Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *April 19, 1918.*

Rev. Hugh T. Stevenson, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, in whom we live and move and have our being, as individuals and as a Nation we desire to thank Thee that Thou hast given us the privilege to serve and to glorify Thee. We ask Thee to direct our labor this day that it may bring glory and honor to Thee, advance the welfare of humanity, and develop the strength of our Nation as we may continue to serve Thee in the battles for freedom. We ask Thee to be with our men on land and on sea wherever they are. As Thou hast always crowned our efforts from the day of Concord Bridge and Lexington in battles for freedom with success so continue until the end shall come, and we shall give Thee the glory and thank Thee that Thou hast enabled us to serve Thee. Watch over and direct the affairs of the Senate and the House and the Nation this day, and throughout all the coming days, that we may ever have as a people that righteousness which exalts a Nation. We ask it in the name of our Lord. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore assumed the chair.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

IMPORTATION OF PRISON-MADE GOODS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from consular officers at Chefoo, China; Odessa, Russia; Rome, Italy; Algiers, Algeria; and Kingston, Jamaica, relative to the extent to which prisoners, paupers, or detained persons are utilized in the production or manufacture of the commerce of various countries, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 217).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Acting Secretary of War submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation in the sum of $11,075 required by the War Department to pay the salaries of the Second and Third Assistant Secretaries of War authorized under the act approved April 6, 1918, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF MAIL-TUBE SYSTEM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Assembly of the State of New York, urging continuation and extension of the mail-tube system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN SENATE, STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, April 12, 1918.

(By Mr. Cromwell.)

Whereas this legislature's action more than 25 years ago made possible the underground mail and parcel transportation which the metropolis enjoys and which all other cities of the State may also possess under the franchise granted by this body; and

Whereas the sentiment of New York, like that of the other large cities of the country where this modern mail-tube system has been tested, is emphatically in favor of it, as indicated by the press and by public expression, by the great business organizations, and by the public generally: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That this legislature associates itself with the public's progressive, enlightened demand for the retention and extension of such service as a necessity of the post office and a relief to the congestion of the already overcrowded thoroughfares of our larger cities; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Vice President and Speaker of the House for presentation to Congress.

By order of the Senate.

ERNEST A. FAY, *Clerk.*

IN ASSEMBLY, *April 12, 1918.*

Concurred in without amendment by order of the assembly.

FRED W. HAMMOND, *Clerk.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NORRIS. I have here a copy of a resolution adopted unanimously at a very large meeting of citizens of Scottsbluff, Nebr. The resolution relates to the liberty loan. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Resolution.

Whereas our country is engaged in war for world liberty; and

Whereas the Food Administration has said that food will win the war; and

Whereas millions of bushels of foodstuffs are being worse than wasted in the manufacture of malt liquors: Wherefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby respectfully petition the President of the United States and Congress to give the country immediate war-time prohibition of the manufacture and sale of all forms of alcoholic liquors, including beer, for beverage purposes, in order that the resources of the country in men, money, and provisions may be conserved for the one great task of winning this war.

Respectfully submitted by a mass meeting of the citizens of Scottsbluff, Nebr., April 7, 1918.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts State Federation of Churches, favoring national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bishopville, St. Charles, and Beaufort, all in the State of South Carolina, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide punishment for persons interfering with the Government in the prosecution of the war or who are responsible for pro-German activities, which were ordered to lie on the table.

PRICE OF COTTON.

Mr. OVERMAN. I send to the desk a telegram which I have received from the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], who is attending the funeral of the late Senator BROUSSARD. I ask that the Secretary may read the telegram.

The Secretary read the telegram, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *April 18, 1918.*

Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Reported from Washington that EMERSON, of Ohio, introduced House bill to fix price of cotton 20 cents, causing demoralization in all branches in the cotton market. After conference with our cotton friends and bankers here, I urge you to make public statement immediately that no bill fixing price of cotton could pass unless it fixed prices on all articles made from cotton, including textiles, also on all products of the farm, also on manufactured articles of all kind, upon the same basis.

JOSEPH E. RANSDELL.

SPEEDING OF WAR PREPARATIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I received this morning a large number of cards, in printed form, showing that they had been sent out by some propaganda and were being circulated to be signed by individuals and sent to Members of Congress. I assume that every Member of Congress is receiving them. They demand attention, and they demand it now, because every one of them is an unjust and uncalled for assault upon Congress. They read:

"For God's sake, hurry up!"—Joseph H. Choate. This urgent appeal was the last public utterance of Joseph H. Choate, only three days before his death. The date—May 11, 1917—was almost a year ago.

Then there is the name of the address, the city and the State, and "address Hon. ———, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C." upon the back.

On the margin of this postal the sender has written these words: "Our boys are looking to you to speed up aeroplanes."

Mr. President, the man who signs this postal little understands what propaganda is responsible for sending it out. He does not understand that it comes either from some one who has no conception of what Congress has done in war appropriations and war measures and has, therefore, been misled by press headlines, or from some source which is attempting to hide the real responsibility for our failure to meet our war engagements by diverting the just censure from those who are responsible for the delay and directing it toward those who are not in the slightest degree responsible for that delay.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Believing that Mr. Chambard, who signs this card, is but one of very many honest and patriotic people who have been misled by these false charges of congressional delay, I think it time for some one to tell the truth and place the responsibility where it belongs, and therefore I propose to speak plainly to this gentleman.

Mr. Chambard, are you aware that Congress has voted with alacrity every dollar asked for by the President or the departments for war purposes?

Are you aware of the fact that unlimited power has been granted to these departments to expend this money for war purposes?

Are you aware of the fact that the delay is due to the failure, the shameful failure in many instances, of those appointed and empowered to speed up production—appointed by the administration and not by Congress, because Congress can not make the appointments—and that notwithstanding these persons have been spending this money in the wildest extravagance ever dreamed of, extravagance that would shock and horrify you were you present as we are to observe it, they still have been able to spend up to date only a small part of the enormous sums appropriated for the most pressing needs of the country, such as ships, guns, aeroplanes, and so forth?

You say, "Our boys are looking to you to speed up aeroplanes." Are you aware of the fact that in the early part of 1917 we appropriated $640,000,000 for aeroplanes alone and we have before us an estimate for $400,000,000 more, more than a billion dollars, more than one-fourth of the entire war debt of the Civil War, for just one little branch of the service?

You have seen aeros. You know their size and structure and can form some idea as to what they should cost and how rapidly they should be constructed. Our 1917 program called for 20,000 aeroplanes, 12,000 of which were to have been placed in France by this time. Now, you know that Congress can not build the aeroplanes. All Congress can do is to appropriate the money, put that money into the hands of the proper department, and instruct that department to go ahead and build them. That Congress has done, and yet up to date we have no planes in France and a mere bagatelle of the proposed number constructed.

Why is this? The answer is inefficiency in the departments, not in Congress. It is stated that no less than 1,500 changes in specifications for Liberty motors and planes have been made up to the present time and ordered to be made by the manufacturers. How on earth could you expect the manufacturers to produce these planes if every day in the year there came several new orders for variations? Had the department responsible for the production of these planes said to Mr. Ford, "We want 20,000 planes of the highest standard manufactured by either the French, the British, or the German powers; go ahead and get them out for us," we would have had them ready long ago.

Our shipping program, because of its greater importance in this war, has been more grossly neglected. We have appropriated for ships and ship construction $1,750,000,000. For the first six months of the war absolutely nothing was done while the board was quarreling over whether we should have wooden ships or steel ships. Since we have finally gotten started, we have allowed strikes and slacking to so hamper the production that we have not accomplished one-tenth of what we should have accomplished under good management had we proceeded immediately upon our entry into the war and continued efficiently thereafter.

But what more could Congress do? Congress is supposed simply to make the laws and the appropriations and leave to the executive branch of the Government the duty of making those laws effective. Congress has not only performed its duty but has performed it with alacrity, generosity, and unanimity almost unknown in legislative bodies. Then, observing that the work is not being done for which appropriations have been made, Congress has been compelled to criticize by resolution and through speeches and investigations, and individual Members have been compelled to press in every possible way the several executive departments to hurry up, speed up, to stop bickering, and to do something. So you have Congress as a whole passing every appropriation, with comparatively little debate, and then the Members doing everything in their power to get the departments charged with the duty of production to speed up the work.

And every time a criticism is made by a Member of Congress he has been subject to abuse by the press of the country because he complains that having voted the money either nothing is being accomplished or the work is not speeding as rapidly as it should be.

So your card, "For God's sake hurry up," ought to be sent not to Congress but to the department responsible for the delay.

Stop a moment and think of what Congress has done: It has raised taxes, authorized the sale of bonds, and provided for the issuance of certificates of indebtedness, so that during the first year of the war up to April 6, 1918, we received from the first sale of—

Liberty bonds	$1,986,625,405.57
From the second liberty loan	3,807,736,299.19
From certificates of indebtedness less certificates redeemed	3,266,649,500.00
From war-savings certificates and thrift stamps	146,617,316.33
From excess-profits tax	1,226,000,000.00
From corporation-income tax	535,000,000.00
From individual income tax	666,000,000.00
A total of	9,648,003,115.52

especially raised for war purposes. And this in addition to the ordinary revenues and customs receipts amounting to nearly a billion dollars to cover the ordinary expenses of the Government.

Not only have we raised that much, in actual cash, but—

We have appropriated the sum of	$18,396,361,267.59
In addition, the present session has appropriated another	3,327,727,797.35
Or a total appropriation of	21,724,089,064.94
Of this sum there has been loaned to the allies	4,748,829,750.00
Leaving a balance for our war purposes of	16,976,259,314.94

Can you realize that this nearly $22,000,000,000 is about six times as much as the entire Civil War debt when we emerged from that conflict?

And what is the result of all this vast expenditure? We have something over 200,000 fighting men in Europe to-day.

Out of this vast sum raised we have not spent up to date more than $9,000,000,000, and this, as I have stated, notwithstanding the awful extravagance that has been indulged in in our war efforts.

We should construct during 1918 not less than 15,000,000 gross tons of shipping. The most we can now possibly hope for is 2,500,000 tons, unless a radical change is made in our ship production.

Now, you must know that Congress is not responsible for this delay. We have voted money. It is ready to be used. Congress has done its work and has done it quickly. No appropriation bill has lagged in the slightest degree. No necessary power has been withheld. Of course we must take into consideration that we were wholly unprepared when we went into this war, and we will make all allowances that should be made for the lack of experience of those upon whom onerous duties were imposed. We will make all excuses that should be made for inefficiency. But when we have done this there is a vast field in which no allowance can justly be made, and a vaster field in which there is no excuse for the inefficiency manifested. If, therefore—and I speak this to the writers of these postal cards—you want to be of service to your country, do not follow the rule that has been adopted by so much of the press of the country of damning Congress when you should know, as the press must know, just where the fault lies. If you want to help your country, send your postals to the several boards upon which are imposed the duties of speeding up production. Say to the Shipping Board, "For God's sake, hurry up." Say to the men who are striking, "In the name of Heaven and patriotism, stop your strikes, stop your slacking, and produce to the full limit of your ability." Say that to these men who are threatening to go on a strike the 1st of May all over the country because the governor of California refuses to pardon a man whom the jury convicted of one of the worst crimes that has ever been committed in this country, the hurling of a bomb into a procession of men, women, and children, that killed immediately some ten or a dozen people and wounded and injured many others, a man whose reputation has been as that of a criminal for years in the State of California. Write your cards to those people and tell them for God's sake, do not go on a strike for such an ignoble cause as that. You will then be doing some good for your country.

Say to all of the department's, "For Heaven's sake, stop burning up the money raised by taxation and bonds as you have been doing during the last year." Say to them, "In Heaven's name, cease these strikes"; "Cease making thousands upon thousands of men who could be fighting for their country lieutenants and majors and colonels and paying them good salaries to do the ordinary work of a file clerk."

Say to them that there is no excuse on earth for its costing this country at least twelve times as much for each man in the field as it costs any of the other powers. Plead to them for activity and reasonable economy, and in the meantime your Congress will go right on performing its duty, appropriating every dollar that is necessary and doing everything that is neces-

sary in the quickest possible time to facilitate our war progress. If Congress at times has seemed slower than you think it should be on the little matter of granting extraordinary and unheard-of powers to individuals, just remember that it has never lost a moment of time in hurrying up and putting into law every matter that has been necessary to production of war material to speed up. So let me answer you, in God's name, bring your influence to bear upon those who are responsible for the delay and not upon those who are appropriating and raising the funds for this war far more rapidly than they can be spent or squandered.

STANDING ROCK INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. STERLING. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably with amendments the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for the payment of annual installments on the purchase price for land in the Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations and I submit a report (No. 403) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution just reported by him. Is there objection?

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

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, in line 7, after the word "approved," to strike out "May 29, 1908 (35 Stats., p. 460), entitled 'An act to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect'" and insert "February 14, 1913 (37 Stats., p. 675), entitled 'An act to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect.'" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to extend for a period of one year the time for the payment of any annual installments due, or hereafter to become due, on the purchase price for land sold under act of Congress approved February 14, 1913 (37 Stats., p. 675), entitled "An act to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 7, after the words "*Provided further*," to insert "That any entryman who has resided upon and cultivated the land embraced in his entry for the period of time required by law in order to make commutation proof, may make proof, and if the same is approved, further residence and cultivation will not be required: *Provided further*"; and in line 10, before the words "per centum," to strike out "four" and insert "five," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided further, That any entryman who has resided upon and cultivated the land embraced in his entry for the period of time required by law in order to make commutation proof, may make proof, and if the same is approved, further residence and cultivation will not be required: *Provided further*, That any and all payments must be made when due unless the entryman applies for an extension and pays interest for one year in advance at 5 per cent per annum upon the amount due as herein provided, and patent shall be withheld until full and final payment of the purchase price is made in accordance with the provisions hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Dakota if this proposed legislation is applicable only to the Standing Rock Indian Agency, or is it general?

Mr. STERLING. It is applicable only to the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, and only to that part of the reservation which was opened to settlement in 1913, and not to that opened for settlement under the act of 1908.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for the payment of annual installments on the purchase price for land in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation."

TEST OF ORDNANCE.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Naval Affairs met this morning and authorized me to report favorably and without amendment the bill (H. R. 10783) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to increase the facilities for the proof and test of ordnance material, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 402) thereon. The necessity for the passage of the bill is very urgent, and I ask for its immediate consideration. There is a letter from the Secretary of the Navy accompanying the report of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill just reported by him. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. JONES of Washington. Let the bill first be read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to expend the sum of $1,000,000, or any part thereof, in his discretion, for the purpose of increasing the facilities for the proof and test of ordnance material, including necessary buildings, construction, equipment, railroad, and water facilities, land, and damages and losses to persons, firms, and corporations resulting from the procurement of the land for this purpose, and also all necessary expenses incident to the procurement of said land: *Provided*, That if such lands and appurtenances and improvements attached thereto can not be procured by purchase within one month after the passage of this act the President is hereby authorized and empowered to take over for the United States the immediate possession and title of such lands and improvements, including all easements, rights of way, riparian, and other rights appurtenant thereto, or any land selected by him to be used for the carrying out of the purposes of this act. That if said land and appurtenances and improvements shall be taken over as aforesaid, the United States shall make just compensation therefor, to be determined by the President, and if the amount thereof so determined by the President is unsatisfactory to the person entitled to receive the same, such person shall be paid 75 per cent of the amount so determined by the President and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as, added to the said 75 per cent, will make up such amount as will be just compensation therefor, in the manner provided for by section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code. Upon the taking over of said property by the President as aforesaid, the title to all such property so taken over shall immediately vest in the United States. For the purposes of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no railroad shall be built in the District of Columbia under this act until Congress has approved the point from which such road may start and also the route to be followed in the District of Columbia.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business is closed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 4401) to require separate street car accommodations for white and negro passengers within the District of Columbia, and fixing penalties for a violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 4402) to amend the naval appropriation act of August 29, 1916, in so far as it relates to sea service in grade before promotion; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 4403) for the relief of John T. Eaton; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4404) repealing that portion of the Indian appropriation act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. L., pp. 1015, 1035), which relates to the disposal of the surplus unallotted lands within the Blackfeet Reservation, in Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 4405) for the relief of Henry Gregg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4406) granting an increase of pension to William Harris (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4407) granting a pension to Elizabeth Dalton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 4408) granting an increase of pension to Walter J. Shelley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 3980) to prevent interference with the use of homing pigeons by the United States, to provide a penalty for such interference, and for other purposes.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. SMOOT. I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3783) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill, the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3783) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Reserving the right to object, I ask that the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. This is a measure of great importance, and I think there ought to be a quorum present when it is considered. Therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Baird	Harding	New	Smoot
Beckham	Henderson	Norris	Sterling
Brandegee	Hollis	Nugent	Thomas
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Tillman
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Poindexter	Trammell
Curtis	Lenroot	Pomerene	Underwood
Dillingham	Lodge	Saulsbury	Walsh
Fall	McCumber	Sheppard	Warren
Fletcher	McKellar	Sherman	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McNary	Simmons	Weeks
Gallinger	Martin	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Hale	Nelson	Smith, Md.	

Mr. POMERENE. I wish to announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] are detained in attendance on the funeral of the late Senator BROUSSARD.

Mr. HOLLIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] are necessarily detained on official business. I desire also to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are detained in attendance on the funeral of the late Senator STONE. I also wish to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] are detained, taking part in the third liberty loan campaign.

