europe, and had printed the results of its investigations in 42 volumes that nobody ever read. Organizations all over the country, bankers' organizations, commercial organizations, boards of trade, had been organized behind the legislation that Senator Aldrich and his commission and his committee proposed to put through.

But, sir, the conference committee met and the public was informed there was a wide difference between the House and the Senate and that no agreement would be effected.

Mr. President, that was repeated day after day, until the Members of this body and of the other body, thrown off guard, came to understand that after the weeks and months and years of agitation and campaigning this piece of legislation was to come to naught because of this difference between the two bodies.

We were near the time of adjournment. The date had not been set, but Senators know that we are sometimes nearly ready to adjourn before the resolution for adjournment is agreed upon by the two Houses. It was pretty well understood that the adjournment of the session was at hand.

Mr. WEEKS rose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to interrupt me?

Mr. WEEKS. If the Senator has reached the point where he wishes to be interrupted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me go on for a while, if you will, until I conclude this thought.

I wonder if Senators can recall the large correspondence that they had during the year or so preceding the culmination of that legislation. I wonder if they did not, as I know I did, write to hundreds, and I think thousands, of business men in Wisconsin and elsewhere who addressed me upon the subject. The papers announced that there would be no legislation upon this subject. I wrote the bankers and the business men in Wisconsin: "We are told in the press, and it is the understanding in both bodies, that there will be no legislation at all." The House had passed one bill and the Senate passed a wholly different bill, and these were in conference and no agreement could be reached.

If Senators will go back to the files of the papers of that time, they will find headlines, and news articles sustaining the headlines, to the effect that "all financial legislation for this session is out of the range of possibility."

Not more than four days before we adjourned I was startled by a morning-paper announcement that the conferees had agreed on that bill.

Mr. President, as an humble Member of this body I had some interest in that legislation. I got that conference report as quickly as I could. What do you think I found? Not only railroad bonds were back in the bill, but railroad stocks, warehouse receipts, every conceivable thing was back in the bill. It was an infinitely worse proposition from a financial and economic standpoint than was the bill as it was reported to the Senate. Propositions which when tested by debate were promptly withdrawn were restored in the conference bill.

The amendment which I had offered to require local banks to hold their reserves up to a certain point was wiped out. It had been accepted on the floor.

The provision with respect to the officials of the bank using the money of the depositors was gone out of the bill.

Senators, I got a bad reputation in this body and all over the country for talking interminably because of the righteous indignation which that report aroused in me. I determined that it should not pass this body if I could help it, and to stop it I spoke for 19 consecutive hours. It would have failed, because the adjournment was so imminent that many Senators had made their arrangements to leave, and the Senate and the House would be without a quorum, but for a legislative trick resorted to on this floor—so reprehensible, Mr. President, that the revered Senator from Georgia, Senator Bacon, rose in his place the day after it had been perpetrated and said that he wished to go on record as repudiating the methods by which the bill had passed.

Mr. President, the RECORD of the Senate was changed in order that I might be taken off the floor. I photographed the RECORD of the congressional proceedings of that night, and I have preserved the photograph and have published it. A RECORD was changed. It is not necessary for me to say who changed it now, because the mutations of time have put it beyond the power of some of the men engaged in it to answer, but I printed in the American Magazine in connection with the articles running as a part of my autobiography the changed RECORD in photograph, and it can be seen there if Members are interested enough to look at it.

The bill was passed. The conference report was put through.

Now, Mr. President, I have spent more time than I intended. I did not intend to speak of it at all. I had not thought of it for years until the suggestion of what happens so often in conference came to me as I considered the effort to write the proposition of the pending amendment into this bill. If adopted, this amendment would be the ground upon which the conferees could stand and write into the bill the Taylor system rejected in the other House and yesterday rejected by a decisive vote in the Senate.

If the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] would like to interrupt me, I will yield to him.

Mr. WEEKS. No; I will take the floor after the Senator gets through.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has the first call for the floor. He rose to interrupt me and forbore in order to let me go on. It was very kind of him.

Now, Mr. President, I come back to this. I do hope that as a Member of this body I shall live to see the rules with respect to conference reports so changed that it will not be possible for two or three men to dictate and put through legislation. This is a democracy, sir. We are supposed to be the representatives of the people.

Our work upon this floor and the work of our associates at the other end of the Capitol is supposed to represent public opinion and the interests of the great masses of this country. But I need not say to the Senators what everybody knows, that very often the public will is defeated, that public interest is perverted, and democracy is shackled in legislation as we enact it.

I long to see the time, Mr. President, when this body shall become thoroughly democratized, when our system of committee appointments shall be wholly changed, when our system of legislation by the dictation of party conferences and party caucuses shall be wholly changed.

Mr. President, not a day scarcely passes but we have evidences here in the Senate of the control of legislation by a small body of men upon a committee.

While I am on the subject, sir, I do not know but that I can serve public interest by taking just a few minutes to describe it.

At the beginning of every Congress a party conference or caucus is called. Under precedents which have come to be accepted, the senior in service, whatever may be his associations or his relation to the great questions of the day, calls that caucus or that conference to order. Some one moves that he be chosen chairman. He is chosen chairman. Some one moves that he be authorized to appoint a committee on committees. By long usage and custom, through which reformers would find it impossible to break, the motion prevails.

Now what happens? One man selects the men who make up the committee. The committees are made up pursuant to the

rule of seniority and the selection of the chairman. They are submitted to the committee, but the chairman of that committee, reflecting the views of the chairman who has presided at the conference, practically controls under custom as it has prevailed here, and our committees thus may centralize the control of legislation in the hands of very few men.

I see Senators turning to the list of the committees to see how I may have fared under that system. I have been here going on 11 years, Mr. President, and there comes a time when a man is given service here by the same system that makes the senior Senator the controlling force in the selection of the committee on committees. Seniority ultimately gives to a man some recognition upon committees.

When I came here in the beginning the committee of which I was made chairman was the Committee on Potomac River Front. I was chairman of that committee for a long time. I had spent a good many years on the question of railroad transportation, first in the House of Representatives, next in the State of Wisconsin, and I asked for a place upon the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I got it, Mr. President, but I am the last Republican on the list. I am at the foot of the whole list. There are plenty of men who came in here after I did who precede me upon the committee.

There is not a divinity that shapes our ends, but there is a power that shapes our ends with regard to legislation and to committees.

Now, Mr. President, I have wandered some distance afield, but after all it bears upon this matter that is before the Senate. The Senate yesterday by a very decisive vote declared that it would have none of this sweating system that drives men to the breaking point. The Senate said it did not want a system that throws men who by their nature can not make a certain number of motions within a given space of time on the labor scrap heap to go out and wrestle as best they may—discarded men to support their families.

Here is a proposition made by the Senator from New Hampshire which is exactly the same thing. It is not the stop watch. Mr. President, the term is somewhat offensive. That is left out of the proposed amendment, but in effect it is precisely the same thing. It is the bonus system, which can only be applied when men, driven to the very highest pressure, shall perform a given number of motions within a given space of time and turn out a finished product.

Mr. President, I must say economic propositions have some attractions for me. They have always had; and when this Taylor system, this scientific management system, was first proposed it made a very strong appeal to me. It took hold of my imagination. I said, "Here is an economy."

When a bricklayer takes the brick as they come from the hod of the carrier ordinarily the process is that he stoops to the level of his feet. The brick are deposited upon the platform upon which he works. He stoops down and picks up a brick. Any of you who ever watched the processes of the bricklayer noticed that almost always he tosses the brick in the air. It makes a revolution. He catches it as it comes down. To the eye of a novice the ends of a brick may appear the same; to the expert they are different. The bricklayer knows that he should hold that brick in his hand as he lays it in the wall with one end of it turned from him and the other end of it turned to him. The ends are not alike. He tosses the brick in the air. He seizes it as it comes down. He lays it in the wall. He bends again perhaps to the level of his feet, and in each of these motions he has lifted the entire weight of his body.

Now, Mr. President, it appealed to me that if those motions could be obviated, if they could be eliminated, or if any of the wear and strain of the weight of that man's body could be gotten rid of, it was economy in physical wear and tear and in the cost of production of the thing upon which he was working.

I saw at once that if this scientific-management system provided a movable platform that rose with the wall as he built it, so that he did not have to bend his body at all, and so that he took the brick right off the platform at the level of his waist, it would be a saving. I saw, too, that if the hod carrier down on the ground was instructed when he put the bricks into the hod to place them in a certain way in the hod, so that when he dumped the hod on the platform he could save the operation of tossing the brick into the air to bring it right-end-to for the bricklayer who was to lay it on the wall. It all appealed to me very strongly, Mr. President; but when I came to see the effect of it upon the great mass of toilers in this country I saw the viciousness of the system. While it does make for profit for the man who has the capital invested in the enterprise, and while he may by some equitable arrangement give the men who work under him, by a bonus or other system, some share in the profits which he can make, yet, when he gives it to them by bonus, that is turning the screws down harder and harder.

Not satisfied with eliminating the waste motions, on top of that, after they have eliminated the waste motions, most of these gentlemen who are striving for profits in their business will offer a bonus to a man who can strive with his associates. By the quickness of his eye, by the curious thing that is called a coordination of hand and brain, he can make certain motions quicker than can somebody else, and he pushes out of employment altogether somewhere from 60 to 80 per cent of the men who are slower in their motions as a result of this difference of attuning the whole system by nature to the acme of speed which the most proficient can attain.

Then, Mr. President, when I came to see those things and the result of them and came to investigate the matter further I became convinced that whatever the economies may be we must not adopt them unripened and undeveloped. If they can be ultimately so controlled as to protect the great body of the toilers of this country, to make the saving that comes from the elimination of waste motion and at the same time not destroy the lives of the men engaged in the business and insure to them their fair share of the saving in which it all results, then we may be able to accept it; but, Mr. President, that is remote, that is not here now. We must not be lured by theoretical arguments with respect to the saving resulting in the destruction or in the deterioration of the vital forces of the great body of the toilers of this country.

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I merely wish to say regarding the Watertown Arsenal——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I should prefer to listen to the Senator from New Jersey after I conclude. I never talk very long.

Mr. President, when I submitted the pending amendment I had no idea that it would provoke a discussion such as has ensued. The Senator from New Jersey, my genial friend, who wants again to get into the argument, immediately, before "high heaven" declaimed against this as an outrage on the workingman, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], in picturesque language, has followed in the same channel.

Mr. President, this system—which will be modified if my amendment prevails—is in vogue in hundreds and hundreds of workshops in the United States; it is in vogue in my own State; and I never have heard that any outrage has been committed upon an employee as a result of it. I never have heard that they have been crushed and outraged and persecuted as has been represented in this Chamber. I do not quite understand why Senators should indulge in language of that kind, in view of conditions which exist in workshops and factories all over our country.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], in discussing the matter, suggested that while the stop watch had been eliminated, other similar devices could be employed, and that the laboring man would not have his condition ameliorated in any way whatever because of words left in the bill.

Mr. President, if the Senator had read what is left in the bill, he would have seen that other devices of similar nature are prohibited, and that they could not possibly be employed under the law as it will stand if the amendment which I have offered shall be agreed to.

The Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. President, has truly wandered afield—that is his privilege under the rules of the Senate—but I confess that I have looked upon the Senator from Wisconsin heretofore as a man who lived in the present and the future rather than in the past. He has, however, gone back to the year 1908, and he has given us a page in the history of the Senate which is entirely new to me. I confess that I never heard it stated before—though possibly I would have found it in the printed record had I read the Senator's biography, which, I presume, I ought to have done—that there was any change in the proceedings of the Senate made by any employee or any Senator, whoever it may have been, on that memorable occasion, which we all remember, because we listened to the Senator at as great length, I believe, as any Senator has spoken in the Senate during the time of my somewhat protracted membership.

The Senator, Mr. President, has told us about the wonderful achievements of the German people, not only in military matters but industrial matters as well, and he called attention to the fact that that great people have accomplished such results because they have conserved human energy and human life.

Mr. President, sometimes I have thought I was the only man in the Senate who was truly neutral as between the contending forces in Europe to-day. I have tried to keep myself neutral; I have tried to think as well of one nation as I have of another; but I have been in Germany and I have seen the German people, I have been in France and I have seen the French people, I have been in England and I have seen the English people, and I confess that I have failed to discover that the German people are any more careful in conserving human energy and human life than are the other nations of the world. Why, Mr. President, take the women of Germany. I have seen them mixing mortar and carrying it up the ladder to the men who were laying bricks, a process which the Senator from Wisconsin has aptly described. I have seen them in the hay fields and in the wheat fields, performing labor that men ought to perform; I have seen them, Mr. President, drawing carts on the streets hitched to dogs, a sight that I have never seen in any other country on the face of the earth. And if Germany in treating its women in that way is conserving human energy and human life I fail to understand what conservation of human energy and human life means.

Mr. President, Germany has a wonderful military system, and her soldiers are among the best in the world; but if I am reading current history aright Germany has found her match in the French nation in this great struggle; and I think she is finding her match in the English nation as well on the battle field.

I think the soldiers from Canada, the soldiers from Australia, and the soldiers from that little isle, which we all admire so much because of its wonderful progress in art, in literature, in science, and in every other department of human endeavor, are proving to be a match for the wonderful German people, with whom I sympathize, because there is a trace of German blood in my veins. So I think, Mr. President, we should not be swept off our feet by the picturesque and eloquent language of the Senator from Wisconsin touching this question.