Mr. BECKHAM. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. JAMES] is absent to-day on account of illness.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SWANSON] is absent, taking part in the campaign for the sale of liberty bonds. He will be back by Monday.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. KENDRICK] is absent from the city on public business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the general pension act of May 11, 1912, is hereby amended by adding a new section, to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That from and after the passage of this amendment the rate of pension for any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War, now on the roll or hereafter to be placed on the pension roll and entitled to receive a less rate than hereinafter provided, shall be $30 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 72 years and served six months, the rate shall be $32 per month; one year, $35 per month; one and a half years, $38 per month; two years or over, $40 per month: *Provided*, That this amendment shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the Senator from Utah what additional aggregate burden will be placed upon the Treasury in the event that this amendment to the law should pass?

Mr. SMOOT. Approximately $40,000,000 for the first year. For each succeeding year the amount will be greatly reduced, as I shall show from letters I have received from different sources, and I think that the Pension Bureau themselves have figures which will demonstrate the accuracy of the statement I shall make.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not feel that we should, except in the direst emergency, impose such an enormous additional burden upon our ordinary expenditures; and I am therefore compelled to object to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not ask for unanimous consent. I moved to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3783?

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3783) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not intend to take the time of the Senate in discussing this bill further than to give a few facts in the case to be considered as a report, as I promised to make at the time I reported the bill to the Senate.

This bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Pensions by every member present, both Democrats and Republicans. I wish to say that I have hundreds of resolutions from the different Grand Army of the Republic organizations of the United States approving this bill. It is true that many veterans think it does not go far enough, but I believe that the rates fixed in the bill will at least partly compensate the veterans for the increase in the cost of living that has taken place since the passage of the act of May 11, 1912.

When that act was passed I never expected to ask Congress again to increase the rate of pensions for the Civil War veterans, but since that act was passed the cost of living has greatly increased, much more than the increase in pensions that is asked in this bill. Again, I know that the veterans of the Civil War, when the act of May 11, 1912, was passed, stated time and time again through their organizations that the rates provided in that act would be the last request they would make for an increase in pensions. The only excuse they offer or could offer for the change is that the cost of living has mounted so high that with the condition they are in physically, and the amount of pension that they are receiving to-day, it is absolutely impossible for many of them to keep body and soul together.

When we take into consideration the legislation that Congress has passed caring for the soldiers that are fighting or will fight, perhaps, in this world war, the rates of pension provided for in this bill are a bagatelle compared to what the soldier of to-day will receive in case of injury, or his dependents in case of death.

We must also take into consideration the fact that there are nearly 150 veterans dying every day, and when 12 months shall have passed that 150 deaths per day will be increased to over 200; and when the year 1926 arrives, under the figures of all life insurance companies as to the rates of death, the mortality tables, there will be none of the veterans left.

I know that this bill carries an increase of $40,000,000 for the first year, and I know that when the act of May 11, 1912, became a law there was an increase then of about the same amount, and our pensions then amounted to nearly $190,000,000 a year. Since then so many deaths have occurred that, notwithstanding the increases that have been made by thousands of special acts, our pension appropriations have decreased from that amount to about one hundred and fifty-odd million dollars. I trust that Congress will see that the last days of our war veterans are robbed of hunger and actual want; and if this small increase of pension granted to them will bring that about, I know that the American people from one end of this country to the other will approve.

I recognize, Mr. President, that this is a time to scan appropriations most carefully; and I want to say now that we could have appropriated $40,000,000 less in many of the bills that have passed without doing an injustice to the country, and thus we could have saved that amount of money to take care of the worthy defenders of the life of our Nation.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate only, I wish to call attention to the number of veterans left in the United States, showing how rapidly they are passing away when we compare the number that are living to-day with the number that drew pensions but six years ago.

Of those who are less than 72 years of age who served 90 days and over, and those 72 years and over who served less than 6 months, there are but 2,171 alive. That, Mr. President, was on February 15 of this year. There is a smaller number than that to-day.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat those figures?

Mr. SMOOT. There are 2,171 of that class.

Mr. NORRIS. Of what age?

Mr. SMOOT. Less than 72 years of age who served 90 days and over and 72 years of age and over who served less than 6 months.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senator might add one to that number and make the list complete. I am not drawing a pension, but would be entitled to it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, Mr. President, and I think there are others in the United States in the same position as the Senator from Minnesota, but I will say that they are few in number.

The number of those 72 years and over who served six months and less than one year is 39,163.

The number 72 years and over who served one year and less than one and a half years is 42,083.

The number 72 years and over who served one and a half years and less than two years is 24,785.

The number 72 years and over who served two years and over is 111,739.

Making a total of 299,941.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is necessary to discuss this question further. I believe that Congress has but to have its attention called to the condition, and it will vote willingly to take care of the Civil War and Mexican War veterans who are still living for the few years that they have yet to live.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ascertain a few facts from him. The bill was considered by the committee before I became its chairman, and I was not in attendance at the session in which the bill was under consideration.

I want to inquire of the Senator if any report was made on the bill other than the formal favorable report?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; there was no report made on the bill, and at the time I reported the bill to the Senate by instructions of the committee I said that whenever the bill was brought up for consideration I would make a statement as to the number of pensioners affected, and as to the cost that the bill would impose upon the Government if it should become a law.

Mr. WALSH. Let me ask the Senator if the bill was referred to any department for consideration?

Mr. SMOOT. The bill was referred to the Commissioner of Pensions, and I will state that I have a copy of the letter from the Commissioner of Pensions, and if the Senator desires I will ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. I shall be glad to have that done.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I merely wish to suggest that a bill proposing to fix an annual charge of $40,000,000 on the Treasury certainly ought to be accompanied by a written report, and by the report of the proper department of the Government, so that the Senate of the United States may have some knowledge with regard to the bill. I have no knowledge whatever of the bill, and I see here hardly anybody on the Democratic side, and on the Republican side very few Members, indeed. I think this matter ought to be treated in the usual way, by having a printed report, in order that the Senate may have the benefit of its consideration before the bill is disposed of.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator, I will read the letter that I have just asked to have printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. I will read it in order that the Senator may have the information that comes from the department.

Mr. OWEN. The point to which I call attention is that the Senator, by reading that letter now and making a verbal report with regard to this bill, does not reach the Senate. There is practically nobody here.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, Mr. President, that is generally the case with all legislation. The Senator from North Carolina called for a quorum before the question of taking up the bill was even presented to the Senate, and I would have done the same thing if the Senator from North Carolina had not done it. But day after day we discuss legislation of the most important character—far, far more important than this bill—with scarcely half a dozen Senators in the Chamber; and it seems to me there is no reason why this bill should be pointed to as something unusual because of the fact that we are discussing it with only 16 Senators in the Chamber.

Now, Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield further, I should like to read this letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 15, 1918.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have the letter of the clerk of your committee to the Commissioner of Pensions, dated the 7th instant, transmitting a copy of Senate bill 3330, to amend the act of May 11, 1912, granting pensions to survivors of the Civil War and the War with Mexico, with request for a report supplemental to that of the 26th ultimo showing the number of pensioners in each class and the probable cost of the bill, if enacted into law, with the age of 72 years substituted for the age of 75 years.

The bill thus amended proposes a rate of $30 per month to persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War, and to such persons reaching the age of 72 years who served six months a rate of $32 per month; 1 year, $35 per month; 1½ years, $38 per month; 2 years or more, $40 per month.

The roll carries no class of survivors rated upon attained age of 72 years. It was ascertained by running through several thousand roll cards that about 75 per cent of the survivors pensioned upon the basis of attained age of 70 years were now between the ages of 72 and 75 years. The results of addition of this percentage of the 70-year class on the roll at the close of the last fiscal year to the 75-year class then on the roll by periods of service and computation of the difference in annual rates at that time and the rates proposed by the bill are shown in the following tabulation:

Age and length of service.	Number.	Increased cost per year.
Less than 72 years and served 90 days and over, and 72 years and over and served less than 6 months	2,171	$10,670,202
72 years and over and served 6 months and less than 1 year	39,163	5,099,178
72 years and over and served 1 year and less than 1½ years	42,083	6,209,772
72 years and over and served 1½ years and less than 2 years	24,785	4,165,542
72 years and over and served 2 years and over	111,739	15,959,268
Total	299,941	42,104,262

The average annual increase is about $140. Allowance for death losses and other changes may be accepted to reduce the above total to $40,000,000 as representing the approximate cost of the bill for the first year should it become a law.

Cordially, yours, FRANKLIN K. LANE, *Secretary.*

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the letter read apparently is a reply to an inquiry for detailed information as to the operation of such an act and the expense to the Government which it would entail. It does not appear to have been recommended by the department. Am I correct in that?

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct; and I wish to say also to the Senator that the department has never, to my knowledge, recommended the passage of any pension legislation, as other departments do in relation to legislation affecting them. In other words, the Pension Bureau has never initiated pension legislation, whereas almost all of the other departments draw the bills affecting their departments asking for the legislation, and they approve of it before the committees act upon it.

Mr. WALSH. I am simply addressing these questions to the Senator in an endeavor to gain the information which I should have endeavored to elicit had I been present at the meeting of the committee at which the bill was considered. I want to inquire now of the Senator if the measure has been asked for by any association of veterans?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not the Senator was in the Chamber at the time I made the statement, but thousands and tens of thousands of the veterans have asked, since the passage of the bill increasing the widows' pensions, that they be granted $50 per month. Mr. President, I could not see my way clear to introduce a bill of that character, and therefore I went to the officials of the Pension Department. I studied the question with them most carefully, and while they are in no position and I do not ask them to recommend pension legislation, I got the information from them which led me to believe that if the provisions of this bill became a law it ought to be all that the Grand Army of the Republic veterans should ask for under existing conditions. Since the introduction of the bill, I wish to say to the Senator that there have been hundreds of Grand Army of the Republic organizations throughout the United States that have adopted resolutions approving of this bill. Many of the resolutions in the body stated that they had hoped that $50 per month would be granted, but they recognize the situation as it exists to-day and approve of this measure, and stated that they would be satisfied with its passage.

Mr. CURTIS. May I make a suggestion here?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to state in line with what has been stated by the Senator from Utah that I have received a large number of resolutions passed by Grand Army posts in favor of an increase. Many of them have asked for a larger increase than is given in this bill. I will state also that I was on the Pension Committee for a number of years, and I never knew the Pension Office to recommend any measures. All that was asked of them was an estimate as to the amount a particular bill would carry.

I hope this measure may pass the Senate to-day.

Mr. WALSH. I gather from the answers made by both the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Kansas that some legislation of this character has been requested by a large number of Grand Army posts.

Mr. SMOOT. By nearly every post in the United States.

Mr. WALSH. That can hardly be correct; at least I have not been honored with any request from any post in my State for the legislation, and that is why I was prompted to make the inquiry.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that perhaps not having been chairman of the committee——

Mr. WALSH. It may be, however, that they directed their requests to the Senator from Utah rather than to myself.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not say whether I have received resolutions from Montana or not. I have not the copies of the resolutions before me; but I know the statement I made was virtually correct, that nearly every organization in the United States has indorsed the bill. Further, I wish to say to the Senator that the representatives of the national organizations of the veterans residing in Washington and acting as the legislative committee of those organizations have approved of this measure, and not only that but they appeared before our Pension Committee. I think the hearings were printed, although I am not quite positive of that. They spoke in behalf of this measure, and there were members of the Pension Committee of the House present at that meeting. Unfortunately the Senator from Montana was ill at that time and out of the city; but I want to assure the Senator, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] now sitting on the right of the Senator no doubt will bear me out in saying that the legislative committee as well as the national commander of the Grand Army of the Republic of the United States were present and spoke at that time in behalf of this measure. The commander stated that many of the veterans throughout the United States felt that there ought to be a flat rate of $50 per month for the surviving veterans; he himself recognized the situation and believed, and not only did he believe but he stated that he knew the passage of this bill would be satisfactory to the great body of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Mr. President, I want also to say that at the time he was speaking to the committee he said "we as a body of veterans never expected to come to Congress again and ask for an increase over the rates provided in the act of May 11, 1912; but," he said, "the cost of living had mounted so high that it is absolutely impossible for the veterans, physically unable as they are to do manual labor, to keep the wolf from the door."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, if this legislation were requested by any formal resolution of the national organization of the Grand Army of the Republic I should feel very much disposed to defer to any request they might make in the matter or any request that might be made in their behalf by any of the officers authorized to express their views in respect to the matter. I am glad to be advised by the Senator from Utah that some of the officers at least did appear before the committee and request the legislation. I was not aware of that fact and was not apprised by any of the Grand Army posts in my own State that this legislation was desired.

I content myself, Mr. President, at this time with asking that there be incorporated in the RECORD the first two paragraphs of the act of May 11, 1912, which this bill seeks to amend, in order that the public may be advised of the increases that it is proposed shall be made. I call attention to the fact that under the provisions of that law a person who has arrived at the age of 62 years and served 90 days becomes entitled to a pension of $13 per month. His pension is raised by this bill to $30. If he served 6 months he gets $13.50. It is raised to $30 by this bill. There are pensions provided dependent upon the period of service until he has served three years or over, when his pension becomes $16 per month; that is to say, the pension now provided by the bill for service in the case of those who have arrived at the age of 62 is raised from $13 to $16.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will yield I wish to say to him I do not think there is anyone to whom the age of 62 applies now left on the pension roll.

Mr. WALSH. That is quite probable.

Mr. SMOOT. There are only 2,171 under the age of 72 who are now left upon the pension roll.

Mr. WALSH. The pension provided in the existing law for one who has arrived at the age of 70 years is $18 per month, having served for 90 days; having served for 6 months it is $19 per month; having served for 1 year it is $20 per month, for 1½ years $21.50 a month, for 2 years $23 per month, for 2½ years $24 per month, and for 3 years or over $25 per month.

I ask that this be incorporated in the RECORD.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

That any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late Civil War, who has been honorably discharged therefrom, and who has reached the age of 62 years or over, shall, upon making proof of such facts, according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the pension roll and be entitled to receive a pension as follows: In case such person has reached the age of 62 years and served 90 days, $13 per month; 6 months, $13.50 per month; 1 year, $14 per month; 1½ years, $14.50 per month; 2 years, $15 per month; 2½ years, $15.50 per month; 3 years or over, $16 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 66 years and served 90 days $15 per month; 6 months $15.50 per month; 1 year, $16 per month; 1½ years, $16.50 per month; 2 years, $17 per month; 2½ years, $18 per month; 3 years or over, $19 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 70 years and served 90 days, $18 per month; 6 months, $19 per month; 1 year, $20 per month; 1½ years, $21.50 per month; 2 years, $23 per month; 2½ years, $24 per month; 3 years or over, $25 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 75 years and served 90 days, $21 per month; 6 months, $22.50 per month; 1 year, $24 per month; 1½ years, $27 per month; 2 years or over, $30 per month. That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty resulting in his disability is now unable to perform manual labor, shall be paid the maximum pension under this act, to wit, $30 per month, without regard to length of service or age.

That any person who has served 60 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States in the War with Mexico and has been honorably discharged therefrom, shall, upon making like proof of such service, be entitled to receive a pension of $30 per month.

* * * * * * *

Approved May 11, 1912.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

The message also announced that the House further insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 44 to the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LEVER, Mr. LEE of Georgia, Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi, Mr. HAUGEN, and Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. STAFFORD managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 3388) to amend the emergency shipping fund provisions of the urgent deficiency appropriation act approved June 15, 1917, so as to empower the President and his designated agents to take over certain transportation systems for the transportation of shipyard and plant employees, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the legislative, and so forth, appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MARTIN, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. SMOOT.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am just in receipt of a telegram from the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] requesting me to ask unanimous consent that further action on the conference report upon the Agricultural appropriation bill in reference to wheat be postponed until he returns to the city. He is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator from Louisiana, Mr. BROUSSARD, and I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless there is objection to the contrary, the report will lie on the table.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table until the Senator from Oklahoma returns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, it was developed on the last roll call that there were only 51 Senators present. Several Senators have told me that they have to leave. A good many are away making patriotic speeches and others are absent attending funerals or on official business. Therefore I ask, for I feel compelled to do so, that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday at 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina moves that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3783) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War or in the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have long since learned from unsuccessful experience that a Senator who opposes legislation of this sort, whatever his motive or the sincerity of his purpose may be, earns little support and less appreciation. Indeed, it is disagreeable to pose as an economist in any direction. So many demands are made upon the Public Treasury of a local and personal character that the practice of uniting these demands in what are called omnibus bills, so that the bill as a composite may represent them all and thus receive sufficient support to obtain a majority vote, only serves to increase the embarrassment of those who oppose them, particularly if the argument is to limit the expenditures of the Government. I say this, Mr. President, with no reflection upon anyone or upon either House, because I know what the influences behind these bills are, and how potent they become when directed to an objecting Senator or Member. As a consequence, it has become impossible to stem the tide of extravagance, of increased expenditure, and of consequent increased taxation.

I had hoped, however, Mr. President, that in such an emergency as now confronts us, when every dollar that can be raised by taxation or by loan is urgently needed by the Government, when our expenditures are reckoned no longer in millions but in billions of dollars, the evident necessity of economizing in every possible direction would be so potent as to compel a spirit of frugality with regard to domestic expenditures that would reduce them to the lowest possible minimum during the continuation of the war.

I had hoped, Mr. President, that consciousness of the fact that pay day must inevitably come and that our obligations are to be met through increased taxation would impel us from a sense of obligation to the producers of this country, who bear the burdens and pay the taxes, to place a limit upon our extravagance, or confine it to those emergencies so palpably evident every day and which are the outgrowth of the demands of war.

But, Mr. President, I must confess to a sense not only of disappointment but of discouragement. This is a wonderfully populous city at present. You can find everything in it except a spirit of frugality, a desire to save. Senators and Representatives are beset every day with schemes, propositions, and enterprises ostensibly necessary or desirable for the prosecution of the war, and presented from every direction having for their immediate purpose a Treasury appropriation, the larger the better, and the representatives and promoters of each scheme endowed with the notion that their particular enterprise must receive immediate financial consideration, if Germany is to be defeated. The employees of the Government in this emergency are unwilling to submit to the imposition of an eight-hour day, and Congress, in obedience to the demand that the present law remain unchanged, have finally submitted.

Demands for increased compensation come from every direction, and, so far as I am aware, in every instance they have been complied with. If there is a single instance the contrary, I trust that those having knowledge of the fact will correct me. The other day the Committee on Appropriations rejected a proposed sum in excess of $4,000,000 for the purchase of a valuable corner in this city upon which the Government is erecting a structure for public uses. Shortly afterwards by Executive allotment that sum was placed at the disposal of the Secretary of the Treasury, and I understand the purchase to have been made. I do not criticize that instance; I cite it as an illustration, and I think an apt illustration, albeit a conspicuous one, of the manner in which the public funds are being used. It was doubtless regarded as essential, yet I think the judgment of the Congress regarding it should have prevailed.

I am surprised that a bill appropriating money for public buildings in different sections of the country has not by this time materialized; that communities which have not yet been blessed with expenditures for those structures should not get into the race "while the going is good," and seize the present opportunity for accomplishing that purpose. It will not surprise me, Mr. President, if such a bill shall materialize before this Congress is over; and it certainly will not surprise me to see it enacted into law.

The rivers and harbors bill—that gray-haired old sinner, whose capacious bosom has carried in days past many and many a successful scheme to secure unneeded money from the Treasury—is as active and vigorous as though it were within the draft age. It has passed the House of Representatives, and I have no doubt will soon knock at the doors of the Senate for immediate consideration, one reason for its immediate passage then to be urged being that it is demanded for "the successful prosecution of the war."

Mr. President, I wonder if any Senator in this Chamber, except the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], has ventured to make an estimate of the amounts of money so far appropriated by this Congress, and has contrasted the total sum with the revenues upon which we must rely to meet them. Perhaps even the Senator from Utah has not ventured that experiment thus far.

Mr. SMOOT. It is too early in the session to do so.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator says it is too early in the session, and I agree with him; but I imagine, Mr. President, the aggregate of those appropriations is far beyond our conceptions, extensive as they may be. It is too early to make such an estimate; and between this 19th day of April and the 4th of next July they may be beyond our present conception. I want to know where all this money is coming from, and to ask whether any of us has seriously considered the burden we are placing upon the taxpayers of the next generation?

Mr. President, we are on the road to national bankruptcy if we do not retrace many of our steps. Let us face the fact, and act accordingly. We can not sell liberty-loan bonds forever, for the great financial and industrial reservoirs of this Republic are not exhaustless; there is a limit, and that limit we are approaching. The people of the United States will pay their taxes; they will subscribe to liberty bonds just so long as it is within their financial power to do so, provided the money which they contribute is expended for the prosecution of the war. Many of them are now inquiring whether that is true, and many of them are justified in criticizing the character of some of our expenditures. Some are now showing reluctance to make further contributions until our methods of expenditure shall be, as some of them should be, corrected.

Mr. President, the mightiest empire of modern times is Great Britain. She is the wealthiest nation of all times, in proportion to her population; she is the creditor nation of the world. Her capital has been for centuries the nucleus of every great financial enterprise; her loans have been extended to every nation on earth; her capital was seemingly exhaustless; but, Mr. President, after fighting three years of a modern war, that mighty empire has called upon the United States at this hour to aid her in meeting her Indian obligations and to tide her over a serious situation. We have responded, as we should have responded and as we shall still respond, for the common cause of liberty and of freedom; but this situation should bring home to our minds the tremendous responsibility which we as Senators of the United States must assume and discharge in the appropriations which we shall make during these parlous times, lest the

mighty structure of our credit shall also sink beneath the weight of a common burden and specie payments are suspended, as was necessary during the last years of the Civil War.

Is this a time, therefore, Mr. President, to add a fixed charge of $40,000,000 upon our annual budget unless that addition is absolutely necessary to our present objects and our present obligations? Is this a time to add a dollar to our fixed expenditures that can be properly and decently avoided?

Mr. President, that is what is proposed to be done by this bill, and I am unable to perceive any emergency whatever to justify it. I believe that away down in their hearts all Senators, whether present or not, very largely share that opinion, and I flatter myself that I am voicing their deliberate judgment regarding the expediency of this measure when I say that it ought not to be passed.

Mr. President, this country has been generous and overgenerous to the men who have fought to preserve it. The Government has extended its pension system from time to time, both by general and by special legislation, until every man, including many who have no right whatever to the largess of the Government, and the widow of every man enrolled upon the military records of the Nation during the Civil War have been made its beneficiaries. No demand which I can recall has ever been made, except in a few isolated individual instances, which has not met ultimately with a favorable response. I say "demand," Mr. President, because that is what I conceive these bills to be. They come from a great and powerful organization, which at times has not hesitated to intimate the political power which it wields, to the end that its displeasure may be averted by compliance with its requirements.

Since I have been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I have had occasion to examine many bills of an individual character whose purpose was to remove the disabilities of the individuals mentioned in them, to the end that they might go upon the pension rolls, and I am sorry to say that in a large number of instances those bills have been favorably reported and favorably acted upon, in consequence of which many men dishonorably discharged from the service have been given the same status as those who enlisted for the war and who fought to the end.

What is the proper conception of a pension system? Does every man who takes up arms for his country impose a contract obligation upon it for his support ever after? Does every man who fights for the Republic do so because of the financial reward which may come and which does come in the form of pensions? I do not want to believe it, and yet, Mr. President, the history of pensions in the United States discloses a mercenary side, which it is difficult to reconcile with the lofty spirit of patriotism. Democrats and Republicans, as they have from time to time alternated in control of this Government, have competed with each other in the alacrity with which they have met these demands, and have claimed all the political advantage that could be reaped therefrom, just as they are now competing with the organized civil service of the United States to secure their political support through the medium of similar legislation.

Mr. President, I deny the general proposition—and I think I can successfully do so—that pensions are given for the purpose of supporting families or individuals, except in rare instances where great disability resulting from wounds or from insidious disease contracted during service renders the recipient incapable of caring for himself. A pension is a badge of honor, or it was in the days gone by, and I wish it could be said that it was a badge of honor now, but when given indiscriminately to everybody whether serving 90 days or 3 years, whether on the field or in the departments, whether in the ranks or in the Quartermaster's Bureau, the contribution is robbed of its aspect of honorable distinction and sinks to the level of commercialism.

I have had occasion, Mr. President, several times, to oppose, as best I could, appropriations which seemed to me to be extravagant or unnecessary. The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has cooperated, except upon occasions when pensions were involved, and then I have noticed that the Senator's principles of economy always yield to the demands of the pensioner.

Mr. SMOOT. Civil War pensioners.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, no; I will not confine my criticism—my "comment" perhaps I should say—to Civil War veterans, for I recall that the Senator was extremely active in securing the extension of the law giving pensions to men engaged in Indian warfare, not only during the Civil War but before and after, some of the campaigns occurring before the Civil War being of questionable merit to me; but the bills have gone through. I regret, therefore, that the Senator, with his ability, his tenacity, and his unapproachable industry, not only in his attention to senatorial duties but to his private affairs, is not with me upon this occasion, because I know that if he were there could be but the one outcome to this bill.

Mr. President, if I understand the basis upon which this bill is to be supported, it is that, owing to the increased cost in living, the beneficiaries of the proposed legislation are unable, because of their age and their lack of resources, to meet present-day conditions and may, therefore, suffer greater or less hardship. To that there are two answers. The first is that the proposed increase is insufficient for such a purpose. I believe that the maximum pension to be granted is $40 a month. There are some, perhaps, who can live upon that amount of money. The man who can do it at present, however, is to my mind as distinct a patriot as the man who is carrying a musket in the French trenches. The man who upon $40 a month can support a wife, to say nothing of children, deserves a medal equivalent to the French Croix-de-Guerre. He exhibits a degree of self-denial and of heroism that should stand as a shining light in these days of crass materialism and selfishness. It is occasionally done, but not very frequently. Hence we are not pretending here to give the beneficiaries of this bill any sum of money which is equivalent to their needs, provided—and I must assume that to be the fact—that they are reliant upon the largess of the Government.

The other answer is this: At the request of the members of the Grand Army of the Republic—and that request has always met with a warm response in my bosom—the Government of the United States and the States, respectively, have built a long chain of soldiers' homes, endowed and supported at the public expense, comfortable and attractive, to which every veteran of the war, whether he fought for the North or for the South, may have access in his old age at any time he desires. I was very much surprised some time ago to receive a letter from a constituent of mine asking me to introduce a bill to double his pension, because he said if it was not doubled he would have to go to a soldiers' home, and he did not want to endure the disgrace and humiliation of entering a sanctuary built for that express purpose so long as it was possible for him to be supported by the Government outside of it. I know that to a proud man such a refuge does not appeal very strongly; but these are far different from other institutions of similar character. These have stamped upon them not only in the legislation itself and in the requests upon which they were based but in the manner of their operation, a difference which means all the distinction between the enjoyment of an honest livelihood and the acceptance of alms and pittances from the public. Consequently, I am out of sympathy—I must be out of sympathy—with that sentiment which, after these homes have been instituted, sees disgrace and humiliation in taking advantage of them.

Mr. President, in these days when we are expending money by billions of dollars, and when our daily outlay is greater than the sum necessary to pay all the annual expenses of the Government during the early years of its existence, forty millions does not seem to be very considerable. To the Treasury of the United States that is a bagatelle, but considered in the abstract the sum is prodigious; and when we consider that the annual pension charge under existing laws mounts up to something like $200,000,000, the addition of 20 per cent, or forty millions more, gives one a fair idea of what the sum stands for.

Forty million dollars, at $10,000 a mile, would build 4,000 miles of railroad, and there are very few institutions outside of the great transportation companies and the great steel and other combinations whose capital comes anywhere near the sum of $40,000,000. Some of the States have revenues very far less than that sum. Indeed, I may say with perfect truth that the majority of the States enjoy annual revenues nowhere near that amount of money.

Where is it coming from, for this is but one of many items in our list? Why should we legislate now for this increase of expenditure? I think I am correct in saying that every appropriation bill so far becoming a law and every appropriation bill pending in the committees show increases over those of the last fiscal year. Many of them contain items that are novel, in the sense that they have not appeared in previous appropriation bills. Where is the money coming from to meet these new obligations, in addition to the vast sums that we are raising for our immediate pressing necessities?

It must be raised either by way of loans, which means a deferred debt, or by way of taxation, which means immediate sacrifice. I think the total assessed valuation of the property of the United States amounts to something like two hundred thousand millions of dollars. Our expenditures up to the present time are desperately near twenty thousand million dollars, and a year from now they will be two or three times that sum of

money. We must either pay the score or we must repudiate it. Which shall we do? Which must we do when the time comes for final action?

It does not concern me, except in so far as my duties require me to speak of it, because I have nearly reached the period of threescore and ten, and there is a time when all activity ceases; but I am concerned for posterity, for nations are led into bondage more frequently by the burden of debt than through the power of the sword. Nevertheless we are going right ahead here expending money for all conceivable objects upon the theory that they are immediately necessary for the public good.

Mr. President, one afternoon during the discussion of the Agricultural appropriation bill, and immediately after an unsuccessful attempt to do away with what seemed to me to be a wholly unnecessary appropriation, I became possessed with a spirit of cynicism, so I took my pen at the desk here and sketched the outlines of a fable. I might well close this discussion by reading it:

A FABLE.

"Once upon a time, when Uncle Sam was youthful, he had to make his own way in the world. He was therefore careful to live within his income. Being thrifty, he amassed wealth sufficient for all his purposes, albeit these were many. In those days his money vaults were guarded by faithful and courageous animals called 'watchdogs of the Treasury.' Then, as now, Uncle Sam's increasing family was divided into factions bearing attractive and inspiring appellations. He committed the management of his affairs first to one and then to another of these factions as their changing preponderance in numbers required. Each of these factions championed economy with great vociferation, and each claimed a monopoly of the virtue. Both had their watchdogs, who succeeded with their masters in the guardianship of the Treasury. Hence, Uncle Samuel took no great concern as to the safety of his strong box, and especially since the watchdogs on duty were watched in turn by the dogs in temporary retirement.

"Moreover, each of Uncle Sam's factions contended that its watchdogs were the only thoroughbreds, and those of the opposition were mongrels and coyotes masquerading as dogs of pedigree. Uncle Sam was pleased with this situation, since theft or misappropriation would be detected and exposed by factional self-interest, promptly followed by an early and complete substitution of watchdogs.

"As time progressed, these great factions established the custom of holding quadrennial 'pride and alarm' meetings. They were so called because the factions at these meetings always paraded their own virtues and watchdogs with great pride and viewed the vices of the other faction and its watchdogs with great alarm. They also compared each his own economies in past administration of Uncle Sam's fiscal affairs with the reckless extravagances of the other faction. So common has this formula become that it has persisted down to this hour. No 'pride and alarm' meeting of either faction would be complete were these terms eliminated from its public announcements.

"These watchdogs guarded the Treasury and watched each other with great success for many years. Through the mutual rivalry and suspicions of their owners Uncle Sam's accumulations waxed fat and became more and more alluring. As time passed, and these accumulations multiplied, the financial virtue of the factions was gradually but surely disintegrated by the temptation to divide and enjoy them. They gazed more and more avidly at the vaults which contained them, and more and more reproachfully at their vigilant watchdogs keeping sentinel over them. The barriers of their moral resistance finally yielded to the unremitting pressure of opportunity. So the watchdogs were gradually tolled away from the Treasury portals and tied in the backyards, where they were starved and their breed finally extinguished. Canines of different quality have been substituted for them. They watch the Treasury, but only to ascertain whether anything is left in it or about to be put in it. They do not watch those who need watching, but they watch for them. Their olfactories quiver with no sense of the possible proximity of marauders, but with the joy of a prospective continuous feast, whose abundance may partially satisfy the insatiate demands of their unappeasable appetites.

"Theirs is the policy of 'the open door,' and the more doors the better, and the fecundity of the breed is beyond computation. It multiplies but does not replenish the earth. They can not be classified as a species, for their shapes are protean. They have just one line of vision, and that embraces the Federal Treasury. Their motto is 'Let no guilty dollar escape.' Their pretexts for public contributions are countless as the sands of the seashore. They are as prolific of them as Germany is of spies. In their progress toward Treasury exhaustion they have sheltered under the roof of the National Treasury all the birds of the air, the beasts of the field, the fishes of the waters under the earth, and the multitudinous swarms of insectivorous life. They inspire Federal employees and men who heard the guns of the enemy from cloistered sanctuaries during the Civil War to help themselves and welcome. They have devised revolving funds which do not revolve and can not do so. They are incapable of turning over. They are called revolving funds because they are all large, round ones. But their spheres become segments as soon as they emerge from the Treasury doors.

"The war has quadrupled the breed and multiplied their pretexts many fold. Discovering and utilizing them constitutes the principal source of competition between Uncle Samuel's factions. The things which have become and are becoming necessary, or which are said to contribute to the successful prosecution of the war, enhance within their scope the Garabed scheme to harness natural energy and purchases of imaginary homes for homeless Indians. The hungry, howling, clamoring pack has surrounded the Treasury, burrowed under it, and swarm all over the roof.

"Time is fleeting. It creates opportunities, but it bears them along its hurrying tides. This war is opportunity, and all wars must end some time. Hence, other avenues to the money vaults, all of them either necessary or contributing to the prosecution of the war, must be devised and pressed to the limit right now. The field has been pretty thoroughly gleaned, but here and there a stray peppercorn may be uncovered and developed. It may still be possible to secure appropriations to teach the taxpayer the difference between pulling his tooth and pulling his leg, and why he should howl at the one and smile at the other; to investigate the habits and hereditary tendencies of the tumblebug and the lightning bug, and ascertain why the one pushes in one direction and looks in the other, while the latter hangs his lantern upon his rear and then flies ahead; to study the vagaries of the lobster, and make him quit blushing when he is boiled; to develop eating crow from an infliction to a pleasure; to study the habitat and the anatomy of the skunk and teach him to use only blank cartridges in polite society; to devise plans for abolishing toil and making idleness productive; to study the maladies of the skin and ascertain why measles break out and shingles strike in. Other suggestions occur to the mind, but let these suffice as specimens.

"Every fable should involve a moral. This is an exception. It dimly suggests that watchdogs must watch out lest they be trampled by the multitude, and that political parties should always wink the other eye when quadrennially denouncing each other for squandering public money with reckless extravagance."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Chamberlain	Harding	Nelson	Thomas
Culberson	Henderson	New	Tillman
Cummins	Hollis	Norris	Townsend
Curtis	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Underwood
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Pomerene	Walsh
Fall	Kellogg	Saulsbury	Warren
Fletcher	Lodge	Sheppard	Watson
France	McCumber	Shields	Williams
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Smith, Md.	Wolcott
Gallinger	McNary	Smoot	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is absent in the liberty-loan campaign.