The Senator, Mr. President, I think very wisely, has called attention to our methods of legislation so far as conference reports are concerned. I do not think the Senator will ever live to see them reformed along the lines he has advocated to-day; but I do think that we ought to have the right, under our rules, to make a point of order against any provision that appears in a conference report that has not been considered by either House of Congress. I advocate that change, and hope that at some time it may be made; but whether we ought to have the right to object to any particular paragraph in a conference report is quite another matter which ought to receive very careful consideration before being adopted.

Mr. President, I feel that my amendment was hardly of sufficient importance to detain the Senate so long as the Senate has been detained in debating the question. Let me suggest what it means. I have moved, Mr. President, to strike from the bill these words:

> Nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant.

That is all.

I stood beside a man for three long years who earned 25 per cent more than I did doing the same kind of work. I never found fault with the fact that he was more expert than was I in performing that labor, and the fact that he received a higher reward than I did never impressed me with the feeling that I was being oppressed or being wronged in any way because of the fact that I did not get as much money as did he.

Mr. President, there are hundreds and hundreds of workshops in this country where bonuses are given to employees, where cash rewards are given to employees, for performing more and better work than some others who are engaged in the same workshop; and I can not for the life of me understand why anybody should object to that. I can not for the life of me see what harm it does to the man who is not as efficient as another and who can not in the very nature of things earn as much money as another.

If my amendment should prevail, what remains in the bill? Why, Mr. President, this provision would remain:

> *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States while making or causing to be made with a stop watch, or other time-measuring device, a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work.

It seems to me that that is sufficient to meet the views of the most radical Senator on this question. It absolutely prohibits the very things that have been complained of heretofore, but it does allow the men who are in charge of the Government workshops the right to compensate to a larger extent the efficient man than the inefficient man, the man who accomplishes more than the man who accomplishes less; and I have heretofore been of the opinion, Mr. President—and I am to-day equally as earnest in that view—that we ought not to legislate so that the most incompetent, so that the least efficient man shall set the standard of work for the men in any workshop in the United States, whether it be a private workshop or a Government workshop.

Mr. President, I am not rash enough to expect that my amendment will be accepted by the Senate; I am not rash enough to believe that Congress has yet reached the point where it will refuse any demands the labor unions of this country shall make upon it, and inasmuch as the labor unions have declared their purpose that legislation prohibiting the bonus system shall be enacted, I do not expect to see it eliminated by a vote of the Senate of the United States; but while I do not entertain the belief that it will be eliminated, I still hold to the conviction that it is an injustice to the workingmen to deny them the privilege of earning a little more additional money because of increased efficiency and increased power to accomplish more work than the men who may stand beside them in the same workshop.

Let us, Mr. President, encourage, rather than discourage, efficiency in Government as in private work, and let us not shut the door of encouragement to men to qualify themselves for better work, whether it be in workshops, in mills, in factories, or in the home by legislation such as is incorporated in this bill, and which, unfortunately, has been incorporated in other bills which have passed during the present session of Congress.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I thought on yesterday this whole question had been settled, but it seems not to have been. The idea seems to prevail that the bonus system is different from the time-clock system. The time-clock system first came in vogue and then the bonus system followed. I find here in Gen. Crozier's report a statement that they have a process of rewards to the foremen of the men. They give a foreman a bonus to drive the men to the limit. On page 20 of the same report Gen. Crozier says, and his statement shows that there is justification for opposition to the proposal advanced by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire:

> Perhaps something can be said on both sides of the question of stimulation by high rewards. There are in all walks of life men who wear themselves out in their effort at great accomplishment, and there are more such in a new country, where the rewards are great, than in old countries, where the more settled conditions imposed narrower limitations upon what may be accomplished by strenuous and intelligent effort.

I insist that a process that shall tend to wear out human lives is not good economy for a nation to pursue.

It is said that the time-clock system, the sweatshop, and the bonus system are all one and the same thing. The Senator from New Hampshire adopts the other view; but Gen. Crozier, referring to the Watertown Arsenal, on page 20 of the same document, uses these words:

> The question remains to be answered how the process at the Watertown Arsenal differs in kind from the class known as "speeding-up," or "sweatshop," or "slave-driving" processes, so called. I take it that the essential difference lies in the character of the stimulation which is applied to increase the output. In the reprehensible methods the output of a very rapid workman is taken as the standard, and the rate set is such that this output must be reached in order to make ordinary wages. The task and the compensation are so fixed that unless the employee puts himself under a great strain all the time he is either discharged or fails to earn a living wage. In other words, the highest possible output is demanded for what is at best no more than the current rate of wages.

I insist that that verifies our position that there is no difference, or only a difference of words, between the sweatshop, the speeding-up, the slave-driving—I am using Gen. Crozier's words—and the time-watch system. I feel that it could do nothing to advance the welfare of the operatives; neither do I believe it would advance the welfare of the Nation.

As I suggested yesterday or this morning, whenever it was, we can not prevent this in private shops; but in God's name do not let the Government of the United States adopt a system that shall drive the last strain and string of a man's tendons and muscles to their utmost tension, or the last drop of blood, upon which to build our prosperous arts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] 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 senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRYAN. Has the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. BRYAN. I have a pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. DU PONT (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to inquire whether the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. DU PONT. As I have a general pair with that Senator, I will withdraw my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who has not voted. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. WARREN (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. WARREN. I withdraw my vote, as I have a pair with that Senator.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is absent on public business, and is paired with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], and that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. OVERMAN entered the Chamber and voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—15.

Brandegee	Harding	Penrose	Wadsworth
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Sherman	Weeks
Dillingham	McCumber	Smoot	Works
Gallinger	Page	Thomas	

NAYS—40.

Ashurst	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Jones	Pittman	Sterling
Borah	La Follette	Poindexter	Stone
Brady	Lane	Ransdell	Swanson
Broussard	Martin, Va.	Reed	Taggart
Chamberlain	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	Thompson
Clapp	Myers	Sheppard	Tillman
Culberson	Norris	Shields	Underwood
Fletcher	Overman	Simmons	Vardaman
James	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	Williams

NOT VOTING—40.

Beckham	Goff	Kern	Pomerene
Bryan	Gore	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson
Catron	Gronna	Lewis	Shafroth
Chilton	Hardwick	Lippitt	Smith, Ga.
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	Lodge	Smith, Md.
Colt	Hollis	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Cummins	Hughes	Nelson	Sutherland
Curtis	Husting	Newlands	Townsend
du Pont	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Walsh
Fall	Kenyon	Oliver	Warren

So Mr. GALLINGER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYAN. I desire to give notice that when the bill gets into the Senate I shall ask for a separate vote on the amendments of the committee, beginning on page 54 and going to page 58, inclusive.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I can not let the occasion pass without congratulating the Senate on the fact that there has been a gain of two votes, since the vote on yesterday, for the beneficent amendment that I submitted to the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment on page 11, at the end of line 20. I do not think the chairman of the committee will have any objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, at the end of line 20, after the word "occurred," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following words:

Provided, That the relative rank of all general officers of the line shall be determined by the date of their respective commissions, seniors taking precedence over juniors.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I should like some explanation of that amendment. That is the law now, as I understand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The only purpose of that is to secure the relative rank of general officers in the line; that is all. In other words, when the Congress passed a bill some time ago to promote certain officers on the Canal Zone for distinguished service, by some misunderstanding or some misconstruction of the law it was held—or will be held, if opportunity arises, so I am informed—that graduates from Annapolis or West Point who graduated five years or any other number of years after the officers who were promoted under that act will take rank over and above them, and the purpose of this is simply to correct it. I hope the Senate will let it go to conference.

Mr. WARREN. I assume the Senator means this to relieve one man alone, does he not, or perhaps three or four men?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, no. There are three or four of them. It relieves all those that were promoted by special act of Congress for distinguished service on the Canal Zone. If I am mistaken about that, there will be no trouble in correcting it. If it goes to conference and it is found not to be necessary in order to correct that injustice, the conferees can take it out.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that I do not know about the conference, but I assume that he means to change the law which provided that those men who were elevated from lieutenant colonels and colonels to brigadier and major generals should stand at the foot of the list, as this was an honorary place. He wishes those to be advanced up to where their original date of commission from West Point would put them?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I do not think that is the purpose of the amendment at all.

Mr. WARREN. The reason why I ask is because there has been of necessity, when we provided for detached officers, some legislation, and we have undertaken to correct it in this law. I thought the Senator was making this entirely too general. If he would apply it alone to those that were elevated on account of their meritorious work at the Canal Zone, that would cover what he wants.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendent was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the bill, a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That section 27 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, be amended so as to read:

"SEC. 27. Enlistments in the Regular Army: On and after the 1st day of November, 1916, all enlistments in the Regular Army shall be for a term of seven years, the first three years to be in active service with the organizations of which those enlisted form a part and, except as otherwise provided herein, the last four years in the Regular Army Reserve hereinafter provided for: *Provided*, That at the expiration of three years' continuous service with such organizations, either under a first or any subsequent enlistment, any soldier may be reenlisted for another period of seven years, as above provided for, in which event he shall receive his final discharge from his prior enlistment: *Provided further*, That after the expiration of one year's honorable service any enlisted man serving within the continental limits of the United States whose company, troop, battery, or detachment commander shall report him as proficient and sufficiently trained may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be furloughed to the Regular Army Reserve under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, but no man furloughed to the reserve shall be eligible to reenlist in the service until the expiration of his term of seven years: *Provided further*, That in all enlistments hereafter accomplished under the provisions of this act three years shall be counted as an enlistment period in computing continuous-service pay: *Provided further*, That any noncommissioned officer discharged with an excellent character shall be permitted, at the expiration of three years in the active service, to reenlist in the organization from which discharged with the rank and grade held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within 20 days after the date of such discharge: *Provided further*, That no person under the age of 21

years shall be enlisted or mustered into the military service of the United States without the written consent of his parents or guardians: *Provided, however,* That such minor has such parents or guardians entitled to his custody and control, and this proviso shall be applicable to all minors enlisted or mustered into the military service of the United States on and after June 3, 1916: *And provided further,* That the President is authorized in his discretion to utilize the services of postmasters of the second, third, and fourth classes in procuring the enlistment of recruits for the Army, and for each recruit accepted for enlistment in the Army the postmaster procuring his enlistment shall receive the sum of $5.

"In addition to military training, soldiers while in the active service shall hereafter be given the opportunity to study and receive instruction upon educational lines of such character as to increase their military efficiency and enable them to return to civil life better equipped for industrial, commercial, and general business occupations. Civilian teachers may be employed to aid the Army officers in giving such instruction, and part of this instruction may consist of vocational education either in agriculture or the mechanic arts. The Secretary of War, with the approval of the President, shall prescribe rules and regulations for conducting the instruction herein provided for, and the Secretary of War shall have the power at all times to suspend, increase, or decrease the amount of such instruction offered as may, in his judgment, be consistent with the requirements of military instruction and service of the soldiers."

SEC. —. That section 58 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, be, and the same is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 58. Composition of the National Guard: The National Guard shall consist of the regularly enlisted militia between the ages of 18 and 45 years, organized, armed, and equipped as hereinafter provided, and of commissioned officers between the ages of 21 and 64 years: *Provided,* That no person under the age of 21 years shall be enlisted or mustered into the military service of the United States without the written consent of his parents or guardians: *Provided,* That such minor has such parents or guardians entitled to his custody and control, and this provision shall be applicable to all minors mustered into the military service of the United States on and after June 3, 1916."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not know whether there is to be opposition to this proposed amendment. It is very important. While it is a long amendment and provides for reenacting of two sections of the act which passed June 3, known as the reorganization of the Army act, I propose its reenactment only to change one provision in each of those two sections. The provision which is changed by my amendment, if it is adopted, restores to the parent the right to withhold consent to the enlistment of a boy in the Regular Army or the National Guard if he is below 21 years of age. Prior to the enactment of the law of June 3 the consent of a parent or guardian was necessary to the lawful enlistment of a boy under 21 years of age and over 18 years of age.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In the Regular Army?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the Regular Army. That law was changed by the act known as the reorganization of the Army act.

I say without any hesitation that the amendment which I have offered is subject to a point of order, and I have guarded myself against that point of order by giving notice of a motion to suspend the rule, and I do not believe that a member of the committee or a Member of the Senate will make a point of order against this amendment, and therefore I do not believe that it will be necessary for me to precede the offer of the amendment with a motion to suspend the rule. Consequently, until there is some manifestation of a desire on the part of some Member of the Senate to raise that point of order I shall simply content myself to offer the amendment.

Mr. President, permit me to say this: I have before me on my desk the bill H. R. 12766, entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Military Establishment of the United States," as it passed the House of Representatives on the 23d day of March, 1916. I have before me the bill H. R. 12766, the same bill, as it passed the Senate on the calendar day, April 18, 1916.

Mr. BORAH. It is a long amendment and I do not know that I understood the Senator as to the precise correction which he desires to make in that act. It refers to requiring the consent of the parent or guardian?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is to restore to the law the provision which requires that the consent of the parent or guardian should be had before a boy could be enlisted in the Regular Army if he is under 21 years of age.

Mr. BORAH. It seems to me that is a very wise proposition. We have in our office now two cases which come under the law as it exists because of the passage of the act of the 3d of June, 1916.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no doubt of that, Mr. President. I had in my office many cases within a few days after the order came to muster the National Guard into the military service of the United States. Within a day or two following that more than 500 cases of appeal from parents were made to the War Department for the relief of boys over 18 and under 21 years of age. In many cases these boys were necessary to the support of families where there were widowed mothers.

Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho will readily see that not only were the boys affected who might be enlisted in the Regular Army, but boys had been enlisted in the National Guard all over the country; in some cases where they were only 18 years of age they were taken out of schools and drafted into the Regular Army. All over the land appeals have come from parents to the War Department and to the commanders of the different regiments and companies for the relief of those children.

It is true the law provided for the enlistment of boys of this tender age in the Navy, and the excuse that is made for changing this law is that it was to make it conform to the law regarding enlistment in the Navy. But, Mr. President, because enlistment in the Navy has been by law at that age wrongfully, and, as I believe, against the best interest of the Navy, and against the best interest of the country, it furnishes no excuse whatever for making this change with regard to enlistments in the Regular Army and the National Guard.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I agree with the Senator about that. I was going to ask him would we not be up against the same trouble when we come to muster the Naval Militia into the service, if we ever do? The Senators' amendment does not propose to correct that?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I did not include that because I knew it would not be germane to this bill. I do propose to correct that provision in the law, but I have to do it in another way, as the Senator will understand.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly. Will the Senator answer this question in addition: Did the Army reorganization bill, which passed a few weeks ago, change the age at which a boy could enlist in the Army?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It did.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It lowered it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It lowered it; that is, without the consent of the parents.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what I mean.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It lowered it from 21 to 18 years of age. That provision was not in the bill as it passed the House; that provision was not in the bill as it passed the Senate. It was incorporated in the conference report. I have searched the RECORD, and there was not a word of discussion concerning that matter in the Senate. It passed, I know, without my knowledge, and I am certain that it passed—and I do not say it in criticism—without the Members of the Senate being acquainted with the fact that it was there.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that it has always been the law with respect to the National Guard that they could enlist between 18 and 21 years of age.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; and I have something to say about that, Mr. President.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Just a moment. I wish to call the Senator's attention——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was aware of the fact, but, Mr. President, boys who enlist in the National Guard do not enlist in the Regular Army. It is not in contemplation of service in the Regular Army that boys enlist in the National Guard; it is not in contemplation of service in the Regular Army that the parents consent to boys enlisting in the National Guard. There have been but two times in 51 years when the National Guard has been called upon to serve otherwise than in the National Guard at home.

Mr. President, I do not want to occupy the time of the Senate for one moment here this afternoon longer than is necessary. I want to secure the correction that ought to be made in this provision, and I submit it with this statement, that the people of this country will revolt upon this proposition, Mr. President. It is pushing this preparedness proposition too far.

Mr. WARREN. Of course there is a little different aspect now than there was a couple of months ago. Of course when we had the Civil War the age of enlistment was 17. At the time these matters were considered it looked more like war conditions than it does now.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That may furnish the reason for the action of the conferees, although I think while it is the action of Congress now, had the attention of the Senate been directed to it at that time it would have been ample reason for rejecting the conference report. I do not think there is anything in the provisions of either of the two bills that warranted the incorporation of that provision in the conference report.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I know the Senator does not want to do an injustice.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not want to do an injustice to anybody.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. But the bill as it passed the Senate provided that the Militia of the United States shall consist of all able-bodied male citizens, and so forth, who are more than 16 years of age and not more than 45 years of age——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, Mr. President, that is true.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Pardon me, just a moment. Then, when the bill had passed the Senate that way the House provision was 18 and 45.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is true.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. So as the bill passed the Senate it provided for drafting these young men into the service.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But that was not the provision in regard to enlisted men in the Regular Army.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is right.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There was no provision whatever that touched that section of the statute in either of the two bills, and strictly the conferees were unwarranted in changing the law in that respect. I do not mean to imply any improper motives, but I do say, Mr. President, that fact might be taken into account by the Senate in considering this matter at this time.

Now, Mr. President, without taking another moment of the Senate's time, unless there is opposition to this provision I shall offer no further reasons for its passage. If there is, then I shall have something further to say.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I ask the Senator if he proposes by this amendment to affect the present status of the men who have been enlisted or mustered in?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do. The language of the amendment affects the present status. I drew it purposely in that respect. It enables the parent in every case where the boy is under 21 years of age to object to his continued service. I think it should be so. This thing came upon him unawares, and there is no reason why there should be any different rule for the boys now in the service and for others who may enlist in the future. Many of these boys were taken from school.

Mr. President, consider just for a moment the time of life of these young men. It is the formative period of their characters. We may be willing to give up our boys to the service of the country in a time of great danger, but there is no such stress upon us now as to require that boys should be taken out of the high schools and taken out of the colleges of the country and pushed into the Regular Army, as it can be done and has been done under these two provisions.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I agree fully with the Senator, if the law is to apply in the future there is no reason why it should not apply now.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We can pass an act lowering the age limit if the time should ever come when this service is required of the youth of the country.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will say to the Senator I will raise no objection to this amendment if he will make it apply hereafter, but I do not see that it ought to be made applicable to the period of discipline which is now prevailing for the National Guard of the country. There are thousands of men probably in the National Guard at the front to-day, and this disruptive proposition of sending out and bringing men home for one reason or another is not good discipline. It is not consistent legislation. If the Senator will make this apply to the future——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will not change it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Then I raise the objection that it is legislation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then I move to suspend the rules for the passage of this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is under compulsion, of course, to sustain the point of order that it is general legislation. The Senator from Wisconsin has given notice for the suspension of the rules, and on that, of course, the roll must be called, because it takes a two-thirds vote.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make the point of no quorum in order that we may get Senators here. I want to discuss the matter then with my friend from Maryland.

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

Borah	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	James	Norris	Sterling
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Swanson
Bryan	Jones	Page	Underwood
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Phelan	Wadsworth
Chilton	La Follette	Pittman	Warren
Clapp	Lane	Pomerene	Williams
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Reed	Works
Culberson	Lippitt	Saulsbury	
Dillingham	Lodge	Sheppard	
du Pont	Martin, Va.	Sherman	

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

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. PENROSE, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. STONE, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. THOMAS answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to suspend clause 3 of Rule XVI for the purpose of introducing an amendment to the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, to Senators who were not in the Chamber when I offered this amendment I merely wish to explain its purpose very briefly.

When the Army reorganization bill passed in June, without the knowledge of any Senator on this floor, outside of the members of the conference committee, the law was changed so that boys who were under 21 and over 18 years of age could be enlisted in the Regular Army or transferred from the National Guard into the Regular Army by draft without the consent of their parents. Within a few days after the time that law was applied here in the city of Washington there were 500 cases of parents who applied to the War Department to get their boys back—boys between the ages of 18 and 21 years—and to take them out of that service.

The proposition was never discussed upon the floor of the Senate. If it had been, I do not believe that it could have been passed. There was very little discussion of the conference report, as Senators will remember. The bill as it passed the House of Representatives did not contain the provision with regard to lowering the age limit under which a boy might enlist in the Regular Army from 21 to 18 years in defiance of the will of his parents or guardian.

No provision of that sort was put in the bill while it was pending before the Senate. I have on my desk the bill as it passed the House; I have on my desk the bill as it passed the Senate, the only copy obtainable, withdrawn from the files of the document room by permission of the official in charge, to be returned there. I have examined them carefully; I have examined the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There was no discussion of this subject before the Senate when the bill was pending; there was no discussion of this subject when the conference report came in. There was very little debate upon the conference report. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] made a speech concerning the conference report, and there was a running discussion upon several features of it, but this provision never was touched. I think if anybody had called attention to it it would have been held by the Senate that the conferees could not put that provision into the bill in conference; but, even waiving that, if the proposition had come originally before the Senate when the bill was pending it would, in my opinion, have been defeated here. I do not believe that the Senate nor the Congress of the United States could go back and face the parents of this country with a proposition that they had written into the law that the home might be invaded and the boy taken against the consent of the parent at 18 years of age and put into the Regular Army.

Mr. President, if there is ever a time when a boy needs the influence of the home, it is then, for that is the formative period of his character. There have been occasions in the history of this country, as there have been in the history of all countries, when the people of this country, when the homes of the country, have been ready to give up even boys of tenderer age than this to the defense of the country; but there is no man in favor of preparedness so enthusiastic in his support of it, I think, that he would be prepared to say at this time, or would dare to say at this time, to the parents of this country, "We are ready now to draft your boys into the service of the Regular Army against your consent."

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Pardon me for a moment. And the very fact that a boy might willfully wish to enlist at that time is the best evidence in the world that that boy needs the influence of the home.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I unfortunately have been detained from the Chamber for a while and have not heard the earlier part of this discussion. Do I understand that under the law preceding the passage of the Army reorganization act the consent of the parent was required in the case of a draft by the Government?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, under the law as it previously stood no boy, without the consent of his parent or guardian, unless he was over 21 years of age, could be enlisted in the Regular Army. If he was over 18 years of age and under 21 years of age, with the consent in writing of the parent or guardian——

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator is now speaking of enlistments. I was referring to a draft.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am speaking of both enlistments and of drafting the youth of this country from the National Guard. There are two proposals which have been made to the Senate for changes in the law; one that the age limit for enlistments

in the Regular Army shall be as it was in the statute before the act of last June, known as the Army reorganization act, was passed, so that no boy between the ages of 18 and 21 shall be enlisted without the consent of his parents or guardian, if he has parents or guardian. The other amendment is that boys can not be taken from the National Guard into the Regular Army by draft or otherwise if they are between those ages without the consent of the parents or guardians.

Mr. President, I doubt if you will find any parents in this country who would not consent to their boys enlisting in the National Guard even though they were below the age of 18, even though they were 16 years of age or 15 years of age, because in the contemplation of the parent of the boy who enlists it does not mean anything but service in the National Guard. There has been no reason why the contract should mean more than that.

In the life of two generations in this country the National Guard has never been but twice drafted into the Regular Army—once during the Spanish-American War and again here within the last few weeks. So all the enlistments that have been made in the National Guard have been made in contemplation of nightly or weekly drills in the armories, and of three or four weeks spent at an encampment within the State, tending to build up a boy in a physical way, something that would appeal to parents; but if the parent contemplated at the time that it meant that a boy 18 years old should be drafted into the Regular Army for a three-year period, I undertake to say, Mr. President, that there are very few parents who would have consented.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. I have not been in the Senate during the afternoon, having been engaged on Senate business elsewhere, but I rise to ask just in what form this amendment is, and is it intended to change the act of June 3, 1916?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is intended to change the act of June 3, 1916, and restore the conditions that prevailed before that act was passed.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not just at this moment. To answer the Senator from Missouri a little more fully, the motion that is now pending before the Senate is a motion to suspend the rules. I was constrained, Mr. President, because this amendment changed existing law, to give notice to the Senate that I would ask for the opportunity to suspend the rules and put this amendment upon its passage. I had no opposition from any member of the Committee on Military Affairs to that motion, and therefore, just immediately preceding the call of the Senate, I had offered the amendment without making the preliminary motion to suspend the rules, because I was advised in advance that no member of the committee would raise the question of its being obnoxious to the rule, and that I might have a vote upon its merits directly, and that a majority vote would carry it; but the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] raised the question of its being obnoxious to the rule, which necessitates, first, my making a motion to suspend the rule, as I understand.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thought the Senator had concluded. I just want, if the Senator will permit me a moment, to say that it is true, as he said, that prior to the act of June 3, 1916, between the ages of 18 and 21 those enlisting in the Regular Army were required to have the consent of the parents or guardian. That was the law prior to June 3, 1916. The question of enlistment in the Regular Army was not discussed in the Senate, as the Senator very correctly says, when the reorganization act was passed; but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that there was in the reorganization bill when it passed the Senate a provision which did fix the age of enlistment between 16 and 45 in the National Guard.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is true, Mr. President. Prior to that time there had been no national law upon that subject. The States had regulated the age.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. What I am calling the attention of the Senator to particularly is the fact that this was before the Senate. Now, when that provision was put into the bill the ages were 16 and 45 for the National Guard. That was before the Senate with the reorganization act; and then in connection with that was section 114 of the bill, which authorized the President to call these young men of the National Guard into the service.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is true, Mr. President; but no Senator called attention to the fact that under the drafting authority given to the President boys of 16 might be drafted into the Regular Army, and no line in the RECORD can be found where that was brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not differing with the Senator as to that. What I am calling the Senator's attention to is that the provision was not formulated in the conference committee, but it was before the Senate, although not discussed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But let me say to the Senator from Oregon that the provision to which he now calls attention, with respect to the National Guard, was not in the statute which fixed the age of enlisted men in the Regular Army.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; it was not. It was in the Dick law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There was no amendment in this bill, as it passed the Senate and as it passed the House, changing the law with respect to enlistment in the Regular Army.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And the Senate conferees and the House conferees went entirely outside of both bills and put a provision in here changing the law.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question? As his amendment is drawn, will it involve disorganizing the forces which have already gone to the front?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As the amendment is drawn, it will release the boys that are under the age fixed in this amendment and under the age as it stood in the law before this act passed Congress without its having information as to what it was doing.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think it would be wise to modify the provision, then, so as simply to apply to the future? I am very cordially with him against allowing any boy under 21 to enlist in the Army without his parents' consent; but if these troops have already gone down to the front, and have been organized on the basis of their present forces, it might cause a very serious interference with existing conditions.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, all that it would do would be to release those boys. Now, the Senator must bear in mind that under the provisions of the bill as it passed the Senate with regard to releasing the heads of families, the commanding officer has the right to do that where the evidence before him is convincing as to the need of the family; so it is no more a demoralization of the company or the regiment in that case than it would be in this case. I do submit, Mr. President, with 500 applications made within three days after the mobilization of the National Guard of this city from parents who needed these boys—their mothers, many of them, came to my office, where the boys were the only support of the family, boys under 21 years of age and those above 18, and other Senators interrupted here on the floor to say that they had in their offices, as I had in mine, applications from different States to have these boys restored to their families—I think it ought to be done now.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, in justice to these boys who have been forced into the Army—for that is what it means—and their parents, it should be borne in mind that we have by law changed the contract or the enlistment of these boys by making them subject to service in the Regular Army, practically speaking; and I think we owe it to them to relieve them from that obligation. I made that point when the bill was up—that we were forcing these men into a service for which they had not enlisted at all, and, as I thought, in violation of the Constitution.