Mr. POMERENE. I wish to announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] are detained in attendance on the funeral of the late Senator BROUSSARD. I wish also to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is necessarily absent, owing to illness.

Mr. HOLLIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are detained in attendance on the funeral of the late Senator STONE. I also wish to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] are detained, taking part in the third liberty loan campaign.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-nine Senators have answered to their names, not a quorum. The Secretary will call the names of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BRANDEGEE, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. TRAMMELL answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-three Senators have answered to their names, not a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS. It is quite evident that we are not going to be able to maintain a quorum, and I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. SMOOT. I think we can secure a quorum if the Senator will allow a motion to be made to direct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well; I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a delay of a few minutes,

Mr. SMOOT. From information I have received since the order was issued by the Senate it will be impossible to secure a quorum. I do not want to hold Senators here longer knowing that to be a fact. Therefore I ask that the order of the Senate requesting the attendance of absent Senators be rescinded.

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

Mr. OVERMAN. There are reasons for the absence of Senators. Many Senators are absent on official business and others on patriotic business during the week end. Therefore I feel compelled to move an adjournment. I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 22, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *April 19, 1918.*

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. KITCHIN, at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We invoke Thy blessing, Almighty Father, upon this body of representative men, here for the purpose of enacting laws for the guidance of a great and growing people, now engaged in a struggle for human rights.

Grant that in all their deliberations they may be actuated only by the highest considerations of right, truth, justice, equity; in the spirit of the Master. Amen.

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

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the table the bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I observe that in making the appropriation for clerk hire for Senators the Senate has made great increases. The increase is attempted in two ways. One by paying clerks salaries from the contingent fund, thereby increasing the contingent fund of the Senate by a good many thousand dollars. Then by direct appropriation the number of their clerks is increased. Already each Senator, as I recall, has about $4,800 for clerk hire. Take the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, for example. As I recall the facts, that committee has clerk hire aggregating about $8,000, speaking only in round numbers. By this new arrangement the Finance Committee of the Senate, the similar committee in that body, has clerk hire aggregating about $14,000 or $15,000. Everyone knows that bills coming from this committee must originate in the House, and without any disparagement of the great work done by the Finance Committee of the Senate, I think it is safe to say that at least as much work is done in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House as is done by the Finance Committee of the Senate. Why then this discrepancy in clerk hire? Just at this time when every one is being called upon to give financial support to the Government, it does seem to me that the legislative branch of the Government ought to conserve where it can. I was surprised to learn what the Senate had done in this respect, and I wanted to ask the gentleman whether or not he would be willing to bring these items back to the House and give us opportunity to consider them, inasmuch as the Senate a year ago absolutely brushed aside the rule, that had hitherto obtained, by which the House would regulate its affairs so far as its expenditures were concerned, and the Senate would regulate its. The Senate violated that rule last year, and I understand that now we have a perfect right to inquire into these increased appropriations for clerk hire so far as that body is concerned.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. COX. Does that increase apply to all of their clerks over there or only to the Finance Committee?

Mr. GOOD. It applies to all of them.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in so far as the Finance Committee of the Senate is concerned, the gentleman is evidently referring to the bill that was reported from the committee. There was a considerable increase recommended by the committee, but that was stricken out on motion of the committee in the Senate. It was not agreed to. I do not find that there is any increase in the bill as it passed the Senate for the clerical force of the Finance Committee. It is true that the Senate has considerably increased the expenditures for clerical services for Senators.

Mr. GOOD. I could not get a copy of the bill as it passed when my attention was called to it by the remarks of Senator MARTIN, made on the floor of the Senate, from which it appeared that action had been taken very materially increasing the clerk hire of the Senate. I would ask the gentleman if that is not correct?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is correct. There is an increase in the bill as it passed the Senate of something over $26,000 to provide clerks for Senators who are not chairmen of committees. That is over and above the appropriation of the current year of $105,600 for a similar purpose. Then I understand the Senate has adopted a resolution providing for an extra clerk for each Senator at $1,200 per year, to be paid out of the contingent fund. That is my understanding.

Mr. GOOD. Formerly the contingent fund of the Senate was $50,000. That was increased to $140,000, of which $40,000 was to be immediately available, which was to pay for the increased clerk hire up to the 1st of July.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman assumes that, and he may be entirely correct. I do not know just why they need the $40,000 now unless it be to meet the expenditures required under that particular resolution. I may say to the gentleman that the resolution adopted by the Senate, I suppose, expires by limitation on July 1, and it would probably be necessary to adopt another resolution for next year.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a few observations?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the matter to which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has referred—that of the practice of economy by the House in the matter of clerks, whereas the Senate is quite liberal toward its own Members in that respect—it should be remembered that there are some Members here who represent an entire State, who have the same responsibilities in regard to looking after the affairs of their people that two Senators have. There are also States in which there are the same number of Members that there are Senators.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment. It has occurred to some of us that this situation should be taken into consideration—not that there should be any effort to discriminate or differentiate in favor of the Members so situated, but at least that is a matter that is entitled to consideration in connection with the question of clerks and clerk hire. I see several gentlemen before me, on the other side, who are from States having no more Members than Senators. In view of such representation, it is to be assumed they have quite as much to do as a Senator in the way of correspondence and attention to affairs in their districts. Gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol seem to think that they are entitled to clerk hire and assistance to the tune of $5,000 and upward. The notion of economy seems to be confined entirely to the House, where the maximum allowance to a Member without a committee is $2,000. I do not care to refer to my own experience in that regard, but it illustrates a

situation such as I have referred to. I have been laboring under the disadvantage of having an allowance of only $1,500 per annum for clerk hire until very recently; now it is $2,000. As the Representative of an entire State, I think I have as much work and correspondence as a Senator from any State. I do not assume the Senators have too great an allowance, but they have almost treble our allowance for clerk hire.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor. With his permission I will yield.

Mr. DOWELL. Did not the Senate merely insist upon the clerks to Members of the House being placed upon the pay roll, and is not that the question that the Senate insisted upon?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, whether or not that was the question, I should say if it was, with all due deference to the honorable body at the other end of the Capitol, the House should decide and not the Senate.

Mr. DOWELL. Is not it also true——

Mr. MONDELL. Personally, I am entirely agreeable to that arrangement, and am, in fact, in favor of it, but it is an arrangement that the House should settle for itself.

Mr. DOWELL. Is not it also true, by reason of the increase of pay that was accorded employees, that the clerks of the Senate who were on the pay roll have been increased by reason of that legislation, and the clerks of the Members of the House are not affected by it and get no increase? Is not that true?

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Wyoming has made some reference to Members on the other side of the House who represent as much territory and as many people as Senators do. Of course, I know that he is aware of this fact, but because of his modesty would not express the hope, which we all indulge in on this side of the House with mingled feelings of regret and joy, that some of those gentlemen on our side may soon have opportunity to participate in this increased allowance for clerk hire in the other branch of the Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. I am told there are gentlemen on this side and the other side who have such ambitions, and I thank the gentleman on their behalf for his kindly words and wishes.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit, I understand arrangements have been satisfactorily made to correct the situation in the next Congress in the State of Wyoming; so it does not apply to the State of Wyoming. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Tennessee will permit me further, I will say that I have been looking through the bill, and I find it is a fact that the House did not increase, as I recall it, by a single dollar the amount which we have appropriated for clerk hire, including clerks, messengers for committees of the House; but the Senate for next year has increased this allowance by $128,000 and more. Now, it seems to me that a matter of that kind ought to be brought back to the House and we ought to have some reason for that stupendous increase. Certainly there will be no greater work on the part of the Senate correspondingly than there will be on the House for the next year over the past year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman understands, of course, when questions arise as to appropriations of this character the claim is always made that each House should be permitted to settle that for itself. Now, personally, I do not entirely subscribe to that idea, because we all, of course, are responsible for these appropriations; but that has been the custom that has been adopted heretofore, and has usually prevailed. I would not like——

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield? Reserving the right to object, if the gentleman from Iowa is through——

Mr. GOOD. I am through.

Mr. COX. I want to ask the gentleman who is in charge of this bill in regard to amendment 90, stricken out by the Senate, and particularly to what is known here as the Borland amendment, which was adopted, as I recollect, by a very large majority. I do not see the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] on the floor this morning.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. For a question; yes.

Mr. KEATING. I wanted to ask the gentleman if the gentleman from Missouri had been on the floor since the Borland amendment had been adopted?

Mr. COX. Well, I do not know anything about that, but I think perhaps he may be away attending the funeral of Senator STONE. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not before the conferees between the House and the Senate agree on that Senate amendment if he will bring it back to the House and give it a chance to express its opinion upon it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Indiana, that, speaking for myself—and I believe the other conferees will agree with me as to that particular amendment—that inasmuch as it was passed on by the House and a record vote taken——

Mr. KEATING. No; the gentleman is mistaken; we have had no record vote on that proposition.

Mr. COX. We had a division vote.

Mr. KEATING. We had a division vote, but no record vote, because there was no opportunity to secure one.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My recollection was that we had a record vote, but the gentleman from Colorado corrects me——

Mr. KEATING. I mean by a record vote there was no yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. COX. Well, while there was no yea-and-nay vote, there was a division vote in the House, and I would like to ask the gentleman whether, as he is one of the members of the conference committee, he will bring that amendment back to the House and give it a chance to express its opinion upon it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, in view of the difference of opinion that exists in the House as to whether or not that amendment should be adopted, and considering the debate that occurred during the consideration of this bill and the efforts made heretofore to adopt it, personally, I say to the gentleman, that I feel as if the House ought to have an opportunity to express itself one way or the other. I speak for myself as one of the conferees, and I assume that the other conferees will feel the same way about it. But I hope the gentleman will not insist upon any rigid promise to bring any particular amendment back.

Mr. COX. I will not.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Because I think the gentleman can rely on the fact that the conferees will undertake to the best of their ability to see that the wishes of the House are carried out.

Mr. COX. I think the House should have an opportunity to frankly express its opinion on that before the House yields to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. EMERSON. How much does the appropriation this year exceed the appropriation of a year ago?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The appropriation bill of a year ago carried, in round numbers, $39,000,000. The bill for next year, as it passed the House recently, carried a total of $69,500,000, and it carries over $70,000,000 as it passed the Senate.

Mr. EMERSON. It seems to me there should be a saving at this time, if possible. I have a letter from a constituent protesting against increasing expenses during the period of the war and expressing the opinion that we should confine ourselves to necessities. My constituent says:

APRIL 15, 1918.

Hon. H. I. EMERSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will find inclosed the seeds which you sent me. These are war times, and the Government needs every cent to win the war.

We will all have to pay lots of tax and buy many bonds, but I, for one, am not for asking people to buy bonds to pay for seeds for Congressmen. Cut out the extras until after the war—forever would be better.

Very truly, yours, H. S. HART.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will understand that this large increase represents the salaries necessary to be paid to the greatly increased number of clerks who have been brought here on account of the war. It is a condition that would not exist in normal or peace times.

Mr. EMERSON. In this bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; in this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SANFORD. Reserving the right to object, the Senate has included an amendment providing for 50 additional policemen, and they insert the very peculiar provision that the appointment to these positions shall be made on account of efficiency and special qualifications. I would assume that all public officers were appointed on account of efficiency or special qualifications without that amendment, but I would like to ask the chairman if he has any idea as to how that efficiency or special qualification should be determined in selecting policemen to guard the Capitol at this time, and whether he intends to give the House a chance to express itself on that subject?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that there is no question in my mind but that at this particular time there is a necessity for an increased number of police to guard the Capitol and the Office Buildings. The gentleman will recall that it was omitted from this bill as it passed the House, for the reason that it was expected to make provision in the sundry civil bill for the appointment of additional police or guards through the Superintendent of the Capitol. The Senate

seems to be of the opinion that those appointments should be made through the Sergeant at Arms of the respective Houses.

Mr. SANFORD. I will agree with the gentleman that there should be additional guards in the Capitol and should have been last year, but is there any reason why policemen should not be selected to guard the Capitol by the method which is now universally accepted as the only method of choosing policemen, namely, through the civil service? Should the Capitol of the United States be the one place in the United States where the patronage system is now used in the choosing of policemen?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is this reason, so far as this particular increase is concerned: These policemen who will be put on if the increased appropriation is made are temporary. In other words, it is not expected that they will be needed after the present condition of affairs has passed away, or after the war is over. This is simply an emergency provision.

Mr. SANFORD. Does the gentleman think that this Senate provision in regard to the selection of these particular policemen, that they should be appointed on account of efficiency and special qualifications, is a reflection on the policemen that we now have?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sure it is not a reflection. So far as I know, all our policemen are efficient.

Mr. SANFORD. Does the gentleman think it is a reflection on the House to maintain a police force at this time to guard the Capitol, a force which is appointed by the patronage system? Is there any city in the United States where policemen are now chosen in that way?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Of that I am not advised.

Mr. SANFORD. It has been discredited all over the United States except in this Capitol.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]?

There was no objection; and the Speaker pro tempore announced as the conferees on the part of the House, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. STAFFORD.

MAIL OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS ABROAD.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Before the naval bill is taken up I desire to ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the matter of soldiers' mail is receiving the attention of Congress. It is natural, of course, that a soldier should desire to communicate with his relatives and that their relatives should desire to hear from the boys at the front. In this connection I send to the Clerk's desk to have read a letter which presents a very interesting, if not a startling, phase of this question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB,
Washington, April 19, 1918.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MOORE: Here are the facts in the case we were discussing this morning.

Frank C. Dodge, 37 years old, born at Barrington, R. I., son of John W. Dodge, in the oyster business at Barrington for 45 years. Mr. Dodge's ancestry dates back to the early settlers of New England.

He was a member of the Seventh Cavalry during the Spanish War. He was 15 years captain of oyster boats and schooners in Narragansett Bay.

August 15, 1917, the United States Shipping Board established at Providence, R. I., a free Government nautical school to train seamen for officerships aboard the merchant marine. Mr. Dodge was one of the first volunteers to take this course. He graduated and was given a third mate's license.

He was assigned first to the *Minnesota* and made a trip across through the war zone.

On his second trip he was aboard the steamer *Harry L. Luckenbach*, and the *Luckenbach* was torpedoed on January 3, 1918, off the coast of France. He took to the lifeboats, and the German U-boat shelled the lifeboats. One shell hit the lifeboat in which Mr. Dodge had been taken. A piece of flying timber broke his left wrist and bruised several ribs on the left side. He was thrown into the icy water, and was in it for 3 hours and 40 minutes when picked up by a French torpedo-boat destroyer. He was taken to Nancy, France, and later transferred to a hospital in Paris for five weeks. After recovering sufficient strength, Mr. Dodge visited some of the towns and cities in France, and while in Saint-Nazaire, France, discovered, much to his delight, that many of the Rhode Island boys in the artillery regiments and motor corps were billeting in the town. Many of them requested that he bring back letters to their mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, relatives, friends, and sweethearts. He brought over about 26 such letters, and on the back of these wrote, "Kindness of Officer Frank C. Dodge, West Barrington, R. I." He was happy to bring back a personal message to the folks here. Mr. Dodge delivered these letters, paying car fare out of his pocket, and found that the mothers, fathers, etc., were wild with joy to hear directly and personally from their sons.

On April 7 Officer Dodge, having recovered strength from his injuries, was back in New York ready to be assigned to another troop ship. He was informed that the Federal authorities in Providence were going to make a case against him for violating that section of the trading-with-the-enemy act prohibiting the bringing of uncensored letters to this country. He went back to Providence of his own accord to await any action that might be taken against him. He was arrested in Providence on a warrant charging him with bringing over uncensored letters and placed under a $5,000 bail. Of his own accord he told agents of the Department of Justice in Providence just where they could locate his baggage in New York City, and told them the names of the people to whom he had brought letters over. He attempted to conceal no information from the authorities, and frankly told them he did not know any such law existed, and that he was sorry if he had technically violated any law, and that in bringing over the letters he thought he was doing a bit of human kindness for brother fighting men and lifelong friends.

Now, the status of the case is that a warrant is against this man's good name, and the United States Shipping Board's officials in New York refuse to let Mr. Dodge sail in his country's transport service until the stigma which has been unjustly placed against his good name is eliminated. He has been held for the action of the Federal grand jury in Providence, which meets May 21. At first officials in Providence refused to permit him to sail until after the grand jury had considered his case, but finally, through the interest of many friends, the district attorney consented to let him sail. But the officials of the United States Shipping Board in New York having heard of the arrest refused to give him his shipping papers.

Respectfully, your friend,

JEROME STUART PRICE.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the writer of that letter is a member of the National Press Club, now attached to the staff of the Providence (R. I.) Journal.