It seems to me that this provision ought to apply to the boys who have been forced into the Army in that way just as well as to the future. I think, as a simple act of justice, we should release these boys from that obligation by the amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I have not the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin before me; so I will ask him for the information, which I will get quicker than I could by reading it, probably.

As I understand from his statement, the effect of the amendment, if agreed to, would be to release all of these boys between 16 and 21 who may now be in the militia——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Between 18 and 21.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Between 18 and 21, without having——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; between 16 and 21.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Without having had the consent of their parents. I was going to ask the Senator whether his amendment was so drafted that if these boys should now obtain the consent of their parents to their service they would not have to be discharged. In other words, I think probably many of these boys who enlisted would like to stay. Now, unless this amendment provides for the contingency, they would

all have to be discharged and have to enlist over again, and I should think it would be easy enough if that is not provided for to provide for it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It just restores the statute, and provides that excepting with the consent of the parent or guardian, if they have a parent or guardian, they shall not be held to the service.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wonder whether the proposed statute, providing consent of the parent as a prerequisite to a lawful enlistment, if passed to-day would be considered to relate back to the enlistment of these boys which may have taken place a year ago. I do not see myself how it could; but I think the Senator can easily put in a proviso stating that in the case of any boy now in the service contrary to the provisions of the act the act shall not apply to him, provided the consent of his parents is obtained and filed with the department within 30 days.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think that is a reasonable suggestion, and I shall be willing to accept it. It can be very easily framed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It can be adjusted in conference, perhaps.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But I did not know but that the Senator's bill, if properly framed now, might not go to conference. It might be agreed to by the House. However, it is an amendment to this appropriation bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is an amendment to this appropriation bill, and it will have to go to the House.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It will have to go to the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; it will have to go to conference.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, the greatest difficulty is with regard to the orphans, the young men who have no parents living. I suppose everyone knows, probably, that out of 100 cases of minors ninety-nine times out of one hundred there is no guardian appointed unless there be money left to the children. In that event an appointment is made, and also in certain cases where children are abused or cruelly treated, and somebody applies as next friend to be appointed guardian. But the great majority of minors have no guardian.

This state of affairs, to my knowledge, constitutes one of the difficulties in recruiting for the Regular Army. A young man between 20 and 21 comes and presents himself to the recruiting officer and is asked his age. He replies, "Twenty years and six months." "Have you the consent of your parents or guardian?" "I have no parents and no guardian." "Well, I can not take you unless you have a guardian appointed." That means an expenditure on the part of this young man of $15 or $20 to go to court and get a guardian appointed; and that is the cause of the rejection of hundreds of young men who apply for enlistment in the Regular Army. Now, this condition should be provided for in the Senator's amendment to the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is provided for, if the Senator will permit me, in the amendment as I have framed it. It only applies to minors who have guardians or parents who may make the protest.

Mr. DU PONT. Then the Adjutant General's Department, to protect itself, will simply prohibit any enlistments of minors without written consent, because young men when they have guardians or when they have parents often say they have not, and then the guardian or parent turns up later and there is trouble.

Now, Mr. President, as I am on my feet, I will say that what the defense act did, so far as the Regular Army is concerned, was simply to apply the same rules and regulations that obtained in the Navy. For years the enlistment of any young man over 18 years of age, with or without the consent of his parents or guardian, has been permitted in the Navy. There has been no difficulty under such rules in all those years, no special friction of any kind; and it was thought wise and proper that both branches of the national defense should be on the same footing. Eighteen years is the recognized military age in all European countries, and is also that which is embodied in the Constitution for the militia.

Mr. President, during the Civil War the great majority of the young men on the Union side were under 21 years of age. Of the total enlisted, 2,778,304, less than one-fourth were over 21 years of age. I have here a table showing these facts, from which it appears that of those who fought on the Union side during the Civil War nearly two and a half million were under 21 years of age, and I suppose that on the Confederate side the same proportion existed, or probably an even greater proportion.

Further, Mr. President, if a young man is to go into the service and patriotically contribute to the defense of his country, I maintain that he had much better do so at 18, when he can be discharged at 22 at the outside, or at 17, when he can be discharged at 21, and then take up his regular avocation in life; and, it is to be observed, that under the provisions of existing law he could be discharged at the option of the Secretary of War after one year's service.

Then there is another provision of existing law. A young man who enlists in the Army and does not like it, or whose parents insist upon his discharge, can be released by purchase, so that the conditions under which he enlists are not nearly so grave as they were in the former days, when there was no opportunity of getting out of the Army, and the enlistment was for five years. Formerly, when a youth enlisted for five years there was no means of getting out, and it seems to me that these conditions should be taken into consideration.

I submit the statement to which I have referred and will ask that it be incorporated in my remarks, if there be no objection.

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

The statement referred to is as follows:

Ages attributed to those who enlisted in the Union Army during the Civil War.

Those 10 years and under	25
Those 11 years and under	38
Those 12 years and under	225
Those 13 years and under	300
Those 14 years and under	1,523
Those 15 years and under	104,987
Those 16 years and under	231,051
Those 17 years and under	844,891
Those 18 years and under	1,151,438
Those 21 years and under	2,159,798
Those 22 years and over	618,511
Those 25 years and over	46,462
Those 44 years and over	16,071

Of the total men enlisted, 2,778,304, less than one-fourth, were over 21 years of age.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I made the objection to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin for two reasons: First, the effect on the Regular Army; and, second, the effect on the National Guard.

The statistics show that the Regular Army is going ahead only at the rate of 1,000 men, net, a month; and since the passage of the Army bill on the 3d of June there has been, of course, an increased enlistment in the Regular Army under the war excitement that was current. Now, a large number of those enlisting were doubtless minors, and enlisted probably without their parents' consent, between the ages of 18 and 21; and those men were lawfully enlisted and have been lawfully sent to the front.

My judgment differs entirely from that of the Senator who offered this amendment. I think the young man who enlists in the Regular Army without the consent of his parents is the very fellow who ought to be there. It is the place for him. It shows that the old people can not handle that boy, and he ought to go where he will get the man handling that will make a man out of him. Instead of spoiling those boys by this sentimental stuff and letting them come home, let them stay where they have put themselves lawfully.

My father went to sea as a midshipman when he was 14 years old in the Regular Navy of the United States, and those were long cruises; but now the Senator from Wisconsin, who represents what was once a hardy frontier State, objects to a young man of 18 serving 90 days in camp away from his parents. There is no reason why a young man who is 18 years old and above can not enlist in the United States Army and serve there successfully and get the discipline of that experience; and if he does it without his parents' consent, he is the very man that ought to be put there, so that they can make him respect constituted authority. He lacks that deference for those to whom he should defer if he acts in that way, and the very action that he takes shows that he ought to be where his nature has put him.

Mr. President, there is another objection, and that is the effect upon the National Guard. The Senator from Wisconsin, at the same moment he objects to a 90-day service for preparedness, says he is willing to sacrifice this young man or any untrained boy of any age, whenever there is a real war, send him to the front, in that event, unprepared, undisciplined, unhardened, food for powder and disease. Why, Mr. President, that is the very acme of unpreparedness. That is not the kind of policy the Senate should follow. Here we have an unequaled opportunity for training these thousands of young men who have gone to the Rio Grande. The chairman of the committee says he does not think there is any possibility of their going across that river and of there being real war. It is a contingency, of course, and may turn out one way or the other; but certainly there is now presented a grand opportunity for training and for preparation. As to the risk, as the Senator from Wisconsin

himself says, there is no very great risk about it now; and yet, when there is not any risk, he wants to bring them home, and when there is a risk he is willing to send them out.

Mr. President, this is a retroactive proposition. It upsets what has been lawfully done under an act of Congress for a month or more. If the Senate concludes to partly disrupt the discipline of the Regular Army and of the militia alike by drawing all these young men out of the ranks who are lawfully there, it is, to say the least, an eccentric military policy, and it is another illustration of the extraordinary vacillation in legislative management of a military plan.

Mr. President, if you want to change this thing for the future, change it, but do not go back and uproot what has been done, and disrupt the discipline of all these commands, Regular and militia alike, by this sort of short-sighted, emotional, and sentimental legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to suspend the rule.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I was going to suggest an amendment to the amendment, but the first question is on the suspension of the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the first question.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word in explanation of my vote. In conformity with my statements in the past I wish to say that I shall not vote to suspend the rule to place general legislation on an appropriation bill, unless the proposed legislation is vital to the interests of our country. I do not believe the proposed amendment is such. Therefore I shall vote against the suspension of the rule. If the rules are suspended, I will vote for the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the suspension of the rule, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DU PONT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. He does not seem to be in the Chamber. I will transfer my pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON], who is absent, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I make the same transfer of my pair that I made on the last vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

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

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN];

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE];

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]; and

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. GRONNA. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], but on this question I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. BRYAN (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. May I inquire whether the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—44.

Ashurst	Chamberlain	Fletcher	Husting
Borah	Clapp	Gallinger	Johnson, S. Dak.
Brady	Clark, Wyo.	Gronna	Jones
Brandegee	Culberson	Harding	Kenyon
Kern	Norris	Reed	Taggart
La Follette	O'Gorman	Sheppard	Thomas
Lane	Page	Sherman	Thompson
Lodge	Penrose	Simmons	Underwood
McCumber	Poindexter	Smith, S. C.	Vardaman
Martine, N. J.	Pomerene	Sterling	Wadsworth
Myers	Ransdell	Stone	Works

NAYS—13.

Bankhead	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Bryan	Overman	Smoot	
du Pont	Phelan	Swanson	
Lee, Md.	Shields	Warren	

NOT VOTING—38.

Beckham	Goff	Lippitt	Smith, Ga.
Broussard	Gore	McLean	Smith, Md.
Catron	Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Chilton	Hitchcock	Newlands	Sutherland
Clarke, Ark.	Hollis	Oliver	Tillman
Colt	Hughes	Owen	Townsend
Cummins	James	Pittman	Walsh
Curtis	Johnson, Me.	Robinson	Weeks
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	
Fall	Lewis	Shafroth	

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion prevails, and the Senate suspends the rule.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. The amendment has been read. It has been printed two or three times, and I think the Senate well understands it. It is somewhat long, because I have reenacted sections of the law, but the only change made is with respect to the age limit. I have proposed in perfection of the amendment three or four lines pursuant to the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] which I think meets that suggestion, and I will ask that those lines be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 3 of the printed amendment, after the words "nineteen hundred and sixteen," insert "and who, within 30 days after the approval of this act, shall not have filed the consent of such parent or guardian."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is so that anyone who is in the Regular Army by virtue of this legislation who files the consent of his parent or guardian remains in the Regular Army.

Mr. DU PONT. Suppose he has no guardian, I ask the Senator?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then he is not affected by the amendment at all one way or the other.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, while I think that this amendment will affect the Regular Army perhaps more than it will the National Guard, nevertheless it looks to me as being a retroactive proposition uprooting the status of men already mustered into the service of the United States and of the National Guard of the several States.

I wish to move three amendments to prevent the retroactive effect of the amendment, namely, in line 1, page 3, after the word "shall," to insert the word "hereafter"; in line 7, to strike out the words "June 3" and insert the words "July 26"; and on page 4, line 16, after the words "shall be" to insert the word "hereafter."

The effect of that will be to suspend the enlistment of men under 21 without the consent of their parents after this date.

I therefore move, on line 1, page 4, that the word "hereafter" shall be inserted after the word "shall."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 1, page 3, after the word "shall," insert the word "hereafter."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I rise to favor the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and to oppose the amendment to it offered by the Senator from Maryland. I think if the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin is good at all—and I believe it is good—it ought to apply to the boy who has been taken into the Army in the last 30 days just as much as to the boy who goes in in the future.

Mr. President, I believe this great country of ours ought to be reasonably prepared to meet an emergency in the future, prepared to meet war conditions if they arise, and I am willing to vote for a reasonable law to accomplish that purpose and for reasonable appropriations to carry it out. But under the pressure of a public sentiment that I do not believe is entirely real, under the pressure that has been worked up within the last year growing out of the hysterical conditions that arise from a great war across the waters, it seems to me that we are going war mad to some extent. When the Congress of the United States will deliberately in time of profound peace, in a time when no great war threatens our people or our country, say that they favor legislation to invade the sanctity of the homes of this country and destroy the family unit and destroy the family life for the sake of building up a great octopus in the form of an

army that may never be used in time of peace, I for one am ready to declare that we should halt.

Military men who see nothing in the life of the Nation except the badge of the soldier, the martial air of the band as it goes down the street, the boom of the great cannon, and the glory of the future, may be able to sacrifice the youth of this country; but I know and you know that some boys of 18 are men, some boys of 18 are children. Some boys of 18 may go into the camp life of the Army and come back home with their moral character and their lives redeemed, and some boys of 18 who are led into the camp life of an army come back home with their moral character destroyed, because they have not the mental and the moral stamina to stand alone when taken away from the family circle, and that unit of the human family is destroyed.

War; yes; in war we should take chances; in war we are ready to sacrifice anything for our country; but in a time of profound peace shall we make the mother and the father of this country sacrifice the boy to make a policeman on a border or a unit in a regiment that may never be used?

I have had letters already in reference to this matter, appealing letters from good men and good women, where the recruiting sergeant met their boy in the streets of the country town and persuaded him in martial glory to go with him to the recruiting camp; and when the father and mother heard of it the shackles of the power of the United States Government were about that boy's wrists, and no power can take him away from the Government for seven long years if the Government seeks to hold him. He may have been the pride of the family, the only child. He may have had a college education and opportunity before him to build up a life that may be useful to the Nation and the country. You tear him away at school age for seven years' enlistment if you put him in the Regular Army—three years with the colors and four years in the reserve, which may be seven years' continuous service. You take him away in the very period of life when he should have the opportunity for a higher education and destroy it. There may be boys who can well go out at that time; there may be boys who can better go than stay at home; but Congress in its great power says that it will stay here and judge of the life of those boys instead of leaving it to the parent and the guardian to determine whether it is better for that boy to lead a life in the Army or whether it is better for him to go to college and pursue the course that the family thinks should be outlined for him.

Mr. JONES. Have we not also provided to pay postmasters $5 for every one of these boys whom they get to enlist in the Army?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly we have. We have put a price on the heads of the youth of this country in dollars and cents to take them away from their homes, their families, and their firesides to make soldiers of them in times of profound peace.

When a man is 21 years of age he may be, in fact, but a boy; but that is recognized by law as the time when he can make his own contracts. Then he must take the chance himself. But by law to reverse the law of this land that has been on the statute books for decades and say that you are going to let a recruiting sergeant invade that home, tear to pieces the tender heart of a mother, destroy the heart's ambition of a father, and possibly destroy the future life of the boy himself, simply because you have made up your minds at any cost to build a great Army machine in this country—if that is where the Congress of the United States is going, if that is where my party is going, then I cry, "Halt!" I am willing to stop the march here, and I will go no farther.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely wish to state one case of which I know. A bright young boy from Georgia, the son of parents in very humble circumstances, the one boy of the family who had shown especially strong mentality. He had won some prizes in the graded schools and had won some prizes in the high school. The whole family, by pinching and saving and economizing, got money enough to send that boy to one of the universities here in the city of Washington. He enlisted with some other boys who associated with him when appealed to by the recruiting officer in the District Guard, never supposing for a moment that he would be drafted into the Regular Army, as he was. When that time came, Mr. President, the pathos of the whole situation as it came to me from that humble home in Georgia was in itself enough to have moved the Senate to strike this provision from the law. There was a family that staked their all on this boy in order that he might have a college education. He was the only one out of the family who had shown a desire for student life, and yet he is drawn into this net by reason of the draft provision which we have here, and all that the family have sacrificed for him is swept aside. I did not intend to take the Senator from Alabama off the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was through.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, not a single soldier has yet been drafted into the service of the United States of whom I have heard; but there has been a call of the President on account of the national emergency, and men have been mustered into the service of the United States under that call.

It is a remarkable situation when two Senators, representing the extreme types of mentality that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] represent, both agree that they are willing to send boys into a war untrained, to kiss them good-by, and to let them go to die of disease or inefficiency from a military standpoint; but they are not willing to let these young men stay in the militia army now for a short while and be made soldiers of when nobody is shooting at them. It is remarkable, indeed, that two such brilliant mentalities should run away from what seems common-sense preparedness, to the extent of this proposition made here this afternoon.

Ruin the boy! Why, the Senator from Wisconsin almost wept here in the aisle about the effect upon that boy whom he has just described in Georgia. Probably the best thing that could ever have happened to that boy in his life would be to get the discipline which he might get in the National Guard in the next three months, and he would go home a better and a stronger boy, a boy more appreciative of his home and of his family. Hard of muscle and clear of eye they would greet in him a real soldier returning. No harm would be done him—not the slightest.

All of this is sentimental imagination, Mr. President. Every one of those young men will be the better for his experience if this wise body will only let them get the experience. The real blow, however, that is being aimed here, Mr. President, is a blow at the Organized Militia of the United States. Every time some Senator gets up here—a soldier being called to the colors—and has a spell of sentimental emotion over the family separation, inside of five days afterwards the Senator from Oregon will give out an interview in the newspapers and describe the action of the Senate as a weakness in the militia system of the United States. That is about what the meaning of this situation is, Mr. President. You have sent these 91,000 or 100,000 men to the front, and you send after them to bring back the ones who have dependents. You will not provide for the dependents, which would be the sensible thing to do and the thing which has been done by every nation of the earth; but you will disrupt these forces and get these men home.

Now comes another line of suggestion of the very same sort, of a young men with dependents—this pathetic family from Georgia, which the Senator from Wisconsin has just described. Why not provide for that family? Why not let that boy stay there and have that experience? He needs it. Why not let some of the young manhood of this country get ready to defend it with some degree of military experience and military skill?

Mr. President, it is absolutely criminal to let this condition of unpreparedness continue. The Senator from Alabama has spoken of the "war craziness" of the country. Mr. President, it is "peace wisdom" to prepare against war. We want to prepare in peace with a reasonable degree of calmness and efficiency against the horrors and possibilities of war, coming as it does these days vastly and suddenly. We do not want to see our boys marching off unprepared, undisciplined, under those banners and those drums which the Senator was just now waving and beating, in which he appeared to glory, as a part of the old-time folly of the miserable military policies that this country has heretofore followed.

No, Mr. President, we have wasted too much life and treasure upon that sort of misapplication of our power in the past. Wars in the future will be nothing like the wars of the past. They will come quickly; they will come hard; they will come fearfully when they do come. It is absolutely essential that the young manhood of this country should now be trained in a way that they will be able to meet these evils and to defend their homes.

Far from sympathizing with the picture which the Senator from Wisconsin has drawn of this home whose members have saved for the education of this boy, and this boy who is going away to a militia camp, as the Senator says, to be destroyed, I look upon it exactly the other way. That boy is going to be made a man, if the Senator will let him stay where he is.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland pardon an interruption?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. How would it do to leave it to that family to say what shall be done with the boy, instead of leaving it to the Senator or to me?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The situation speaks for itself. The boy has shown that he needs the military experience; and if he gets it for 90 days, it will not hurt him, unless he is the greatest milksop in the world.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course, it would be a relief to the family if he comes home in a wooden box, I suppose, according to the Senator's logic.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Quite the contrary. Give him a chance to keep out of that box.

Mr. CLAPP. The family does not seem to be considered here.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Wooden boxes will be filled much more by unpreparedness than by preparedness. It is from not letting boys become manly soldiers that you fill wooden boxes. The incapacity of a country to properly drill, instruct, and marshal its forces is what fills the wooden boxes with dead soldiers. At the time of the Spanish-American War this country had no trained militia to speak of. We owe a great deal to the Dick law, and the organization that took place under it; but the Spanish-American War illustrated how unpreparedness fills the wooden boxes.

Mr. President, the experience in the organization of the militia even under the imperfection of the Dick law has been a wonderful thing for this country. It was a little taste of what we ought to have a great deal more of. I deplore the position of the two distinguished Senators, who are willing to call home a boy because of sentimental emotion, rather than to let that boy be trained and make a man out of him in the service of his country, who say they are patriotically willing to march the boy out with a banner and a drum in the event of actual war and probably to die because wholly unprepared to meet an enemy, but are not willing to let him go into camp for three months and be trained with his fellows, as every able-bodied citizen of Switzerland has to do when he comes of age. Mr. President, that is soft sentimentality, and although the Senate is probably overwhelmed by it and will adopt this procedure, nevertheless it is unwise and in the ultimate analysis both dangerous to the country and hard on all the boys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask that the amendment to the amendment be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 5, in the printed amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, after the word "shall," it is proposed to insert the word "hereafter."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Is there not another amendment of the Senator from Maryland pending to the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland has been disposed of.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator called attention to several amendments, Mr. President.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I thought the vote on the first would indicate the uselessness of offering the others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understood. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, on page 42, I move to strike out, beginning with the words "*Provided further*," in line 7, and all of lines 8, 9, and 10.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 42, line 7, after the word "subsistence," it is proposed to strike out:

Provided further, That authority is hereby granted the Secretary of War to sell or otherwise dispose of, in accordance with law and regulations, the United States Army transports *Meade* and *Crook*.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I tried to find out just why the department wanted to sell these transports, but I have not been able to get very much information with reference to it except the statement from the Quartermaster General's office, that they are old and unsuitable for their purposes and ought to be disposed of, because of the fact that possibly with some expenditure they can be made suitable for commercial purposes. The *Meade* is a vessel of 5,641 gross tons, of 3,375 net tons, and was constructed in 1874. The *Crook* is a vessel of 4,126 gross tons, 2,703 net tons, and was constructed in 1882. So it appears that the vessels are quite old; and while it is generally stated that a vessel that is 20 years old is ready for the scrap heap, Admiral Benson, before the subcommittee on commerce, considering the shipping bill, my recollection now is, referred to one naval transport that was constructed in 1879, and stated that that vessel was good for 10 years' service yet.

The War Department states that the *Crook* has been laid up at San Francisco for several years. I can not understand why, with the great necessity that we have had for ships during the last two or three years, one of the Army transports should be laid up during all that time and apparently no effort made to put it into the service and get any good out of it, especially when the Senator from Florida stated the other day that the Government has spent $2,000,000 in transporting nitrate from Chile during the last two or three years.

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

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. There will have to be some legislation before the Quartermaster General's office can put the vessels into regular lines of commercial business outside of the wants of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. JONES. I would not want them to do that.

Mr. WARREN. The sale of these vessels will accomplish exactly what the Senator wants to accomplish, I take it; and that is to increase the shipping facilities of the country. It will take them from a place where they can not be used for the purpose for which he wishes them to be used, and it is hoped that they may be bought and put in order so as to be able to engage in regular commercial business.

Mr. JONES. Well, why do we not use them for transportation purposes, in view of the fact that we are paying high freight rates now to the Philippines, to Hawaii, and to various other places?

Mr. WARREN. We are doing that already with transports which the Government is using.

Mr. JONES. Oh, no; the Government is paying large sums of money all the time now, and has been, for the transportation of its freight.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that the stoppage of the sale of those vessels will simply tie them up that much longer; that is all. They will not be put into service.

Mr. JONES. Why not? Why could they not be repaired and put into service?

Mr. WARREN. Can the Senator from Washington tell me the capacity of these vessels?

Mr. JONES. I have just stated the gross-tonnage figures. The *Meade* has a gross tonnage of 5,641 and a net tonnage of 3,375, and the *Crook* has a gross tonnage of 4,126 and a net tonnage of 2,703. So they are pretty good-sized vessels.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Do I understand that those ships have not been used, but have simply been lying at the dock?

Mr. JONES. It is stated in the House hearings that—

The *Crook* has been laid up out of commission for several years at San Francisco, and the local authorities at that port have stated that it would require a very large expenditure to place this vessel in working condition, with no guaranty that service for any considerable length of time could be obtained, even after the expenditure of a large sum of money. The transport *Meade* was surveyed by a representative of the Steamboat-Inspection Service at Galveston, Tex., in the fall of 1914, the report indicating that the physical condition of the vessel was such that she was unsafe and unseaworthy. The vessel was therefore sent to Newport News, Va., and placed out of commission.

So that they have been out of commission for several years.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It is remarkable that they should have been permitted to lie there when, as the Senator has said, we have such a demand for ships for carrying the Government's freight.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Is the Senator fully satisfied of the fact that those ships under the law could be used for carrying miscellaneous freight for the Government, or does the law which authorized the purchase of ships and making them transports confine the operations of those ships to the movements of and the supplies for the troops?

Mr. JONES. I can not say about that; but if there is any lack of authority, if it had been asked for, it could have been given. I do not know whether there is a limit on the authority for that purpose, but it does seem to me that, if the Army requires nitrates for the different arsenals, for the powder factories, and so on, that we could certainly use the transports for the purpose of bringing the nitrates here, because that is purely an Army supply material. I may be mistaken in that, but I am assuming that the Senator from Florida was informed of what he was saying the other day when he stated that it had cost this Government $2,000,000 in freight charges for the transportation of nitrates for the Government.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I think the Senator has raised a very important point, Mr. President, particularly as we will be asked within a week or so to pass the ship-purchase bill. Now, we are asked to sell vessels. It would be better, it seems to me, to pass legislation transferring these vessels to that department of the Government which will have charge of the ship-purchase proposition.

Mr. JONES. I was going to refer to that, and suggest that it might be a good idea for us to hold those two transports, so that we could turn them over to the shipping board as soon as possible; and they would have something to work with, at any rate.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to ask the Senator a final question. Has the Senator been able to get any definite information from the War Department as to why these two vessels were out of commission?