I would not interfere with the ordinary course of the law. Whatever is the law should be enforced. But here is a case where warning should be given to the soldiers and sailors who are facing the dangers of war of the legal pitfalls that confront them if they attempt to communicate with their relatives on this side of the water in any manner except as laid down by the regulations of the Army and Navy. Here is a man with the qualities of a hero, who has done "his bit" for his country, and who must now suffer for it because out of the kindness of his heart he endeavored to bring tidings from his chums in Europe to the friends on this side who are longing to hear from their loved ones. His arrest is a part of the secret service system with which we have to deal in the United States. On the face of it, it seems harsh that such a man should be denied the further opportunity to serve his country. I desired to have the letter read as a note of warning——

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two more minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I bring it to the House as a note of warning to all soldiers and sailors to be careful about their correspondence. They should be protected against a repetition of the Providence case.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 10854); and, pending that motion, I wish to see if we can make an arrangement with reference to general debate. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] if it would be agreeable to him, and also to the House, if he would join with me in a request to the House to dispense with all general debate and proceed with the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman make that request?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. In order that I may say a word, I will reserve the right to object. I do not propose to object, however, because I appreciate the urgency of this measure. But a number of gentlemen have asked me to secure time for them, and I promised to do it. So may I ask the gentleman to include in his request that after this bill has been passed and sent to the Senate general subjects may be discussed by this side of the House for two hours? A number of gentlemen who never consume any time in the House have something to say, and, appreciating their wishes, I made the promise that I would endeavor to obtain time for them. But within the last 24 hours we have been notified of the absolute urgency of the

passage of this measure. If the gentleman will include that in his request, that will be entirely satisfactory. I will exclude next Monday, because I understand that has been set aside for another purpose.

It is desirable that we pass the naval appropriation bill as promptly as possible, discussing it under the five-minute rule and amending it where it should be amended, but that we send it to the Senate promptly, where the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee has assured us, after conversation with some of the Senators, that the measure will be considered by the Senate in a very, very short time. Will the gentleman be willing to add that to his request?

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say to the gentleman that my desire is to get immediate consideration of the bill, and to give an illustration to the country that we can take up a war bill and deal with it in a business way, and put it through without having outside discussion intervening to prevent the early and prompt passage of war measures.

Mr. BUTLER. It was for that very purpose that I made the proposition to defer the discussion of general subjects until after the passage of the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. So far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing, if it meets the pleasure of the House, to have two hours set aside for gentlemen on that side and two hours for this side, if it is desired, for the discussion of the state of the Union after this bill has passed. That practice prevailed in the early history of this House, and I believe that once since I have been a Member here there was a day set apart for discussion of questions under the state of the Union, upon the request of Mr. Galusha A. Grow.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I have here a memorandum of the requests made of me for time. If all these requests are complied with, we will need on this side of the House fully five hours' time, and I am assuming that there will be that much time needed on the other side. Now, I believe that all the members of the Naval Affairs Committee agree that we ought to move with the greatest expedition to secure the passage of this measure, and they have foregone any requests for time in general debate.

Mr. PADGETT. Would it be agreeable to the gentleman that a night session be held for the purpose of general debate?

Mr. BUTLER. I am not much in favor of night sessions.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Or Sunday! [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Tennessee has put a hard question to me. I would have to go around to these gentlemen to find out whether they would be willing to postpone their bedtime and stay here at night. I assume that if we go into this unlimited general debate we will not be able to reach the consideration of this bill under the five-minute rule before next Tuesday, and I know the gentleman from Tennessee will agree with all of us that expedition is the one thing necessary. When we get into the Committee of the Whole, we will be able to satisfy Members that the statement I have made is not an exaggerated one. These troops must be sent abroad, and they can not be sent until you pass this bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Did the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] desire to make a request?

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Massachusetts desires to reserve the right to object. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that expedition in the passage of any measure is necessary. The request which has been proffered involves rather a revolutionary proceeding, particularly during recent days in Congress, namely, to pass a bill and then talk about it afterwards. Now, two hours for general debate after the bill is passed will take just as long, just as many minutes, as before the bill is passed, and after this bill is passed there are other measures of just as much urgency as this. I have gone over the bill fairly carefully, and I can not find very many appropriations which are to be immediately available. If this measure is passed by both branches of Congress and becomes a law by the 30th of June, that seems to be all that is necessary.

Mr. PADGETT. May I interrupt the gentleman a moment? Every appropriation in this bill is made available by a general provision at the end of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Then that is one of the few pages that I had not reached in going over the bill. Let me say to the chairman that I trust he will not plunge into the five-minute debate without himself making a short preliminary general explanation of the measure. Then after he does that, let us go ahead and read the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PADGETT. The request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] was for debate upon matters not connected with this bill, in order that gentlemen might have an opportunity to speak upon other matters.

Mr. WALSH. I do not want them to talk about anything except the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. I know; but the gentleman asked for that, and under the rules they could speak upon matters not pertaining to the bill. I wanted to expedite the passage of the bill and to help the gentleman get permission that Members who desired to speak might do so at some other time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, four of the gentlemen who made requests for time have sent word to me that they will not stand in the way of the immediate passage of this bill. Therefore I withdraw the request I made, and will ask the chairman to proceed as quickly as he knows how. [Applause.] I promise these gentlemen now that since they have been so generous in this matter I will endeavor to get them an opportunity to speak later.

Mr. WALSH. May I ask the chairman of the committee a further question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that it is the purpose, of course, to permit liberal discussion under the five-minute rule, as items of the bill are reached.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly; so that every line of the bill may be clearly understood and intelligently acted upon by the House.

Mr. WALSH. And the gentleman desires to confine the discussion under the five-minute rule to the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a letter——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, H. R. 10854, and asks unanimous consent, pending that, that there be no general debate on the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUNN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if discussion will be limited to the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. It will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will say that unanimous consent has already been given for that. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill under the five-minute rule. General debate having been dispensed with, under the rules of the House debate must be confined to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. PADGETT. If I have the floor.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not the intention of the chairman to make a brief statement to the House as to the contents of the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think it is necessary. Any matter that comes up where information is desired I will be glad to give all the information I have. The bill has been on the calendar for three or four weeks with a full report as to the items and purpose of the bill, and I do not think it necessary to make any preliminary statement now.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That hereafter the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay the amounts due on all claims for damages to and loss of private property when the amount of the claim does not exceed the sum of $1,000, and occasioned and caused by men in the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States in European waters during the period of the present war, all payments in settlement of such claims to be made out of "Pay, Miscellaneous."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. May I ask the chairman of the committee if the last proviso in the paragraph is in accordance with the bill which passed the House earlier in the session with reference to losses of goods and effects of men in the Naval Coast Guard Service?

Mr. PADGETT. No; this is for the purpose of authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to do what a similar act that passed the House this session gave the Secretary of War with reference to the Army. It allows the Secretary of the Navy to adjust small damages that may be occasioned in the Navy to the people of France and citizens of France, limiting the amount not to exceed $1,000, instead of having those people send their claims over here to be presented in a special bill to Congress or trying to get into the Court of Claims.

Mr. WALSH. I recall the bill passed with reference to the Army and there was no limit.

Mr. PADGETT. There was not; but this is limited to $1,000.

Mr. WALSH. Why was the limitation placed in this proviso?

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary thought it was well to limit the discretion and not give absolute power to adjust large claims. There might be a claim come up for many thousand dollars; for instance, the sinking of a ship, which might involve half a million or a million dollars. He did not think it was well, and did not ask for that unlimited power. This is for citizens that suffer small damages to private property.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. I think the gentleman will remember that we found that a great deal of this damage came from ships of the Navy running into docks and into rowboats and things of that kind.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did not we consider that this would very largely promote harmony among the allies?

Mr. PADGETT. Absolutely.

Mr. BUTLER. And would enable the Secretary to dispose of little claims without having to refer them to some tribunal?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. We did not want a state of feeling to grow up that the American ships and sailors had done injury and damage to private property of the allies, with no means of redress, and leave them in a dissatisfied and disturbed condition.

Mr. WALSH. Is there any special bill pending for this purpose?

Mr. PADGETT. No; there is not.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. A bill similar to this was passed the other day in reference to claims for damages arising out of the movement of troops in France.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but that had no limit.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; but there was a proviso that limited the class of claims that might receive benefit to those that would be proper under the laws of the country in which the claim arose. There is nothing of that kind here.

Mr. PADGETT. This is limited to $1,000, and it is intended to take care of these minor things.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That was what the other was intended for.

Mr. PADGETT. No; because there was no limit in that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The phraseology was without limit, but the discussion was entirely devoted to small incidental claims.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but it might take in big ones. This is limited to $1,000, and it is intended to take care of many little things that may arise where a man is injured to the extent perhaps of $15, $20, or $25, so that he would not have to come over here and refer it to our tribunals.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 10783) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to increase the facilities for the proof and test of ordnance material, and for other purposes.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Temporary government for West Indian Islands: For expenses incident to the occupation of the Virgin Islands and to the execution of the provisions of the act providing a temporary government for the West Indian Islands acquired by the United States from Denmark, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1917, to be applied under the direction of the President, $200,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] a question or two in respect to this item. When the West Indian Islands were taken over under purchase there was consideration had as to how they should be controlled, whether by the civil or the naval authorities. I listened with much interest to the gentleman's very earnest statement to the House the other day when the river and harbor bill was under consideration in reference to a possible development for naval purposes of the Virgin Islands. From some remarks the gentleman made, but more particularly from remarks made by other distinguished members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which the gentleman is so able a chairman, I gathered it is not possible for the Navy Department ever to utilize the Virgin Islands as a naval base. If that is the case, there is no sense on earth why the government in control of those islands should remain in the Navy Department. Can the gentleman enlighten the House a little upon that? We had some consideration of this before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the act of Congress taking over the Virgin Islands and providing for a temporary government placed them altogether under the President.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is the makeshift that we made.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the law now. The President placed the government under the Navy, and it appears it is being governed under the administration of the Navy Department. The island of Guam is governed in the same way.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. But there is a great difference between the island of Guam and the Virgin Islands—as much as there is between the two poles of the Arctics—unless the Virgin Islands are going to be used for military purposes. I feel it is proper and just here to state that if it is not the purpose to use them for a naval purpose, then Congress and not the President should devise a scheme of government for the people of those islands. It is contrary to our scheme and system of government that they should be controlled by an Executive order.

Mr. PADGETT. That rests with the wisdom and desire of Congress as to when it will legislate for a permanent government. Under existing law it is under the control of the President. He could have placed the government of the islands under the War Department or, as he did, under the Navy Department or under any other of the departments. He saw fit to place the matter under the administration of the Navy Department.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman is entirely correct in that statement; but the point I wish to emphasize is this: It was expected when we passed that law—at least it was the expectation of some of us who helped to write the law or who consented to it as written—that it was temporary, and it was distinctly understood that perhaps within a year there would be presented to the Congress for its consideration a scheme for a permanent government of the islands. That has not yet arrived. Perhaps the disturbed condition of the world justifies its postponement. I rather think that is correct.

Mr. PADGETT. I think the gentleman is entirely correct in that assumption, that the disturbed conditions have so engaged along other lines that it is entirely proper for the President to continue the government under the Navy administration, regardless of the future government.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If we are justified in the assumption that these islands are not to be used for naval objects, Congress should be taking up the subject of a permanent government, and its character and kind and jurisdiction over them should go to the Committee on Insular Affairs. If it is to be used for military purposes, like Guam—and everybody knows that Guam exists under the American flag wholly because of its military value—then the government should be kept under the Navy Department.

Mr. BRITTEN. Guam is not being developed in a military direction.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. But it is the earnest expectation of every one that Guam will be so developed.

Mr. BRITTEN. Not of every one. The same condition might be imposed upon the Virgin Islands. Some military activity may prevail there at some future date, just as it may occur in Guam, but the island of Guam is now administered under a governor general who is a naval officer. The same condition will prevail in the Virgin Islands, and I know that my good friend will agree that Guam is very properly administered.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Very properly, and the administration of it is exactly where it belongs, but I think the gentleman will see the difference. The island of Guam contains the only harbor in an area the radius of which is about 1,500 miles.

Mr. BRITTEN. A very poor harbor.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Or a distance of about 6,000 miles across. It is absolutely the only harbor in a quarter of the globe that commands the trade routes, and the routes that fleets would take in crossing from the Eastern to the Western Hemisphere. It is the most important strategic point under the American flag, bar none, except the Hawaiian Islands, but now I gather from the gentleman's committee that they do not expect to develop the Virgin Islands.

Mr. PADGETT. As to whether there would be any development at all has not been considered. The question that was asked me the other day and which I answered was as to the relative value or adaptability of the harbor at St. Thomas for a naval base, compared with others. I stated then that at Samana Bay there was a place many, many, many times more valuable and much better adapted than St. Thomas.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. But I am unofficially advised that the harbor at St. Thomas is incapable of a development so as to make a proper place for our present Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. In my judgment it is not a proper place to establish a naval base.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Now, may I make one further inquiry of the gentleman? The sum named here is $200,000. What on earth are we going to spend $200,000 on in the government of the island of St. Thomas?

Mr. PADGETT. The revenues of the island of St. Thomas, the Virgin Islands, especially St. Thomas, were derived from its shipping. There are no industries there to amount to anything except a little mercantile——

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. There is quite a lot of ship repairing.

Mr. PADGETT. There was, but this war has absolutely paralyzed it, and the people there are in a deplorable condition, so far as resources, revenues, and occupations are concerned, and there is a shortage of revenues as compared with absolutely essential necessary expenditures.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. They had a land tax. Is not the land producing as much now as it did then to enable it to pay this tax?

Mr. PADGETT. The land tax there is nominal. The land starts at the water's edge, is bounded by the heavens on one side and the water on the other.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. PADGETT. And goes up straight from the water. The farming interest amounts to nothing.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I assume estimates were submitted showing $200,000 was needed to administer the government of that island?

Mr. PADGETT. The estimates submitted were very much more, but the Secretary has only reported $200,000. Admiral Oliver—and when I was down there I spent several hours with him in a personal conversation, going over the whole state of the island—was very earnest in recommending even much more than this.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Did he want to build docks or build roads?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it was for health and hospitals and internal government and administration of affairs. It does not contemplate making anything of that kind whatever.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, may I say just one word here, that one of the sources of revenue of that island was a lottery, which, of course, has now ceased to exist, in addition to the returns received from shipping. Now, it happened that down there the educational system was entirely maintained by religious institutions. That has now practically ceased, and some of this money is going to go into the schools.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Just one final word, and I do not care to take up too much time, but I do consider this very important. I am sure evidence was submitted to the committee to which I belong when we purchased this island for the sum of $25,000,000, which some of us thought was extortionate, that there would be no considerable charge on the Treasury of the United States in maintaining it unless we wanted to develop a naval base. Now, here is an estimate for the first year of $200,000.

Mr. PADGETT. But last year there was an appropriation of $100,000, and this year it is $200,000, and last year it was just for a part of the year and before they had opportunity to have any investigations or estimates.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Now, the fact is that we have on our hands, which cost $25,000,000, some land which will not grow enough to justify taxation, bounded by the sea beneath and the heavens above, land where the sanitation is such that we will have to spend money to improve the health, land that is not good for a naval base, and that is going to cost $200,000 a year to administer.

Mr. PADGETT. This is not permanent, but in the disturbed conditions, as was stated a while ago, and the breaking up of the shipping and the dispensing with the lottery there from which they received revenues, there is that shortage of revenues that it is necessary for us in those disturbed conditions to supplement it. When conditions become normal, when shipping is resumed, I think that the islands will become then self-sustaining; but in the present disturbed conditions, with their principal industry gone and with the source of revenue from the lottery gone, which was about $175,000 a year, if I remember, why, they are in bad shape.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. HUSTED. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what the great value of these islands is to the United States if they are practically worthless from an agricultural standpoint and are not good for anything for a naval base? I am sure the people of the United States believed when those islands were purchased that the United States had made a splendid investment. We paid $25,000,000 for them, did we not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. And with the assurance they were going to be a great safeguard to the United States in the Caribbean Sea.

Mr. FARR. I suggest Germany at any time will take them off our hands.

Mr. BRITTEN. Not now.

Mr. FARR. At any time this Government desires to give possession to Germany she will be very happy to get possession of them, with some of the other land down there——

Mr. BUTLER. Germany will need to have 1,200 ships, then.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think any country will ever take them off our hands. The Monroe doctrine will have to be abandoned before any other country could get them of this Government. It is necessary to have those islands, and I presume they were negotiated through the State Department. The Navy Department had nothing to do with the acquisition of those islands, but they were turned over to that department for administration.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask if it is not a fact that these little islands that we were talking about cost pretty nearly as much as all the other land that the United States has purchased of any country from its organization down until now?

Mr. PADGETT. I think we paid something like seven and a half millions for Alaska, and then in the Paris treaty after the Spanish-American War I think we paid $20,000,000 for the Philippines. How much we have paid since then has been a source of unlimited disputation and debate.

Mr. SLOAN. But the Louisiana Purchase, our great purchase, was only three-fifths of what these little islands that might disappear in the night cost us.

Mr. PADGETT. That was a great acquisition.

Mr. SLOAN. Do they keep a force down there to prevent anybody from abstracting those islands in the course of the night time?

Mr. PADGETT. They are firmly rooted in the bottom of the ocean.

Mr. SLOAN. But suppose those corals that are at work under it should strike, for instance. Would not the foundations be removed from those islands?

Mr. PADGETT. The corals are so constituted that they never remove anything. They always add to the formation.

Mr. SLOAN. They do not belong to a union?

Mr. PADGETT. They are always adding to the formation.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state under what act the $100,000 appropriation was carried last year?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. It was carried in the act of March 3, 1917, Public Act No. 389.

Mr. WALSH. That was not the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. PADGETT. No. I think it was a bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations. It was after the naval appropriation bill had passed, as I remember.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order in view of the fact that the gentleman has answered the question I had in mind in replying to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The disclosures that have come to light in this colloquy here are, to say the least, wonderfully surprising to me and disappointing. Those islands we have been looking upon for more than 70 years as of great value to us strategically, and now it seems that after we have purchased them at a good price the information comes to us, probably through investigation, that the purpose for which we purchased them can not be carried out.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know whether it was the purpose for which we purchased them. I am rather inclined to think that the underlying moving spirit that prompted the purchase was to keep somebody else from getting them.