Mr. JONES. Only a general statement that they are unseaworthy, unfit, and so forth. I have a letter from the department——

Mr. PENROSE. In what way unseaworthy? Could they not be repaired?

Mr. JONES. The department say that, if authority is given them, they are going to sell the vessels to some commercial interests, who will repair them and put them in commission; and I take it that if private parties could do that the Government ought to be able to do it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if there is any provision in this bill that will prevent the Government buying these ships back when we have passed the ship-purchase bill?

Mr. JONES. Not at all; not at all.

Mr. SMOOT. And pay 100 per cent more.

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

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator's motion to strike out the permission to sell those ships does not cover the question. Unless he provides that they may go into some other management or unless he changes the present law, they will not be used for the purposes the Senator mentions.

Mr. JONES. Would the Senator be willing to put a provision of that kind in the law? I am perfectly willing. I think something ought to be done so that these ships can be used. I do not see why any of these ships should be tied up at the docks during the last several years, and especially during the last two years, when we have been paying such high freight rates, when there has been such a demand.

It seems to me that the department has been a little derelict, if it has not had the authority to use these vessels for transporting nitrates, for instance, in not asking for it, if the Government has needed them; and if it was necessary to have them repaired, the department should have come to Congress and asked for such an appropriation or such authority as may have been necessary to repair them and use them in supplying the Government's needs.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the department has asked on other occasions for permission to sell these vessels. They have stated what it would cost to repair them; but they do not believe, for the purpose for which transports are maintained in the Quartermaster Department, that they can make these vessels fit and safe for transporting soldiers—human life. They do not think it is worth while, in the condition they are in, to try to repair them; but they might be repaired and used to perform some other service, and the whole purpose of this provision is to take them out of where they are, doing nothing, and put them into service.

Mr. JONES. And put them in private hands.

Mr. WARREN. Certainly. If the Government sells them, I presume the Senator does not care in what hands they are, if they are doing business.

Mr. JONES. I am inclined to think that when the Government has them it ought to use them, especially for its own transportation.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator had better prepare, then, an amendment that will cover it. What he proposes now simply leaves them tied up.

Mr. JONES. The mere fact that we are prevented from selling them is no reason at all for leaving them tied up.

Mr. OVERMAN. How much wharfage are we paying for them?

Mr. JONES. I do not know. I suppose we are paying possibly hundreds of dollars, or maybe, as a Senator suggests, thousands of dollars.

Mr. OVERMAN. Oh, more likely thousands of dollars.

Mr. JONES. Yes; probably thousands. I do not expect that these vessels would be used in transporting soldiers. Transports are not used solely for that purpose. There are other things that the Government has to have transported—hay and various products of different kinds.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I understand that the law restricts the use of these vessels absolutely to transporting troops and supplies for troops, and that they could not be used for any other purpose. Is that so?

Mr. JONES. I do not know. If it is, the law certainly ought to be changed.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; if that is the law, it ought to be changed.

Mr. JONES. I can not believe that that is the law.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Wyoming probably knows whether it is the law or not.

Mr. JONES. I can not believe that it is.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Wyoming says he understands it is the law that when these transports were authorized this limitation of use was put upon them.

Mr. JONES. That is no reason for our authorizing the sale of them here to private parties, unless we think it is better to do that than to change the law and allow them to be used by the Government.

Mr. LODGE. If we can not do that under the law, we had better sell them rather than to have them rot at the wharves.

Mr. JONES. Why, certainly; but we can make the law. We are the lawmakers. We can legislate to meet the situation, and we ought to have done it two or three years ago. If the fact was called to our attention that by reason of the law they could not use these vessels, we are derelict in our duty for not doing it and they were derelict in their duty if they have not called it to our attention.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator has evidently given a good deal of thought to this matter, and, if it does not delay the bill, I would suggest that he offer an amendment to-morrow releasing the limitations on these vessels, so that they may be used to haul nitrates, or anything else, for the Government.

Mr. LODGE. That is the simplest way.

Mr. PENROSE. That is the direct and practical way to get at it—to disagree to this amendment for the sale of these vessels and put in a provision removing the restriction. It is ridiculous for the Government to sell two vessels this week and next week to be authorized to purchase millions of dollars' worth of vessels.

Mr. JONES. I was going to call attention to that fact.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I call the Senator's attention to the hearings on this subject? This is not an amendment at all. It is a provision in the House bill.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes. I have moved to strike it out.

Mr. FLETCHER. It will have to be a motion to strike out.

Mr. JONES. That is what I have done. I have made a motion to strike it out.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will look at the hearings——

Mr. PENROSE. I refer to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to strike it out.

Mr. FLETCHER. In one of the hearings this statement was made by Col. Baker:

> The transport *Meade*, 42 years old, and the transport *Crook*, 34 years old, are in such physical condition at the present time that they can no longer be economically operated as transports, and it is felt that their continuance in service is not justified by any service they can render. The *Crook* has been laid up out of commission for several years at San Francisco, and the local authorities at that port have stated that it would require a very large expenditure to place this vessel in working condition, with no guarantee that service for any considerable length of time could be obtained, even after the expenditure of a large sum of money. The transport *Meade* was surveyed by a representative of the Steamboat Inspection Service at Galveston, Tex., in the fall of 1914, the report indicating that the physical condition of the vessel was such that she was unsafe and unseaworthy. The vessel was therefore sent to Newport News, Va., and placed out of commission.

Mr. JONES. Yes; and after that statement the department——

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington permit me to ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Has the Senator any information as to when the Government bought those ships?

Mr. FLETCHER. One of them is 43 years old.

Mr. VARDAMAN. But when did the Government become possessed of them?

Mr. FLETCHER. Oh, there is nothing here to show that.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator know what the Government paid for them or the value of the ships?

Mr. FLETCHER. The suggestion is made that it was during the Spanish-American War, in 1898.

Mr. VARDAMAN. In 1898-99.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not a list of them. I have it at some other place, but I have not it here. I am not sure but that those vessels were perhaps obtained at that time.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Did the board of survey make any estimate as to the value of the vessels?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I think not. I have no figures of that kind. They give the age of the vessel. They say the transport *Meade* is 42 years old and the *Crook* is 34 years old, and both are out of condition, and both are unseaworthy.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The transaction is in keeping with many that occurred at the time of the Spanish-American War.

Mr. FLETCHER. They were never cargo carriers or anything of that sort. They were used to transport troops and to carry passengers.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, my understanding is, and I get the information from pretty reliable authority, that they were originally cargo carriers, and that they can be very easily fitted up now for cargo-carrying purposes. Of course there were possibly some changes made in their original carrying capacity in order to fit them for use as transports; but, as I understand—I have not had the time to look into this as fully as I would have been glad to do, and get all the facts in regard to it—originally they were not built for transport purposes. These vessels were built in Scotland and for cargo-carrying purposes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator lives in a State that is largely interested in transportation on the water. Does the Senator really think that a vessel 42 years old is worth repairing?

Mr. JONES. The War Department thinks so.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, they think that some private party may patch it up and put it on a river, perhaps, or a pond somewhere.

Mr. JONES. No; these ships could not be put on our rivers. These are foreign-built ships. They will have to go in the foreign trade.

Mr. GALLINGER. But will they have to go in the foreign trade?

Mr. JONES. They will under the present law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Hardly so, I think. They belong to the Government.

Mr. JONES. But if they are sold to private parties they can not go into the coastwise trade or our river trade.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not quite sure, considering the amendments that have been made to our navigation laws, whether they could get American registry or not. I think they could.

Mr. JONES. There might be something to that; yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. A vessel 42 years old—I know something about that matter—is so obsolete that I wonder that anybody would try to repair it for ocean transportation. It would look to me like a fallacious scheme. Of course, if they were not so old, I would join the Senator very earnestly in preventing the Government from selling them, and make them the nucleus for the shipping board, because the shipping board will not be able to get any new vessels under two or three years, and they can not buy a vessel to-day, foreign or domestic, without paying twice what it is worth. So these vessels would be a nucleus for that grand scheme of spending $500,000,000, I think, on a matter that will never amount to anything, so far as the interests of the Government are concerned.

Mr. JONES. That is one thing I really had in mind. I am hoping to have something for this shipping board to start on and to handle. I have provided in this bill that it shall have authority to repair ships; and I thought probably, if private parties could repair these ships and make them commercially a profitable venture, the shipping board that we are going to get might get some experience by repairing these ships and putting them into commercial trade.

Mr. GALLINGER. I sympathize with the Senator in that, because I am sure that unless they are authorized to buy interned ships they will not be able to buy any ships, foreign or domestic, without paying more than twice what they are worth, and, as I suggested a moment ago, they will not be able to get any ships built in our shipyards under two years at least.

Mr. PENROSE. And then a suggestion might arise to have the shipping bill apply to the Lakes. These vessels might be useful on the shores of the Lakes.

Mr. JONES. Yes. Of course, when they are in the hands of this shipping board they can go in the coastwise trade.

Mr. PENROSE. They might afford a nucleus for ships for the interlake traffic.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in view of the solicitude of our friends on the other side that the new shipping board, if it ever comes into existence, will have nothing to start with, I am willing to leave this matter out, and let either the new shipping board or some subsequent session of Congress dispose of the matter in an appropriate way.

Mr. JONES. Very well. I just want to call attention to what is said by the department here:

> The present demand for ships for commercial service is such that if these two vessels could be sold at this time the amount which could be obtained by the Government by such sale would be greatly in excess of the amount that could ordinarily be obtained for these vessels, it being probable that there would be some form of commercial service for which they could be satisfactorily used, although not suitable for the use of this department.

So the department suggests that these vessels that have been so strongly condemned in the statement read by the Senator from Florida, where it is said that they are not safe for passenger traffic or anything else, can be used by private parties with safety and with profit.

They also state here that—

> The rate now being paid for the transportation of Government freight on the Pacific is high, approximately $15 per ton.

Then I want to call attention to one suggestion here with reference to conditions on the Pacific:

> To the Philippines the only steamship companies operating regular service are the Toyo Kisen Kaisha and the Java-Pacific Lines, both foreign registry, who advise that they have no published tariff in effect at the present time, but that rates are quoted as shipments are offered.

That might be a very valuable suggestion to those who are considering the shipping bill and requiring the publication of rates and all that sort of thing. These foreign companies do not publish any tariff rates at all. They simply make quotations when shipments are offered, and that is what we will be up against in the matter of competition.

> They state that shipments of general merchandise are being accepted for July sailings at rate of $20 per ton, weight or measurement.

I will not take the time of the Senate further. I should like to put in the RECORD this letter from the department. I have, in fact, three letters here—two letters from the department and this other statement—which may be considered by the committee of conference. As I understand the chairman is willing to let this go out and consider it in conference, I will not take the further time of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the letters referred to by the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD.

The letters referred to are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL OF THE ARMY,
Washington, July 8, 1916.

Hon. W. L. JONES,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of July 6, 1916, addressed to the Secretary of War, and by him referred to this office for reply, you are informed that the reasons why the Army transports *Meade* and *Crook* should be sold by the Government are that these vessels are so old and out of repair that they are no longer suitable for satisfactory use as Army transports, and the cost of their maintenance and operation is so great that they can not be efficiently and economically operated for the transportation of the Army and its supplies.

The present demand for ships for commercial service is such that if these two vessels could be sold at this time the amount which could be obtained by the Government by such sale would be greatly in excess of the amount that could ordinarily be obtained for these vessels, it being probable that there would be some form of commercial service for which they could be satisfactorily used, although not suitable for the use of this department.

Although the rate now being paid for the transportation of Government freight on the Pacific is high (approximately $15 per ton from the west coast to the Philippines), the cost of operation of either the *Meade* or *Crook* for the quantities of Government freight being transported would be greatly in excess of the total expenditures necessary to transport same by commercial carrier, and the department would not be justified in operating either one of the vessels mentioned for such freight service as is now being accomplished commercially on the Pacific. The exact amount of freight which has been carried on the Pacific for the Army during the past six months, or the exact rates paid for the different shipments, is not as yet fully of record in this office, but telegraphic inquiry has been made of the officers in charge of such shipments on the Pacific coast, and as soon as their replies are received you will be further advised in regard to your inquiry in this respect.

Very respectfully,

HENRY G. SHARPE,
Brigadier General, Quartermaster Corps,
Acting Quartermaster General.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL OF THE ARMY,
Washington, July 15, 1916.

Hon. W. L. JONES,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SIR: Replying further to your letter of July 6, 1916, in which you requested rates now being paid by the War Department to private parties for transportation of freight on the Pacific during the last six months, and what amount of freight has been carried for the Army during that period, you are informed that the depot quartermaster, Seattle, reports the following quantities of freight have been shipped from Seattle to Honolulu and Manila at the expense indicated for each:

Kind of freight.	Destination.	Quantity.	Freight rate.	Total.
Hay	Honolulu	86,900 cubic feet	5 cents per cubic foot	$4,345.00
Bran	do	54,603 pounds	$4.50 per ton	122.86
Fish and meat	do	15,800 pounds	2 cents per pound	316.00
Wharfage	do			292.00
Oats	do	2,731,921 pounds	$3.50 per ton	4,780.86
Oats and hay	Manila	153,907 cubic feet	$15 per cubic ton	57,715.13
Total				67,571.85

The desired report has not as yet been received from the depot quartermaster, San Francisco, but you will be further advised as soon as the required information has been received.