Mr. FESS. That was not the purpose originally, when Mr. Seward wanted to buy them.

Mr. PADGETT. At that time, the gentleman will bear in mind, the ships of the Navy were sail ships of a few hundred tons, and the little harbor at St. Thomas would accommodate those small sail ships, but would not now accommodate ships of 40,000 tons displacement or one of 32,000 tons, 850 feet long.

Mr. FESS. Then we are to understand that the Danish West Indies Islands are not available for a naval base?

Mr. PADGETT. I can only speak from my own personal knowledge from having been there. I do not think under any circumstances that it would be desirable to establish a base there when it is possible to get one near there that is far superior.

Mr. FESS. Will it not be construed by the American people that we purchased "a pig in a poke"; that we paid a big price for a group of islands and afterwards investigated and found that they could not be utilized? Will not that be the general opinion of the public?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know about that. The gentleman can form his own ideas about that.

Mr. FESS. That is my own conviction about the matter.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that my own idea has been, even before I went there, that the purpose in getting them was that it would be cheaper to buy them and own them ourselves than to have a controversy over somebody else's getting them.

Mr. FESS. That may have been the purpose.

Mr. PADGETT. It may have been the underlying purpose. That was not discussed in the open.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. I think it is fair to say that for a number of years before we acquired those islands Denmark had practically abandoned them; that is, she was spending almost nothing on them. As I remember, we found that the inhabitants of the island of St. John had practically gone back to the bush. Religion, education, sanitation, and practically everything had been thrown aside.

Mr. PADGETT. There are only a few hundred people on the island.

Mr. FESS. I will say to my colleague from New York that for years and years those islands had been looked upon from the standpoint of the State Department as being very valuable, and that we ought to purchase them. Big prices were offered for them, and when the matter came up last year the question arose as to why we should pay such an exorbitant price for what they had originally been offered for, and I gathered the idea that it was a very strategic advantage to us as a naval power.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman's statement just now would indicate that the object in view was a diplomatic object. The State Department has repeatedly called attention to the value of those islands, not the military authorities but the State Department. From the diplomatic standpoint the islands were considered to be valuable. Our purchase of them has prevented others from coming in there, and, to say the least, from causing us a lot of embarrassment.

Mr. FESS. If other nations believed it would be of strategic value to be there, would we not be in the same position?

Mr. BRITTEN. No. We have many harbors on this side, and other nations might not have any on this side, and a small harbor in the Virgin Islands might be valuable to another nation.

Mr. FESS. Would it be a good policy for us to go into the West Indies and buy everything we can get?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; at any time, rather than let somebody else have them for hostile use against us.

Mr. HICKS. From the agricultural standpoint the value of those islands is almost nil. There are just a few valleys where sugar can be grown.

Mr. FESS. I had thought that they were strategically valuable.

Mr. HICKS. I thought so, too, but when I was there last summer I thought we had gotten something of very little value.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, may I have a minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. I would like to ask the chairman whether the use of the phrase "West Indian Islands" is not misleading, inasmuch as there are many islands in the West Indies other than the Danish West Indies or the Virgin Islands. Why not make it read, "Temporary government for the Danish West Indies Islands" or "Temporary government for the Virgin Islands"?

Mr. PADGETT. It should be "Temporary government for the Virgin Islands." That came down from the department in that form, and we simply followed the estimates.

Mr. FESS. That is in the caption. I do not know that it is material.

Mr. PADGETT. It follows the provision that was in the other appropriation bill.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to the fact that when this purchase was up for consideration it developed that at a prior date these islands had been offered to us at $5,000,000.

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. And that we had not purchased them. At that time I submitted a rather strict inquiry to find out the reason for the addition of the $20,000,000. A few years before they had been offered for $5,000,000 and not purchased, and now they were asking $20,000,000 additional, which seemed to be quite a boom in real estate. I could not understand why at that particular time $20,000,000 were added to the price of these islands, over what had been estimated before. I am interested now to find that we are just discovering that we paid a very large price for something that can be of very little if any value to us, either during the war or at any other time.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not possible that we purchased a lemon grove.

Mr. SLOAN. Perhaps a squeezed lemon.

Mr. FESS. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs if the organization of any more permanent form of civil government for these islands is in contemplation?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that as soon as they get them in a stabilized condition under the naval administration the question of a permanent government will be taken up; but in the disturbed conditions now existing and the necessity of keeping outposts and a lookout down there, and it being the only thing we have in that group of islands, the government is to remain under the Navy Department. How long it will so remain I really can not say.

Mr. FESS. I agree that it is a matter for the Executive and not the Congress, and that whether the President wants to govern through the War Department or the Navy Department is a matter that should be left for the time being entirely to his option. I agree also that the status is not such now that we could organize a civil government there. I think that would be unwise at this stage.

Mr. PADGETT. The organization act says that the government of these islands shall be vested in a governor and in such person or persons as the President may appoint, and shall be exercised in such manner as the President shall direct, until Congress shall provide for the government of said islands.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Investigation of fuel oil: For an investigation of fuel oil and gasoline adapted to naval requirements, including the question of supply and storage and the availability, economically and otherwise, of such supply as may be afforded by the naval reserves on the public domain, and for such other expenses or transportation and hire of vehicles in connection with naval petroleum reserves as the Secretary of the Navy may deem appropriate; for the purchase of necessary instruments and appliances; for the extension of the naval fuel-oil testing plant at the navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa.; and the temporary employment of civilian experts and assistants, $60,000.

Mr. ELSTON. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question about this expenditure. Can he tell me a little about the scope of this appropriation of $60,000?

Mr. PADGETT. This appropriation has been carried for the last three or four years. It is for the purpose of experimenting both with the manufacture and the development of fuel oil, and also for the preservation of the oil that we have upon our public domain.

Mr. ELSTON. This matter has come up incidentally in the Committee on Public Lands, and the question was asked of the representative of the Navy Department as to why actual exploratory drilling was not made by the Navy Department on naval reserves where there are no private holdings, as in naval reserve No. 1, in California, and No. 3, I believe, in Wyoming. The oil content of the domes covered by these naval reserves is not definitely known.

I think it advisable, and I believe the representative of the department agreed, that the Navy should make exploratory drillings to find out the possible oil content, in order to determine the disputed necessity for holding on to naval reserve No.

2, which is covered largely by private claims, and which is involved in litigation.

Further than that, it was brought out in the committee hearings that the oil shales of Utah and Colorado had come under investigation as a possible fuel reserve. The statement was made by the representative of the Navy Department that these oil shales were not seriously considered by the department as a possible reserve, although the oil content in them was acknowledged, and experiments in other countries showed the practicability of the extraction of fuel oil from shales of this character. Is it intended under this appropriation that these shales, for instance, shall be experimented upon with the idea of determining whether there is a great reserve there of fuel oil for the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand it is the purpose of the department to develop, as far as it can, the whole product to ascertain where there is oil, and the character of it, and to experiment in the manufacture and development of it in its largest sense. But, as I stated, I think this is the third appropriation that we have had. The first one, I think, was for about $30,000, and last year $50,000; but war conditions arose and changed the situation of things, so that the Navy Department has not been able to take it up as a new enterprise and develop it as the Secretary of the Navy desires.

Mr. ELSTON. How would the gentleman regard an amendment to increase this appropriation to an amount large enough to permit exploratory drilling in these two naval reserves, which are untouched by private claims?

Mr. PADGETT. I would not want to do that now, because we have so many activities already and so many more urgent demands for money for strictly war necessities that we want to put the money where it is needed and withhold it where it can be withheld.

Mr. ELSTON. I appreciate that, but I believe if the chairman of this committee had been present at the hearings of the Public Lands Committee he would have been impressed with the importance of ascertaining what amount of oil is contained in these naval reserves which are not covered by private claims. Until that is done, we will not know how best to adjust the conflict between the Navy and the private claimants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SHALLENBERGER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. SMOOT as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Aviation: For aviation, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, producing, constructing, operating, preserving, storing, and handling aircraft, establishment and maintenance of aircraft stations, including the acquisition of land by purchase, donation, or condemnation; and for experimental work in development of aviation for naval purposes, $188,042,969: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for drafting, clerical, inspection, and messenger service for aircraft stations shall not exceed $300,000.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to reserve a point of order on this for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. Some of this seems to have escaped my attention as a member of the committee. I want to ask about the including of the acquisition of land by purchase, donation, and condemnation. Is this any specific land?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Were any limits placed on the amount of money to be expended for that purpose?

Mr. PADGETT. When Capt. Irwin was before the committee he called attention to the fact that at Miami, Fla., they have built a station on which a very large amount of money has been expended under lease. This was to authorize the acquisition of that land at Miami, on the east coast of Florida, the point that was selected by the board that went up and down the Atlantic and Gulf coasts as the most desirable and best-fitted place on the south Atlantic. He stated that this was needed, not only for war purposes but also for aviation purposes after the war, and also for the purchase of a site at Port Arthur, Tex., if I remember correctly.

The amount that was intended for the purchase of the Army was either $50,000 or $52,000. The amount at Port Arthur I do not recall at this moment, but it was stated that these places were needed on the south Atlantic and Gulf coasts, and that large expenditures were being made and would still be made on this leased land, and with the purchases by these small amounts we would own the large improvements placed upon them.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Then it is only contemplated to purchase the land at two places?

Mr. PADGETT. That is all I recall at this time.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee how much money we have appropriated for aviation in the Navy up to and including this which is recommended in the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. Last year in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1918, in the regular naval bill we appropriated $5,133,000. Under the deficiency act of June 15 we appropriated $11,000,000, and under the deficiency act of October 6, 1917, we appropriated $45,000,000. I have not a memorandum of what was carried in previous years. I may add that the larger amount here is needed because of the very rapid enlargement and development of machines, and also for the establishment and operation of bases in Ireland, Scotland, France, and England.

Mr. FOSS. How many aircraft stations have we in this country at the present time?

Mr. PADGETT. I have a memorandum of them here, but they are regarded as confidential, and also we have a number in the places I have mentioned, and their location is regarded as better not for publication.

Mr. FOSS. Do they intend to increase the number of stations?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know of any beyond what they have now. They have got a number at different places. I can give the gentleman an illustration. The largest airplanes we are constructing now cost $30,000 and the two engines cost $6,000 each, making a cost of $42,000 for a machine.

Since that machine was put into operation in the recent past we learn that they are making still larger ones abroad. So what is regarded as the best to-day next week is superseded by something still larger.

Mr. FOSS. In other words, the last word has not been spoken.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it has not.

Mr. FOSS. This subject of aviation is of immediate interest to the House and the people generally throughout the country. We have been hearing about the progress of aviation in the Army, and I think it would be interesting if the gentleman would speak in a general way of the progress made by the Navy. Has it been satisfactory?

Mr. PADGETT. Not altogether. The aviation matter has not been entirely satisfactory, but I do not think it has been the fault of the department or of the administration. For instance, at the beginning of the war private manufacturers held out promises that they could extend their business and deliver a certain number of machines at a given time. When they came right up to the proposition they were unable to do what they had promised. Their promises were too optimistic, but the situation has improved very rapidly. A few days ago I was talking with Admiral Taylor, whom the gentleman knows well, a member of the Aircraft Board representing the naval side, and he stated that the Navy was up to its promises and expectations with training machines, but that they were about 60 days behind on the combat or fighting machines, and that the 60 days was being cut down, and they were making good progress toward getting up to their expectations.

He also stated that the companies and firms that had heretofore made optimistic promises and were unable to perform them are getting better organized, better to understand the work, and that they are delivering much more satisfactorily.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reverting to the reply of the chairman of the committee to the question of my colleague about the progress of aviation in the Navy, I think this is an opportune time to say something I have in my mind. It is not my intention to criticize anybody in particular in the department of aviation or in the Navy. I think the attention of Secretary Daniels should be called specifically to aviation in the Navy at this time. There appears to be a lack of coordination there some place. Surely no one will say that the head of the Bureau of Construction and Repairs, Admiral Taylor, is not one of the

foremost naval constructors in the country. Admiral Earle, at the head of the ordnance, is equally rated among the great ordnance experts and is ably assisted by Commander Kearney. Admiral Palmer, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, is a complete success, as also is Admiral Griffin, Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering. All these various bureaus contribute something to aviation. Aviation is presided over by Capt. Noble Irwin. I am sure that when the chairman of the committee said that aviation was not entirely satisfactory he expressed it very moderately. The subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs, presided over by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], went into the conduct of the war by the Navy very thoroughly, and we were highly pleased with our findings in almost every particular, except in aviation. There is a lack of coordination there somewhere. Members of Congress can not tell them what to do, but I am sure if the Secretary will dig into it he will find that something important is lacking.

Last year some $64,000,000 was provided for aviation. When Capt. Irwin came before the committee he said that amount of money was ample. I really think that the House would be astounded if I told them how many qualified pilots we had in the Navy on January 1 of this year, the number is so ridiculously small. They say we are going to get more machines some time this year. I hope we are. Expansion of aviation in the Navy Department depends very largely on what is done in the Aircraft Board. We are going to use the Liberty motor. The Liberty motor up to the present time has not been turned out in very large numbers. It is said that they will be from now on; but it is always next month or the following month that something is to be done. It makes no difference, however, from my point of view, how successful the Army is in getting out Liberty motors, unless we have coordination of the various bureaus making up aviation in the Navy we are doomed to further disappointment.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Do I understand that the Navy is using the same motor that is being made by the Army?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. And that the Army is manufacturing for the Navy?

Mr. BRITTEN. The Aircraft Board is controlling the manufacture for the Army and the Navy. Of course, the gentleman understands that the Army itself does not do the manufacturing?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy makes its contracts and the Army makes its contracts.

Mr. BRITTEN. Not for motors.

Mr. PADGETT. They are using the same motor, the Liberty motor. A certain per cent goes to the Army and a certain per cent goes to the Navy.

Mr. DOWELL. Right here may I ask one other question? Is there other difference between the planes used by the Navy and the Army?

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, yes; a great difference.

Mr. PADGETT. The motor is the same, but the mechanical construction of the planes for landing is very different. One is to land on the water and the other on the land.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. If it is along the line of my argument, for I have not yet concluded.

Mr. HUSTED. I find that in the Army aviation they are turning students out of the ground school much faster than they are able to provide them with planes in which to learn to fly. I think that is unfortunate. I know men who have passed through the ground school who are being drilled now as private soldiers in the infantry, and they are losing the benefit of their theoretical training, which they got in the ground school. I would like to know if that same condition exists in the naval aviation.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; there is a shortage of planes.

Mr. PADGETT. Just at this point, before we get away from the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Two or three days ago I was in conversation with Col. Deeds, who is very prominent in the Army manufacture of planes, and he stated this fact, which I think is the keynote fact: He says there is not an aviator abroad who has not machines with which to fly, and that there will not be one abroad that will not have machines when he needs them.

Mr. FARR. They are foreign machines?

Mr. PADGETT. They are foreign machines; yes. They made contracts with France for the delivery of machines over there until they could organize the business here and get them abroad, but they are beginning to ship them abroad. The crucial fact that I want to bring out is that the men we have over there to fly have the machines, and that preparation is made to furnish machines to all that we send over there as they need machines, and we are shipping machines now.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We are shipping the motors there, too, are we not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And hope to increase the shipment very largely?

Mr. PADGETT. And I will say another thing: Col. Deeds said to me that England had made a request for a given number of motor engines by the 1st day of July. He stated that they not only expected to furnish England with the number that she had asked for but they had their arrangements made to furnish her more than she had asked by the 1st day of July.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me there to ask a question of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. BRITTEN. Certainly.

Mr. DOWELL. Can the chairman of the committee tell us about how long it takes to construct one of these planes when the contractor is in full operation?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know the time that it takes; but just a day or two ago several of us went across the river, near Anacostia, to see the large machine that came up from some point down in Virginia, about a hundred miles, coming in an hour and four minutes. We went over there to see it, and Admiral Taylor pointed out that machine and said that arrangements for the manufacture of those machines as soon as they got their plans developed were such that they would turn out two a day.

Mr. DOWELL. How many manufacturers are making that machine?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know, but there are several of them.

Mr. BRITTEN. That would probably go into the dozens, because of the various parts being manufactured all over the country and assembled in the larger plants.

Mr. DOWELL. What I was trying to get at is what we may expect as to the rapidity of the manufacture of these machines.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will not that depend almost entirely on the manufacture of Liberty motors, if the Army and the Navy use the same motor? It has been said publicly that it is the expectation, beginning on March 1—and by the way that program has fallen down—to turn out 5,000 motors a month. So that the aviation program in the Navy as well as the Army must depend entirely upon the output of motors.

Mr. PADGETT. And the motors have been standardized and they are proceeding with the manufacture of the motors in the standardized condition. Heretofore, as the gentleman knows, the Liberty motor was a composite manufacture of a number of different patents where the patentees agreed that the best part of their idea might be consolidated into this composite machine; and then they started out to test it, and if a weak part was discovered it was improved. Then, in making further experiments, taking advantage of every discovery, that was added in. Now, they have gotten a machine which they believe is a good workable machine and they are proceeding to manufacture those in quantities, not changing their plans by these developments and improvements made from time to time, but they are making them as they have them and if they get a further improvement they will make the improved machine subsequently, but they are making quantities of the machines as they are now developed and standardized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I had five minutes a moment ago and I have not spoken a word yet.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a short question?

Mr. BRITTEN. I will.

Mr. MAPES. I would like to know if production of the aircraft of the Navy is under the Aircraft Production Board, the same as the Army?

Mr. BRITTEN. Indirectly it is.

Mr. MAPES. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. BRITTEN. Admiral Taylor, chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repairs, is a member of the Aircraft Board, which controls aviation production to a large degree.

Mr. MAPES. Does the board have control of the production of the aircraft of the Navy?

Mr. BRITTEN. It has as to establishing the contracts for the production of motors. The Navy will get its quota out of the general production of approximately 5,000 per month.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. McKENZIE. I desire to ask my colleague in regard to certain language in the section here, which reads like this:

Including the acquisition of land by purchase, donation, or condemnation.

This is for a flying field, and I would like to ask my colleague what has been the policy of the Navy Department in regard to that matter. Has the Secretary of the Navy gone ahead and purchased land wherever he saw fit without coming to the Committee on Naval Affairs and submitting the proposition and asking for an appropriation?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; he has purchased no land.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. BRITTEN. But he has done this, and I was about to come to that particular point. At North Island, San Diego, there are some 1,200 acres of Government land, one of the most wonderful aviation fields in the world.

The Weather Bureau reports indicate that a flier can fly there longer than elsewhere, fly a greater number of hours per day on an average at San Diego than any place in the United States because of the delightful climate, no rain, and plenty of sunshine. Now, here is what has been done with aviation in the Navy: Instead of developing that field for which an appropriation was made more than a year ago and the money in hand for a specific purpose for land owned by the Government, our aviation in the Navy goes to Miami, Fla., and leases for a nominal amount a few acres on which they immediately expended $450,000 in building construction, and now comes to Congress and says, "We have spent $450,000 on a little piece of land, and we ought to buy it now." Another instance: At Key West they acquired by lease a small piece of land from a railroad company and they immediately expended $300,000 or $400,000 on buildings on that land which we did not own, and they now desire appropriation for its purchase. One of the things that caused me to make up my mind that aviation in the Navy is not progressing properly was that San Diego condition. The land owned by the Government, the money appropriated for a specific purpose, to be used only for aviation at that place, and not a single dollar was spent after April 1, 1917. We must now purchase these two pieces of land in Florida because of the character of improvements we have put on them, and naturally the committee must recommend this procedure. We have got a million dollars' worth of buildings on land worth $80,000 or $100,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. If my colleague will permit, my reason for asking this question is due to certain criticisms which have been made over legislation of Congress granting the Signal Corps in the Army power to buy land, and that a great sum of this $640,000,000 appropriated by Congress for the construction of aeroplanes has been expended in buying fields here and there and everywhere, it seems, and putting up buildings on them.

Mr. BRITTEN. Well, that has not been the case in the Navy, but in fact——

Mr. McKENZIE. And I thought perhaps the same abuse was carried in the Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. Purchases and general conditions are quite satisfactory. The Navy is as clean as a hound's tooth in every direction.

Instead of buying land in the South, as they do for the Army, the Navy will lease a piece of land for a dollar a year, put an enormous amount of buildings on it, and then very naturally suggest that it be purchased.

That process may be all right. Maybe we needed an aviation field at Miami. Maybe the location is good. Maybe we needed one at Key West. The location there may also be good. But in the meantime we should have developed the plant at San Diego, Cal., where the Congress had provided for the development of Government property with an appropriation for an aviation field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for two or three minutes without interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Would it not have been better to have purchased this land before they expended this money on it?

Mr. PADGETT. They had no authority.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. You could have gotten the same authority that you are asking for now.

Mr. PADGETT. Congress was not in session. We had to go ahead and act.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Are you paying an exorbitant price for this property in comparison with its value before the buildings were erected and the improvements made?

Mr. PADGETT. From the hearings that we had on the matter it is shown that it is undeveloped land on the water front, and they say the people were asking about the price we proposed to pay. I think it is more than it would be worth or would sell for, but I do not know what water-front land is worth there.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think it is the duty of the committee to ascertain the value of this property before the improvements are put on it?

Mr. PADGETT. We did. They said that those people in that country were asking these prices for the land.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, answering my colleague from Illinois, in the Miami purchase the only evidence that the Aviation Bureau or the officers had about the value of the property, was a letter from the secretary of the chamber of commerce down there, who said that the land was probably worth $45,000 in comparison with adjoining values. But it developed in the meantime that as soon as we acquired this property on a dollar-a-year lease we expended $45,000 for filling in and grading while making the land available for aviation purposes, and now we are probably going to pay $45,000 more for the land. That has not yet been determined.

I am not objecting, understand, to the establishment of these aviation bases on the Atlantic coast. We probably need them.

Mr. PADGETT. What you object to is that we did not develop San Diego?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; that they did not develop San Diego.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. I wanted to understand why you did not make some preparations about buying this property before this money was expended, and now you are paying this exorbitant price after you have made it valuable.

Mr. BRITTEN. Ordinary business practice would suggest an option on the land at least, which they have not done.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Is any limit placed on this for the protection of the Government?

Mr. BRITTEN. Not specifically. I do not think we will pay more for the land than it was worth when we started to build down there. I am satisfied there is nothing crooked or disagreeable about the transaction. I do complain because Government-owned land on the Pacific coast which Congress desired developed remained untouched and not a dollar was spent on it for a year, notwithstanding the fact that we were at war.

I do not think I am violating any confidence when I say that, after parleys back and forth between this country and England, it is agreed that the one thing that will stifle the submarine more than anything else is the seaplane.

The chairman of the committee stated a few moments ago that we were establishing aviation bases in Ireland and Scotland and England and France. That is true. We are establishing a good many of them, at enormous cost, but these bases are worthless unless we have seaplanes. The seaplane, equipped with machine guns and to drop bombs, is the one thing to destroy submarines rather than destroyers themselves.

On that account I am anxious to see aviation developed in the Navy even further than aviation in the Army, but it never can be under existing conditions in the Navy Department. I do not think the Secretary of the Navy or the Assistant Secretary is to blame. This matter has probably not been called to their attention, but until there is coordination between the various bureaus contributing to aviation in the Navy aviation in the Navy is going to be a failure, as it is to-day.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I will ask the gentleman a brief question.

Mr. BRITTEN. You may.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. JUUL. What part, if any, of the $640,000,000 that we appropriated for airplanes at the special session has been utilized?

Mr. BRITTEN. Probably 95 or 100 per cent of it has been either expended or obligated.

Mr. JUUL. Did the Navy get any share of that?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; none of it. That was for the Army.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the views expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] are shared by the other members of the committee of which he is a member, nor do I feel that the criticism he has directed at the aviation branch of the Navy is borne out by the facts. I recall that the gentleman from Illinois had reported to him some facts in relation to the development of the aviation field at Miami, and also at Key West, that led him to conclude that the action of the Navy in developing these fields was unwise, and on the strength of this information, if it had been correct, the gentleman might have been justified in his conclusions, but afterwards our committee found that information was altogether incorrect.

Mr. BRITTEN. Only as applying to the Key West purchase, and not to the Miami purchase.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The same is true of his criticism of the activities of the Navy at San Diego. North Island was owned jointly by the Army and the Navy. There had been no division of the land between the Army and the Navy, but it was understood that the Navy would take the north half of the Island and the Army would take the south half of the island and develop it. The Army unfortunately was occupying the portion of the island that the Navy was to have, and was using it for aviation purposes. They had buildings there, and men stationed there, and the Navy was unable to get possession of its part of the island without interfering with Army aviation training at its then principal field.

Not until about three or four weeks ago did the Army begin to vacate the part of the island that was to be apportioned to the Navy. They have not yet vacated all of it, though very strenuous efforts have been made by Capt. Irwin to have them vacate at once, because the Navy is anxious to develop its station there. So I want the Members of the House to know that the part of the island which the Navy will develop as an aviation field has been for some years in the possession of the Army, and used for Army aviation. The money is already appropriated for the development of the San Diego field, and the plans are drawn for much of that development, and I have assurances that just as soon as the Army vacates work will begin immediately on that field. The Navy appreciates the importance of developing this field, since there are students on the western coast who are now prepared to take their elementary training there.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. My colleague on the committee, who is always very fair and courteous, said a moment ago that plans had been prepared. Will he tell the House just when the plans for the improvement of North Island were approved by the Navy Department, or if they have been approved up to this present time?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not think they have been finally approved. The plans have been tentatively drawn, and I think comparatively recently. I do not remember the exact date, but I think that came out in the hearings before our committee.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; it did; and I should like to refresh the memory of my colleague. When Capt. Irwin came before the committee he said that plans had been prepared and were about to be approved. On a question from me as to when they had been prepared and presented to the Navy Department he said "last Saturday," this being Monday or Tuesday. I have since learned that the plans were not approved and are not approved to-day, notwithstanding the fact that we have been at war for a year, and that a year ago Congress appropriated several hundred thousand dollars for the development of that particular field, and all they have got to do is to draw plans and have them approved and go ahead with the construction, but they have not done that even to this day, notwithstanding these facts.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yielded to the gentleman only for a question.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAYS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. I ask that my colleague have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Alabama have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is it not true that the revised estimates show that it will require a much larger sum of money than was originally appropriated for this San Diego field?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Very much larger.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And that that is one reason why the plans have not been furnished?

Mr. BRITTEN. Is that any reason why they should not do anything at all? They have got half the amount. Why should they not go ahead with some of the work?

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman if it was not further shown that the war being on the Atlantic side and not on the Pacific side, these Atlantic developments were the urgent and pressing needs, instead of those on the Pacific coast?

Mr. BRITTEN. Are we taking no boys from the Pacific coast because the war is on the Atlantic side?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, that is not the case at all, but there had to be development over here before we could train to be prepared for the emergency.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not want to criticize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] because he is sincere in the views he states. I think it is but fair to say, however, that if the members of the committee will read the hearings of Capt. Irwin they will find that like the other members of the committee, excepting the gentleman from Illinois——

Mr. BRITTEN. Those hearings are not printed, are they?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; the last hearings are printed, and I have them here. I repeat, all members of the committee excepting the gentleman from Illinois were fully satisfied that the grounds of criticism now directed at the aviation branch of the Navy by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] are not well founded, especially in so far as it relates to the San Diego station.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for just a question there?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is the gentleman himself satisfied with the progress that aviation has made in the Navy during the past year, since we have been at war?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No; I do not think anyone is satisfied with the progress that aviation has made, either in the Navy or in the Army; but I think the officers directing the aviation department of the Navy are capable and industrious and have put forth every possible effort to hurry up construction. They simply could not accomplish the impossible, and their disappointment is as keen as ours.

The Navy has very recently built, near Philadelphia, a factory for the construction of airplanes. They have already turned out more than three, and the production will increase from this time on. That factory was built in an incredibly short time. It has been in operation only a comparatively short time, and they are now largely expanding this plant. The new part of the plant is to be an assembling plant. Contracts have been let in different parts of the country for the different parts of planes, and they will be assembled and put together rapidly at this plant. The naval officers recognize that airplane construction is about 60 days behind on the estimates made last August as to what could be accomplished.

Mr. PADGETT. Less than 60 days. They feel that will be overcome largely as soon as they can have this factory or place for the assembling of completed airplanes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] desire to ask me a question?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman has already answered the question I was going to ask, which was if that was to be an assembling plant. The gentleman has so stated.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes. The part that is completed is a building plant, but the additions will be an assembling plant.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. What in general is it proposed to use in these planes that are being assembled?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. My understanding is that the Liberty motor will be used.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman place the responsibility for the 60 or 90 days' delay in the Navy? I am informed from reliable sources that that is practically the delay in the Army.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think that is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is, the delay is about three months?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Sixty days, I think, in the Navy.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. In other words, the Army hopes in three months from now to be as well advanced as it ought to be now.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Admiral Taylor, who has been referred to here in such complimentary terms, and who fully deserves what has been said, gave to the subcommittee a very clear and full statement of the cause of the delay. Unquestionably private companies have fallen far behind what they estimated to the department they could do, and most of this delay is due to the private companies failing to carry out what they at one time believed they would be able to accomplish.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Of course when the assembled plane is utilized that is the way to get the greatest maximum of output; but if the various plants scattered throughout the country, of which you ask certain things to be produced, if any one falls down, your whole plant is practically paralyzed, or at least its output is stopped.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. From information I have the aviation department of the Navy has foreseen the possibility of that and has not confined the production of parts to any one particular factory or factories. They feel now that they will have very good returns from the contracts let.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I profoundly hope that that is true, but we have been expressing that same sentiment off and on, mostly off but sometimes on, for a year. Has the gentleman anything more to justify his hope than he had some months ago?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I can only say that all the stations are now provided with training planes, and they are fairly well equipped with service planes for advanced training. At all of our completed foreign stations we have a sufficient number of pilots, mechanics, and other trained officers to carry on the program at present. They likewise are provided with a sufficient number of planes. All of these have been obtained from France. We are now prepared to send some finished planes from here to our forces abroad, and these shipments will now rapidly increase, so the department informs me.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman does not mean by service planes battle planes?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; they are now prepared to ship at least 20 service planes, and shipments will steadily increase, so Capt. Morrill has informed me.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman state whether the Navy expects to produce in the near future any battle planes?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. We have not produced one yet.

Mr. PADGETT. Admiral Taylor told me a few days ago that at the present time they were up with the program, and expected, with reference to the training planes and with the battle planes or fighting planes, they were about 60 days behind, but were cutting that down, and now the private concerns were beginning to make deliveries.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I ask the gentleman a question in all sincerity, and he can answer it or not, as he likes? Why was it not possible to take a perfectly successful English airplane and manufacture it in this country?

Mr. FARR. I think I can answer that question, if the gentleman from Alabama will permit me.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. FARR. It was because of the fact that they could not expedite the work on the particular machine. One thing is very comforting—we can build three or four Liberty motors to one Rolls-Royce machine.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The Navy had closed a contract for building Rolls-Royce motors, but afterwards ascertained that the output would be so small that the contract was canceled. Under the contract as tentatively agreed on no deliveries were promised for nine months.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. But that does not answer my question.

Mr. HICKS. Yesterday I visited a plant in my district where they are manufacturing a large number of nonflying training machines. They are used entirely for training on the ground. It used to be an old picture-frame molding factory. They are turning out a vast number of these machines every week. It is very pleasing and interesting to see all these machines being turned out.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the Navy Department has decided upon a type of combat plane and upon the motor to be used in that combat plane?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; but the department recognizes that developments in aircraft are constantly occurring, and it is their purpose to keep up with the most advanced ideas.

Mr. HUSTED. The combat plane has been decided on? If proper, I would like to inquire what motor they have proposed to use in it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The Liberty motor; but experiments are now being made with other motors. If anything better than the Liberty motor is found, the Navy will not hesitate to make use of the same, is the information given me by the department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman state what estimate is placed on the efficiency of the planes we are going to make as compared with the best planes being used in the war?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The information we have from men like Admiral Taylor is that there is no motor superior to the one we are manufacturing. I will say that France and England have approved it, and orders from both France and England for these motors have been received and some shipments have been made.

Mr. HUSTED. I am rather surprised at the gentleman's statement that we intended to use the Liberty motor in the combat plane.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I was speaking of the large Navy planes.

Mr. HUSTED. I understand they do not intend to use it in the combat planes in the Army aviation.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not know about that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The chairman stated that we have not produced any combat planes, and yet I understood him to say that the naval authorities claim that they are only 60 days behind their program. It must have been, then, that they did not expect to produce any combat planes up to this time. Is that it?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We have secured planes abroad, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I notice a great many young men on the streets here in aviator's uniform, with the flying badge of the Navy, many more than of the Army. Have we plenty of trained fliers developed now in the Navy?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. My understanding is that we have a good number; not plenty. We are constantly adding to this number.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman thinks we have plenty of those?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The production of fliers is ahead of service machines, and it is hoped will be kept so. May I just add in that connection that we had something like about 320 officers and men in the Aviation Service when war was declared. We have now more than 17,000.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. How many of those are fliers?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am not prepared to tell the gentleman the number, but do not think it would be proper to write it into the RECORD.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman wishes, I am willing to show him a tabulation that I have here.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is there the same general requirement for aviation in the Navy as in the Army? Does a flier have to have a certain amount of skill, and does he receive an increase of pay?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. And these men who have the badge are trained aviators?

Mr. PADGETT. There are student aviators and trained aviators in the Navy.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Do they wear this badge when only a student?

Mr. PADGETT. I must confess that I do not know anything about badges.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. My information is that only trained fliers are permitted to wear the badge.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I see so many more of the Navy than I do of the Army that I asked the question.

Mr. PADGETT. I stated before that I could not tell the insignia of an ensign from that of an admiral. I do not know anything about uniforms or insignia.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not recall having noticed the badges, but the department informs me the badge is worn only by the trained flier.

Mr. TILSON. Has the gentleman said anything in regard to the tactical use of these planes? It is perfectly well understood how the battle planes and other planes are used in the Army; but, with the German Navy practically off the seas, what is the intention or expectation in regard to the use of these aeroplanes in this war?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Part of that information perhaps might be considered confidential. However, the larger planes, I will say, are used for hunting and destroying submarines, and they are very effectively used for that purpose.

Mr. TILSON. That is the point that I wished to bring out.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There will be some combat planes of a smaller type used by the Navy, but I would not care to discuss matters in that connection.