Respectfully,

HENRY G. SHARPE,
Brigadier General, Quartermaster Corps,
Acting Quartermaster General.

QUARTERMASTER GENERAL OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1916.

REPORT OF OVER-SEA SHIPMENTS.

1. In reply to your telegram of the 8th instant the following report of over-sea shipments is submitted:

	Weight.	Measurement.	Total cost.
For fiscal year 1916:	*Pounds.*	*Cubic feet.*	
To Hawaii	15,474,678	678,489	$54,391.41
To Philippines	7,732,486	232,750	39,432.44
For period Jan. 1 to June 30, 1916:			
To Hawaii	7,304,671	299,371	27,044.41
To Philippines	None.		

2. The rates paid for the transportation of the shipments referred to are as follows:

To Hawaii up to January 12:

General merchandise, $3.50 per ton, weight or measurement; hay, 5 cents per cubic foot; refrigerator cargo, 2 cents per pound.

January 12 and subsequent:

General merchandise, $4 per ton, weight or measurement; hay, 6 cents per cubic foot; refrigerator cargo, 2 cents per pound.

To Philippines:

General merchandise, $12 per ton, weight or measurement; canned goods, $9 per ton, weight; hay, $6 per ton, measurement.

3. The present rates for shipments to Hawaii are as named above for period subsequent to January 12, 1916.

To the Philippines the only steamship companies operating regular service are the Toyo Kisen Kaisha and the Java-Pacific Lines, both foreign registry, who advise that they have no published tariff in effect at the present time, but that rates are quoted as shipments are offered. They state that shipments of general merchandise are being accepted for July sailings at rate of $20 per ton, weight or measurement.

Colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. I want to say that I understand an amendment has been adopted with reference to voting by the soldiers. I want to reserve that amendment, and reserve the right to offer an amendment to it in the Senate.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, there are two items with respect to which I should like to reserve the right to offer amendments in the Senate, namely, on page 68, on the subject of the manufacture of arms, where the committee reduced the House appropriation for rifles from $5,000,000 to $2,500,000; and on page 87, where the committee amendment cut down the amount provided for Field Artillery practice ranges and places for the instruction of troops from $300,000 to $800.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be offered, before the bill goes into the Senate, at the request of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I desire to reserve the amendment on page 18, beginning with line 11, down to and including the word "seventeen" on line 2, page 19.

Mr. LODGE entered the Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. I observe that the Senator from Massachusetts is here now. I did not know that he was coming in. I have just asked to have reserved the amendment which the Senator mentioned to me.

Mr. LODGE. I am much obliged to the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to which I ask the attention of the chairman of the committee, and I hope he will be willing to accept it and take it into conference. I do not wish to take up time in discussing it, though I think it is important. I will send it to the desk to be read. It is to go at the end of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the bill, the following words:

Section 122 of the act of Congress approved June 3, 1916, shall not apply to persons who have lawfully received their medals of honor in accordance with the terms and conditions of the law or laws relating to medals of honor then existing.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts explain the purpose of that?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the Army act approved in June there was inserted a section numbered 122, concerning investigations with regard to medals of honor. That section was entirely new matter, put in in conference. It never was before the House. It never was before the Senate. It is not connected, so far as I can make out, with anything in the bill. In providing for that investigation it is said:

This with a view to ascertain what medals of honor, if any, have been awarded or issued for any cause other than distinguished conduct by an officer or enlisted man in action involving actual conflict with an enemy by such officer or enlisted man or by troops with which he was serving at the time of such action. And in any case in which said board shall find and report that said medal was issued for any cause other than that hereinbefore specified the name of the recipient of the medal so issued shall be stricken permanently from the official medal-of-honor list.

Under the act of 1862 it is provided that medals should be given for distinguished gallantry in action or other soldierly acts. A second provision in 1863 provided simply gallantry in action. Many medals were granted for soldierly acts properly under that law and were given in accordance with the act of 1862. Now it is proposed to apply rigidly to all those medals a new definition, making it absolutely retroactive. If medals were improperly issued under the terms of the act of 1862 or 1863, it is all very well perhaps to take them away; but if they were properly issued under the acts of 1862 and 1863 they ought not to be taken away by a new definition adopted last June. It is to cure that that I offer this amendment.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I think the amendment is subject to a point of order, and I shall have to make that point.

Mr. LODGE. Undoubtedly it is subject to a point of order; I do not dispute that, but I think we are likely to have some very serious cases of injustice to men who received, and justly received, medals of honor in the Civil War and in the Spanish War in accordance with the law at that time. I do not believe myself it can be done or would be done by any board of officers, but I do think that it is a very bad precedent to have a clause that was put into a bill in conference, never before either House of Congress, under which such a wrong might be done.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have no fear whatever that wrong will be done by a board of officers composed of retired Army officers of character.

Mr. LODGE. I will say, Mr. President, this amendment is suggested by the board.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I make the point of order that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to give notice that I reserve the right to move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment I offered with reference to Fort Taylor, Key West, was defeated, or to offer that amendment again in the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to make the same reservation with reference to the proposition offered by me in regard to the appointment of inspectors of food products for the Army.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certain amendments have been reserved for a separate vote. The question will be, first, on concurring in all the amendments not reserved for a separate vote.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the reserved amendments in their order.

The SECRETARY. The first one was reserved by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], to insert, on pages 18 and 19——

Mr. LODGE. The two provisos that begin at line 11, page 18, and go down to line 2, on page 19. They provide for a change in the system of details which I believe is a step toward restoring the old abuse of permanent details to Washington.

They also apparently, on the face, permit advancement by the department from one grade to another.

I do not care to argue the amendment. It is general legislation attached to no general legislation furnished by the other House, and I make the point of order that it is general legislation out of order on an appropriation bill. There is no legislation in the bill as it came from the House with which it can be connected.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the only object the committee had in placing this provision in the bill was to put this department for one year on the same basis as the Ordnance Department has been placed, so that it might have the benefit of its experienced men in time of serious stress. The item is, of course, subject to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained. The next reserved amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. By the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], on page 68, line 12. It reads:

Manufacture of arms: For manufacturing, repairing, procuring, and issuing arms at the national armories, $2,500,000.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, struck out "$5,000,000" and inserted "$2,500,000."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the facts, as I understand them, are these: The rifles used by the men in the Army are made at only two places, both of which are Government arsenals, which have an aggregate capacity of 750 rifles a day, running eight hours. I further understand that there are on hand at the outside 750,000 rifles. Some statements have been made that there are on hand 500,000 rifles.

The committee cuts the House appropriation for rifles from $5,000,000 to $2,500,000. It seems to me that the one thing we most need are rifles to put into the hands of our volunteers if war should be suddenly thrust upon us. In view of the fact that there are only two factories capable at the present time of making these rifles and in view of the fact that a rifle once made can be put in a box and kept for 20 years, and in the view of the fact that if we should have war thrust upon us we will need possibly not 500,000 men but three or four million men, it seems to me unwise to limit the House appropriation. The cheapest and best preparedness, the most necessary preparedness, is to have in the country enough rifles so that we can arm our men.

I hope the House provision will remain. On the vote taken in the Committee of the Whole I think the Senate committee amendment was sustained by a majority of only 2.

I therefore reserved the amendment, and I ask for a further vote upon it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I assume from what the Senator says and from what other Senators have said that there is no private concern which is engaged in the manufacture of these rifles and perhaps would not be permitted to manufacture them. Is that right?

Mr. REED. I understand there are no private concerns engaged in making them, but whether they would or would not be permitted I can not answer.

Mr. GALLINGER. One other question. These two concerns manufacture a certain number of rifles daily—750, a Senator stated. Is there anything in the law that will prevent them from running two shifts?

Mr. REED. I think not. They could run two or three.

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not know how that might be.

Mr. REED. But the point is that if we have trouble we will need these rifles at once to put in the hands of our green men in order that we may as soon as possible accustom them to their use.

Mr. GALLINGER. In other words, we need a surplus stock. Is that it?

Mr. REED. I think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator is right.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I have begged pretty hard to reduce some of the appropriations in this bill, but I have not been very successful. Usually the begging is to increase appropriations rather than to diminish them.

In this particular case, Mr. President, we have, as the Senator has said, making an allowance for the differences of opinion that have been expressed here, from 500,000 to 700,000 rifles in store. These guns cost about $16 apiece, in round numbers; so with $2,500,000, taking 75 per cent of the money as money to be expended for Springfield rifles, we could manufacture 115,300 rifles. That would raise the number in store from 500,000, or at the outside 700,000, to a little over 800,000.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. According to military estimates, how large a force would that number of rifles properly equip and at the same time provide a necessary reserve of rifles? I understand it is ordinarily estimated that there should be from five to seven rifles per man of those actually engaged in the field. For instance, if we had 500,000 men under arms, we should have at least five times that many rifles.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Of course, there is a difference of opinion amongst military men in that regard.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. What is the Senator's view of it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Personally I know nothing about it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But from the Senator's investigation what does he think?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should say that there ought to be at least from two to three more than the number required for each man.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Is there any military authority that puts the limit as low as that?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think that Gen. Crozier puts it at five.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Gen. Crozier puts it at five?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Then, it would require a large number additional to be manufactured and kept in reserve if we should really need them in time of national stress?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I realize the importance of the suggestion of the Senator; but, in round numbers, speaking of the men we now have, there will be more than five rifles per man in reserve for the troops we now have, because, at the outside, we have not over from 225,000 to 250,000 men.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yes; but if we should become engaged in actual hostilities, I presume the Senator is not unconscious of the fact that we would be compelled to increase our armed forces very materially.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. We have enough rifles, I suppose, for peace times; but if we should be suddenly confronted by war and should recruit the number of men that we have provided for by the laws already passed, it seems to me that the statement of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is very moderate and not extreme; and, if that is true, this is one of the most necessary implements of the preparedness which we are seeking to bring about.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. One thing that influenced the Senate committee, I will say to the Senator, is that the Government has the absolute control of the only factories where these rifles are made, and they are working all the time turning out these arms.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Exactly; and that adds further to the necessity of making them as fast as we can. The capacity of these two factories is limited; it can not be readily increased; there are no outside factories from which the Army can secure the standard rifles——

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. None at all.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Which we now use, and therefore we should keep those factories going, it seems to me, with sufficient speed to provide the necessary number of rifles for an emergency.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They are not now working all the time. They are turning out, I think, about 750 rifles per day; but they can turn out 1,500 per day by working two shifts.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But there would have to be an additional appropriation to enable them to turn out 1,500 per day, whether it is done in one shift or two shifts.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, before the Senator sits down——

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. How many men does the law now provide for the Regular Army? How large a force?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. With the first increment 126,000; altogether.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. With the number of men the President is authorized to call out is not the Regular Army larger than that?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. With the 20,000 additional authorized some time ago?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It would be something larger than 126,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. How much larger?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have the figures here. The number to be provided for, not counting on any increase due to the

national-defense act, is 102,660, and for the first increment under the national-defense act 23,455, making a total of 126,115. If the Army is brought up to maximum strength under the joint resolution authorizing maintenance at maximum strength, there would be added over and above the strength before such organization 27,571.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That would bring it up to what?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The first increment under the national-defense act is 23,455, leaving to be absorbed by the second increment under the national-defense act 4,116. That would bring it up to 130,000 in round numbers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then, in addition to that, when the National Guard, subject to the call of the President, is added, how many additional does that make?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. About 166,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That would make, then, altogether about 290,000?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In round numbers, yes. One hundred and sixty-six thousand plus 130,000 would make 296,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In round numbers about 300,000 men?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Now, how many rifles have we?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In reserve about 700,000, and this appropriation would manufacture about 115,000 more, making 815,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And Gen. Crozier's estimate of the number which ought to be provided is from four to five more than the number of men, so that, taking the maximum number of men it would not meet the requirements?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It would hardly meet the requirements.

Mr. President, I want to say that I realize the importance of keeping enough of these arms on hand; but, as I said a while ago, the Government has control over the arsenals. Congress meets again in December, and having control of them, with their output steadily going into the reserve, we could increase the number when Congress meets, if it should be necessary. In the case of many of the other appropriations contracts have to be made in advance.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I have also reserved the item under discussion. I simply want to make the suggestion that it seems wholly inopportune to reduce by one-half the amount the House has provided for the manufacture of rifles, in the very teeth of our obvious necessities and of the national purpose to be prepared.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the committee amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I desire to reserve, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. CUMMINS], for a vote in the Senate the amendment on page 68, lines 10, 11, and 12. I inquire if the amendment can be reserved at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the amendment which has been under discussion, and on which the question now is.

Mr. KENYON. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was not concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next reserved amendment.

The SECRETARY. The next reserved amendment is that reserved by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] on pages 55 to 58, relating to certain claims for damages for loss of private property.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I move to strike out, beginning with line 23 on page 54, the balance of that page, and the first four lines on page 55.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 54, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out the item "Credit in the accounts of Maj. James Canby," beginning with line 23, on page 54, and ending on line 4 on page 55, as follows:

Credit in the accounts of Maj. James Canby, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Maj. James Canby the sum of $80, disallowed on voucher 920B of his money accounts for the month of November, 1913, and now standing against him on the books of the Treasury.

Mr. BRYAN. I will read from the House hearings in this language:

This amount was paid by Maj. Canby for hire of a seven-passenger automobile from Washington, D. C., to Gettysburg and return, * * * while escorting an official mission from Great Britain.

It was not authorized. The auditor disallowed it, saying that it was a trip taken by officers of our Army for the purpose of giving a trip to officers of a foreign country. I move to strike that out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was not concurred in.

Mr. BRYAN. Now, Mr. President, I move to strike out lines 5 to 11, inclusive, on page 55.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 55 it is proposed to strike out lines 5 to 11, both inclusive, as follows:

Credit in the accounts of Capt. David L. Stone, United States Army: The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Capt. David L. Stone the sum of $1,191, disallowed on voucher 6B of his money accounts for the month of December, 1911, and now standing against him on the books of the Treasury.

Mr. BRYAN. This officer put in some bathrooms and fixtures that he was not authorized by law to put in. There was no authority of law for the expenditure. The other day it was stated that the disbursing officers would have to bear this loss; but I have examined the House hearings, and the men who spent the money without authority of law are the men to whom the charge stands upon the books of the auditor's department.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, were they put in a Government building?

Mr. BRYAN. Why, certainly they were put in a building that this officer had erected.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator just a moment? I think a point of order would lie against all of this legislation. It has been before the Senate a number of times, and usually has gone out in conference. The committee has inserted a number of these matters at this time at the urgent request of the Secretary of War; and in order that the Senate may have the benefit of what he says, I am going to ask to have his letter to the committee, under date of June 29, 1916, printed in the RECORD. There were not only these claims, amounting to some $8,000, which we put in the bill at the request of the Secretary of War, but there were other claims, amounting to $6,480.98, which we did not put in, because they involved the payment of money.

I will say that the first lot of claims involved actual expenditures by the officers which have been disallowed to them by the auditing officers. In many cases the Government got the benefit of the money, the officer simply supposing that he had authority, but he did not have authority; and it was disallowed and charged to his account on the books of the War Department. So we have differentiated between the claims which were paid out, and the Government got the benefit of them—except in the one case to which the Senator has called attention—and those claims that involve the payment of money by the Government.

I ask to have the letter read.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, does the Senator want it read now?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not care, myself, to have it read; but one of the Senators asked to have it read.

Mr. BRYAN. The hearings state the whole case, and the official letters from the Secretary of War have been given to Congresses before this, and the House has never consented to allow these items to stay in.

I realize that the whole of these amendments are subject to a point of order, and my disposition was to make the point of order; but upon examination I find that there are two or three to which I have no objection, and it seems to me they ought to be paid. So I have adopted the policy of moving to strike out of the amendments those which it seemed to me ought not to be paid, and leaving in the others.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does not the Senator from Florida think a bathroom was a necessity in that building?

Mr. BRYAN. No, Mr. President; I do not think an officer in the Army, without any authority of Congress, has the right to be spending public money to fix up a house as he thinks it ought to be fixed up.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, I will not argue it with the Senator, but a house without a bathroom is not fit for an officer of the Army.

Mr. BRYAN. I think if they understand that Congress will not allow that sort of thing to be done, they will quit doing it. This does not prevent this officer from coming in and submitting his claim in the regular way, disassociated from an appropriation bill, to Congress. He can go before the Committee on Claims at any time and the matter can be considered on its merits.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a request for the reading of the letter?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If we are going to vote upon it, I should like to have the letter read.

Mr. NORRIS. So should I, if a vote is going to be taken.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator sees fit to make the point of order, that is a different thing.

Mr. BRYAN. No; I do not make a point of order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If we are going to pass upon it I should like to hear the testimony. I ask that the Secretary may read the letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 29, 1916.

The honorable the CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
United States Senate.

SIR: I have the honor to invite your attention to certain relief measures which were embraced in the regular annual estimates for the support of the Army for the fiscal year 1917, and which are published on pages 369–371 of the published "Estimates of Appropriations, 1917."

The measures are divided into two classes—(a) those which simply look to the relief of disbursing officers from disallowances made against their accounts by the accounting officers of the Treasury, and (b) those which contemplate reimbursement. With respect to the relief measures, no appropriation of funds is desired or required, and the reimbursement measures call for a total of but $6,480.98.

A majority of the measures have been previously submitted to Congress, but have failed of consideration. The department is very desirous of obtaining consideration of these measures, and with respect to those which pertain to the relief of disbursing officers it may be stated that in many instances the Treasury Department has held in abeyance action looking to recovery of the amounts disallowed only upon representation by this department that the cases had been submitted for the consideration of Congress.

I would thank you to give these measures your consideration in acting upon the Army appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1917, now pending, and am making herewith a tabulated statement of the measures, which shows those calling for an appropriation of public funds and those which do not:

Relief measures requiring no appropriation.

Maj. James Canby, United States Army	$80.00
Capt. David L. Stone, United States Army	1,191.00
Capt. Henry L. Kinnison, United States Army	82.50
Maj. John E. Baxter, United States Army	18.96
Capt. L. C. Brown, United States Army	124.00
Maj. H. L. Pettus, United States Army	1,545.00
Col. Frederick G. Hodgson, retired	21.00
Capt. Briant H. Wells, United States Army	171.00
Capt. Girard Sturtevant, United States Army	2.99
Maj. James E. Normoyle, United States Army	5.00
Maj. G. G. Bailey, United States Army	106.00
Lieut. Col. I. W. Littell, United States Army	98.65
Capt. O. R. Wolfe, United States Army	40.00
Maj. G. G. Bailey, United States Army	31.09
Lieut. J. H. Barnard, United States Army	4,555.00

Relief measures requiring an appropriation.

Relief of Lieut. H. E. Miner, United States Army	160.00
Relief of Maj. H. E. Ely, United States Army	200.00
Relief of Lieut. J. A. Barry, United States Army	135.00
Relief of Lieut. Waldo C. Potter, United States Army	375.00
Medical services and hospital care rendered George Vay, injured seaman	103.90
Relief of Lieut. J. F. Taulbee, United States Army	200.00
Reimbursement to Acting Dental Surgeon Frank C. Cady, United States Army	127.61
Relief of Lieut. Sloan Doak, United States Army	150.00
Relief of Pay Clerk H. G. Foster	350.48
Relief of Leland Stanford, Jr., University	450.01
Relief of Lieut. Joseph T. Clement, United States Army	50.00
Relief of Pay Clerk S. R. Beard	168.80
Reimbursement for quarters rented by officers:	
To Lieut. Col. Frederick P. Reynolds, United States Army	323.90
To Capt. Leartus J. Owen, United States Army	191.67
To Capt. Adam E. Schlanser, United States Army	278.00
To Capt. Jay D. Whitman, United States Army	86.80
To Capt. E. D. Kremers, United States Army	340.00
To Capt. L. B. McAfee, United States Army	293.00
To Lieut. G. D. Graham, United States Army	301.20
Relief of Pay Clerk Hastie A. Stuart	182.40
Payment for rent of buildings, Philippine Islands	1,722.42
Reimbursement to Acting Dental Surgeon William A. Squires	290.79
Total	6,480.98

Respectfully,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me inquire if there are any other amendments reserved?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are other amendments reserved.

Mr. BRYAN. The chairman of the committee does not think he can finish the bill to-night?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; it is nearly time to take a recess.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, to shorten the time and to help us get through this bill as much as possible, inasmuch as the Senator from Florida is going to differentiate between certain of these claims and others, I make the point of order against the entire list.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained, and all the claims go out.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I presume that in a few moments the Senator from Oregon, in charge of the bill, will move to take a recess. I do not want to interfere with his plan, but I would like to ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution. It will not take a moment. It will lie over under the rule.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 240) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 16734) to pay to certain families of the men of the drafted forces of the United States a sum of money for their maintenance during the term of service of such drafted men in the service of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over and be printed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I desire to offer and ask to have printed in the RECORD an amendment which I gave notice I would move to suspend the rules in order to offer; and I should like to have it printed in the RECORD to-night in order that Senators may be able to see it. It has not been printed as a proposed amendment, and is not on the desks of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

That the sum of $2,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for the support of, at a cost of not more than $50 per month, or so much of said amount as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, and not more than such enlisted man has been contributing monthly to the support of his family at the time of his being drafted, the family of each enlisted man of the National Guard called or drafted into the service of the United States until his discharge from such service, which family during the term of service of such enlisted man has no other income, except the pay of such enlisted man, adequate for the support of said family: *Provided*, That the action of the Secretary of War in all cases provided for in this act shall be final, and no right to prosecute a suit in the Court of Claims or in any other court of the United States against the Government of the United States shall accrue to such enlisted man, or to any member of the family of any such enlisted man, by virtue of the passage of this act: *And provided further*, That this act shall not apply to any such enlisted man called or drafted into the service of the United States who shall marry after the 1st day of July, 1916; and the word "family" shall include only wife, children, and dependent mothers.

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. 5645) for the establishment of Noyes, in the State of Minnesota, as a port of entry and delivery for immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5172) to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C., with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 16185) to give the consent of the Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La., and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate to cancel their respective signatures to the enrolled bill (H. R. 12197) authorizing Ashley County, Ark., to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew, and also directing the Clerk of the House to re-enroll the bill with certain amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of Mabel H. Paine, of Urbana, Ill.; of Nat M. Washer, of San Antonio, Tex.; of A. L. Ide & Sons, of Springfield, Ill.; and of Edith Hecht, Lena Blanding, and Ganter & Manter Co., of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Maine State Federation of Labor, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KERN presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from citizens of Rockhill, Greenville, Watkins, Union, Pelzer, Clinton, Newberry, Easley, Laurens, Honea Path, Greenwood, Lancaster, Pendleton, Ninety Six, Columbia, Anderson, and Piedmont Mills, all in the State of South Carolina, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Springfield, Bloomington, Quincy, Chicago, and Wheaton, all in the State of Illinois; of Delmonte, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, all in the State of California; of Wheeling and White Sulphur Springs, in the State of West Virginia; of Asheville and Raleigh, in the State of North Carolina; of Springfield and St. Louis, in the State of Missouri; of Atlanta, Ga.; of Lexington,

Ky.; of Ansonia, Stanford, and Winsted, in the State of Connecticut; of Ghent, New York City, Poughkeepsie, White Plains, Pawling, Tupper Lake, Rochester, and Larchmont, all in the State of New York; of Providence and Newport, in the State of Rhole Island; of Rockland, Oquossoc, and Castine, in the State of Maine; of Pittsburgh, Wilkes-Barre, and Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania; of Des Moines, Iowa; of Forest Glen, Md.; of Bridgeton, Englewood, Summit, Hoboken, and Elizabeth, all in the State of New Jersey; of New London, Sunapee Harbor, Little Boars Head, and Soo Nipi Park, all in the State of New Hampshire; of Hyannis, Gloucester, and Amherst, in the State of Massachusetts; of St. Clair, Mich.; of Portsmouth, Ohio; and of Burlington, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 6705) granting an increase of pension to Andrew G. Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART:

A bill (S. 6706) granting an increase of pension to Andrew M. Vanover;

A bill (S. 6707) granting an increase of pension to Elbridge A. Collins;

A bill (S. 6708) granting a pension to Elizabeth Shaffer (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 6709) granting a pension to Ruthie Pruett; and

A bill (S. 6710) granting a pension to Emma Graham (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 6711) granting an increase of pension to Oscar T. Barker; to the Committee on Pensions.

CHILD LABOR.

Mr. BORAH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8234) to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 16763) to increase the revenue, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—MARY WALLS.

On motion of Mr. O'GORMAN, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying the bill S. 4185, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, granting a pension to Mary Walls, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On July 21, 1916:

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept from the city of Pittsburgh certain lands in exchange for other lands of equal area.

On July 26, 1916:

S. 35. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent for certain lands to the town of Myton, Utah;

S. 36. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent for certain lands to the town of Duchesne, Utah; and

S. 2845. An act authorizing the sale of the marine-hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 16185. An act to give the consent of the Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La., and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5172) to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C., which was, on page 2, line 2, after "thereof," to insert "So, also, shall every rectory, parsonage, glebe house, and pastoral residence which is occupied as a residence by the pastor, rector, minister, or rabbi be so exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That such rectory, parsonage, glebe house, or pastoral residence be owned by the church or congregation for which the said pastor, rector, minister, or rabbi officiates: *And provided further* That not more than one such rectory, parsonage, glebe house, or pastoral residence shall be so exempt for any one congregation."

Mr. CLAPP. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS BAYOU BARTHOLOMEW.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution (No. 50) of the House of Representatives, which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, requested to cancel their respective signatures to the enrolled bill (H. R. 12197) entitled "An act authorizing Ashley County, Ark., to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew"; that upon the cancellation of said signatures the Clerk be directed to reenroll said bill with amendments, as follows: On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four"; in line 9, strike out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "five."

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution.

The resolution was concurred in.

RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m., Wednesday, July 26, 1916) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, July 27, 1916, at 10 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *July 27, 1916.*

(*Legislative day of Tuesday, July 25, 1916.*)

The Senate reassembled at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16460) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in order to facilitate business 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:

Ashurst	Fletcher	McCumber	Sherman
Beckham	Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Hollis	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Husting	O'Gorman	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Taggart
Clapp	Jones	Page	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Penrose	Vardaman
Culberson	Kern	Pomerene	Walsh
Cummins	Lane	Ransdell	Warren
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Works
Dillingham	Lodge	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-seven 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 the absent Senators.

Mr. OVERMAN. I was requested to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, and Mr. STERLING entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. KERN. I move that further proceedings under the call be vacated.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reserved will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next reserved amendment is on page 87, where the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] reserved the