Mr. TILSON. It is a fact that it is the intention to use them, and they are being used now to destroy submarines.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will say that it is, and that it is believed there will be no more effective means of disposing of submarines than by aeroplanes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to do so, but I would like to have five minutes more, as I want to make one connected statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his time for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Now, in connection with the aviation fields at Miami and Key West, referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], these two fields were selected by boards early last year after a thorough inspection, and on their recommendation these fields were taken over and developed. There were no funds available out of any appropriation the Navy Department had for the purchase of these fields or even for their development, and the money used in the development of the fields came from deficiency appropriations.

The field at Miami, I am informed, was thought to be very desirable for aviation purposes. It was strategically located. Some allusion was made by the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that a great deal of the field had to be filled up. I am informed that would have been true of any field selected along the coast, and they simply dredged nearby and filled from this dredging. Dredging was necessary for the use of the water in front of the station, and this dredging was used to fill with.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is not trying to convey to the House the idea that you need deep water for the landing of sea planes?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. They needed to deepen the water at that place, and this dredging would have been necessary at any point along the coast. The large planes, I learn, will require about 6 feet for safe operation.

Mr. BRITTEN. How much water do sea planes draw?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The hearings show that only the necessary dredging was done at Miami.

Mr. BRITTEN. How much did the dredging cost, if the gentleman remembers?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not recall.

Mr. BRITTEN. Was not the amount $45,000, and was not that the original value of the property?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No purchase price has been fixed on the property. Capt. Irwin stated that he felt the present owner might demand more than the Government should pay, and in that event condemnation proceedings would be had to obtain a reasonable price. He gave us information as to what the president of the chamber of commerce and other business men of Miami had estimated to be the value of the property. And I feel sure that Members of the House need have no uneasiness that the Navy will pay more than a reasonable price for the land, unless a jury requires them to pay more for it. I fully concur in the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois that it is unwise to improve property first, without having a contract for its purchase; but yet you understand this was hurried-up work. The Navy had no authority to buy there, and could not wait for an appropriation. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HUSTED. I would like to find out if the Navy Department is able to provide the student fliers with planes upon which to learn to fly as rapidly as they are graduated from the ground school?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman perhaps missed the statement I made just a few minutes ago that I am informed that all of our training stations are now supplied with a sufficient number of training planes.

Mr. HUSTED. To take care of the graduates from the ground school?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. I know that condition does not exist in the Army.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And these stations are fairly well equipped with service planes for advanced training, where it is proposed to give advanced training.

Mr. SEARS. If the gentleman will permit, I wish to say for the information of the gentleman from Chicago, who seems to be laboring under a misunderstanding, that much of the valuable land around Miami is made from filled-in ground. Mr. Deering, of the Deering Harvester Co., is completing a $4,000,000 residence and outbuildings near the aviation camp on partly filled-in ground. This is done by simply pumping the sand out of the bay until the low places are filled up and all of the land is not only level, but high and dry.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is there any land down there that might be used for an aviation field or some lowland that might be filled in that the Navy Department might have acquired rather than to take this very expensive piece of property, valued, according to the association of commerce, at $45,000, and expend an additional $45,000 on filling it in?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. May I ask for three minutes more?

Mr. BRITTEN. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRITTEN. I want to ask the gentleman, who knows all about land down there, if, in his estimation, it could not have been possible to acquire other land at a whole lot less money?

Mr. SEARS. I doubt if it would have been possible. The land about Miami is of tropical growth, and——

Mr. BRITTEN. Why was it necessary to have it right at Miami?

Mr. SEARS. It is not; it is some distance away.

Mr. PADGETT. The board went and selected the place because of its location and adaptability to flying uses, and they say it was the best place on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. SEARS. Land that might have been gotten much cheaper would have cost more to fill in.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, none of the committee complained about the location of the land at Key West. We did feel that the land at San Diego, owned by the Government, for which an appropriation was made by Congress for that specific purpose, should also have been utilized.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Just in that connection I think the gentleman will recall that the information before the committee was very full and showed beyond question that the Navy could develop its part of North Island, for the reason that the Army was occupying and using it for aviation purposes. That unquestionably was the reason why the Navy could not at an earlier time begin the construction of buildings there. There could not have been any better reason assigned. The Army, an important branch of the military service, was actually using and occupying it for aviation purposes. They have not yet vacated it.

Mr. BRITTEN. One more question. What prevented the completion of the plans and specifications for construction work down there by the Navy Department during the year we have been at war?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that I do not think an hour's delay will be occasioned by the failure to have plans, but construction will be commenced just as soon as the Army surrenders possession, and insistent demand is being made for the land by the Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is very optimistic. The plans have not been approved up to this day.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The very fact that the Army was in possession and using the property, and the further fact, as stated by the chairman of the committee, that those who were advising the Navy Department said that the stations nearest the war zone should be first developed accounts for the delay in developing the San Diego station.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman inform me as to the number of acres of which this tract consists?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. San Diego—it is a very large tract.

Mr. BRITTEN. Twelve hundred acres.

Mr. SABATH. Twelve hundred acres; that would be about——

Mr. PADGETT. The Government took over the North Island, but this other tract of which we have been speaking is down here at Miami, Fla.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Only a small acreage at Miami—about 26 acres—and if a reasonable price can not be agreed on condemnation proceedings will be had.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman was talking about the land for which we expect to pay $45,000.

Mr. PADGETT. That is about $2,000 an acre.

Mr. BRITTEN. Before we leave the item of aviation I would like to have one minute in order to give a few figures to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRITTEN. I desire to substantiate what I said a few moments ago. On April 1, 1917, when we went into the European war, the Navy had 93 completed seaplanes. They had 133 additional seaplanes under course of construction. On January 1 of this year they had 324 completed planes, all told, many of which were obsolete. In other words, on April 1, 1917, we had 226, either completed or in course of construction, and almost a year later we have 324, an increase of about a hundred in nine months of war period. If that is making real progress, I do not know the true definition of the word. Aviation in the Navy to-day is almost a complete failure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, the progress in aviation has been keenly disappointing to the people of this country. The fact is that there has been too much publicity and promising and too little productivity. A double injury has been done us by those who have made such glowing promises and not fulfilling them. We have not the thousands of aircraft expected, and Germany was stimulated to frantic efforts to produce many thousands of machines; and they have done it.

Now, I have no doubt in my own mind to-day—although I must confess that I view these things with a great deal of concern on account of the many assurances relative to aircraft—that the condition will be improved. But we have not any American machines on the fighting field, and it is no comfort to me to have those in authority tell us that those of our boys who are over there, ready to sacrifice their lives, have machines furnished by our allies when we know that they can not spare these machines; else they would not be asking us to supply them with liberty motors.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. What encouragement is it to hear that other nations are ready to buy Liberty motors when in six months we produce 65 of those motors out of 20,000 that have been contracted for by the United States Government, and when we produced last month less than we did the month before?

Mr. FARR. That is what I say. The newspapers have been used to encourage the people to believe that we are doing wonderful things to fight in the air, when we are doing very little.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. And, furthermore, we were told not to get Rolls-Royce engines because we could produce these faster. In fact, they are producing the Rolls-Royce engine at the rate of 800 a month, while we are producing only 50.

Mr. FARR. I think the Liberty motor, in some respects, will surpass the Rolls-Royce motor. It is a lighter machine. It will have more power, and we can make the Liberty motor, if statements made to me are anywhere near true, three or four times as fast as we could make the Rolls-Royce machine.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman tell us who is responsible for these glowing reports and false reports as to production?

Mr. FARR. It is a mystery to me. Only a few weeks ago, in the Committee on Naval Affairs, I talked about a special page article that appeared in a Philadelphia newspaper stating that we were going to have thousands of machines by next July. Mr. Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy, was before us at the time and I presented some of the figures mentioned in this article and asked him the question, limiting the number to 5,000 by July 1, if he thought that promise would be fulfilled, and Mr. Daniels stated frankly, "Yes; and I think we will be able to do better than that."

I do not question Mr. Daniels's integrity or truthfulness. I believe he stated what he actually believed. We had Admiral Taylor before us, and there were very encouraging reports as to what this country was going to do in the matter of aircraft. The admiral also was sincere in his statements; but we have been keenly disappointed. The information that I get is that there are too many persons interested in aircraft.

What we want is one big man to take hold of this situation and build the airplanes and send them to Europe and help to win this war.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I take it from what the gentleman has said that he does not approve, for example, the action of the Secretary of War in calling in the reporters and giving a statement as early as last July as to what this Liberty motor is in its operation, in view of the fact that changes have been made since then, and it still is not used for the combat plane or the very fast flying plane.

Mr. FARR. We are not making any combat planes. I think one type of bombing machine is a most promising one, but difficulties have arisen because of the fact that many parts are needed for the combat machine that are not necessary for practice machines.

Mr. FESS. In other words, it produces a state of public opinion that will revolt later, when the truth comes out?

Mr. FARR. There is a great deal of anxiety throughout the country about our aircraft. But I got much satisfaction from the President's recent address in Baltimore. It is the best punch that the President has put into a speech. He has caught the spirit, the purpose, and the determination of the American people to make a real fight. They know it takes force to meet force, and they want it done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I infer from the gentleman's remarks that if we confined the statement of those gentlemen to the recording of history and prevailed upon them to avoid prophecy we would be giving a better service to the American public?

Mr. FARR. My criticism is of the false encouragement given to an anxious people, who are willing to make every sacrifice to win the war. We have made great progress in our preparations. Our Navy is in a highly efficient condition—actual, not imaginary. It has been made such by performance and not promise. The country wants to see less promise and more performance in aircraft. There is no doubt of our ability to do it. Our allies are holding on with desperation waiting for us to add strength to that right arm of brave, splendid, young men over there, of which Secretary Baker speaks, by putting more of the power of the American body in that right arm.

Mr. HUSTED. Does not the gentleman think it was a very serious mistake to devote our entire energies to the experimentation, in trying to develop a new motor, instead of building motors that had been tried out in actual warfare and were known to be right, and experimenting on the side in the attempt to get something better? Now, we have devoted our whole time to experimentation, in the hope of developing a better motor, and we have not got the motor yet; and everybody who knows anything about air motors knows that it takes about two years to perfect one. In the meantime we have no motor to put on our planes.

Mr. FARR. I hope the gentleman's statement is not true. I trust we have succeeded in getting a real motor. I have confidence that we have. I talked with a constructor only three or four days ago relative to this matter, and I believe he knows what he is talking about. He has a knowledge of the business, and he thinks we have done splendidly so far as we have gone, and that the Liberty motor is a success. The same gentleman informed me that Germany has maintained her strength in the air largely through one machine—the Mercedes. She has made no changes in that machine; but by tactical experience and ability has utilized it to great advantage.

Mr. FOCHT. Inasmuch as the gentleman has just stated that he was disappointed with respect to the prediction and forecast made by Secretary Daniels and others in authority, will the gentleman, who is a member of the committee, inform me and other Members of the House who are standing on the outside what he thinks about the aeroplane business and when we are going to get 5,000 or 1,000 machines, or any airplanes, to go to

Europe? Will the gentleman state that, if it is not exceeding the bounds of propriety for him to do so?

Mr. FARR. The promise is made that 750 machines will be delivered by the 1st of July.

Mr. FOCHT. I do not want promises, but the gentleman's own idea.

Mr. FARR. I want to say frankly and regretfully that all we have had before the committee and in the newspapers has been much more of promise than of actual results.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is always well informed about naval matters. Does he think aviation in the Navy is a success to-day?

Mr. FARR. No; I do not think so, because of the fact that the undertaking was so tremendous and the promises were too many. A year ago last February, with all the facilities that we had in this country for building aircraft, we could not turn out more than 100 to 125 ordinary practice machines in a month. So what was the sense of talking about 20,000 or 10,000 or 5,000 within a year, and elaborate combat machines at that?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Do I understand the gentleman to say that 750 airplanes are promised by the 1st of July?

Mr. FARR. Seven hundred and fifty Liberty motors are promised. It is promised that they will be ready for England on July 1. That shows that England needs more aircraft, and it is not comforting to us to hear the statement made that our boys over there have English machines, when we are taking those machines away from England, which is putting up the battle to protect the liberties of this country.

Mr. PADGETT. England has asked for 750, and we expect to furnish more than 900.

Mr. FARR. Seven hundred and fifty is what the gentleman told me at Anacostia the other day. I think the chairman of the Naval Committee and every other member of the committee are disappointed in the number of airships turned out. I regret that we have suffered that disappointment, because I think our Navy is in wonderfully good shape. It is vastly the best Navy that we ever had and is making a fine showing across the ocean; and when the real crisis comes, I believe it will show splendid results. [Applause.]

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago that Secretary Daniels made the statement that we would have 5,000 airplanes by the 1st of July.

Mr. FARR. More than 5,000.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. How can that be reconciled with the promise made by the man supposed to know? How can we reconcile that statement with the optimism of the Secretary?

Mr. FARR. The Secretary of the Navy believed it would be done. Frankly, the Secretary of the Navy was deceived, as the rest of us were deceived, and as the country has been deceived.

Mr. FOCHT. Then you are still in doubt as to whether you are going to have five or even one?

Mr. FARR. We saw a splendid bombing craft over at Anacostia the other day, and it made an excellent record in coming up from Newport News. There is no question about that, and I believe the Liberty motor has many excellencies. But it is a question now of turning out the Liberty motor. One fighting craft over in Europe is worth more than a thousand in our imagination in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania think it is a fair assumption to say that England is short of airplanes, simply because she proposes to buy some of our Liberty engines? Is it not possible that England might want some of these engines on account of the fact that they are better perhaps than those she now has, but that nevertheless she is fully equipped with airplanes?

Mr. FARR. England wants aircraft, more aircraft, and more aircraft. France wants aircraft and more aircraft. She wants these fighting aids, and we are not furnishing them. We are not furnishing them for our own boys over there, and we are not providing them in sufficient numbers to develop the thousands of young men in this country who are anxious to do their all for their country.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not think it is a fair conclusion that England is short of airplanes simply because she is buying a few Liberty engines.

Mr. FARR. It is good evidence that she can use more.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to have it understood which we are considering, the larger sum in this paragraph or the sum stated in the proviso. I think it is very important that that should be made clear before we go along.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] knows something about the Liberty motor, and I would like to have him state it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I only want about a minute, Mr. Chairman, to make a statement relative to my understanding about the Liberty motor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as gentlemen know, these motors are made largely in our section of the country, in the Middle West. A few days ago I visited the Buick plant, in Flint, where they are making a large number of these engines. The head of the Buick plant is regarded as one of the greatest manufacturers in America. He started in the shops as a boy and has worked up to the presidency of the company, and thoroughly understands mechanics. I asked him about the Liberty motor, and particularly about the newspaper reports to the effect that it is a disappointment. He told me that in his judgment it was the greatest piece of mechanism he had ever known anything about. In its simplicity, durability, weight, and in all essential things it surpassed anything he had ever seen. It weighs only 100 pounds more than the engine in the Buick car. The engine in the Buick car is about 40 horsepower, while the new Liberty engine is a 400 horsepower. I make this statement, based not on my own opinion but upon the information I have received at the Buick plant, which is turning these engines out right along.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was it the opinion of this expert manufacturer of engines from whom you had the information that the Liberty motor would come up to the expectations made for it?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Absolutely; and I think, myself, judging from the statements made by Mr. Chrysler, the gentleman I refer to, that it has proven to be no mistake on the part of the Government to develop this new engine, because it is much simpler in construction, lighter, and more durable than any other engine suitable for aviation purposes. I do not state this of my own knowledge, because I am not a mechanic, but my opinion is based on information supplied as I have stated.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman tells us about the wonderful information of this particular gentleman about motors, but does he know that after the Liberty motor had been perfected, presumably in Flint, Mich., it was sent to St. Charles, La., and there discovered that the radiator had been constructed for winter service, and, although it worked well up in Michigan, it was impossible to use it in an aeroplane in the summer time, and it had to be sent back to have the radiator changed? I believe there were 106 changes of that sort discovered by the experts.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It is undoubtedly true that in developing any piece of mechanism of so complicated a nature, difficulties will have to be met that could not have been foreseen.

Mr. HICKS. If the gentleman will allow me, I understood from a man well informed on this matter that the Liberty motor, while it developed a tremendous horsepower on the block, it did not develop that same horsepower at an elevation of 10,000 or 12,000 feet in the air. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Not of my own knowledge, but I am inclined to think that the gentleman's information is not correct.

Mr. PADGETT. A few days ago a number of members of the committee went across to Anacostia to see a big machine that came up 100 miles from down in Virginia. It came up in an hour and 4 minutes, and went up to an elevation of over 10,000 feet. They said they came without missing a stroke, without any impediments or criticism of the engine whatever. It was the double Liberty motor—had two motors in it, and that machine was 92 feet and 8 inches from tip to tip of the wings.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. It strikes me that we can get more than one report just like that. Everyone speaks of the perfection of the thing he has done. It is so perfect that it can not be improved. The truth about the matter is we are finding defects all the time.

Mr. PADGETT. There is nothing perfect. They have been making experiments to develop it, just like they made in the automobile, in electricity, in the talking machine, and in the radio, and all those things, when they were being developed. I stated at the outset that many experiments were made until they got to the present status, but it is now standardized, and they are producing the machines. It is a valuable and efficient and competent machine. If improvements are found in the future, it will not delay the production that is going on until

they get the number, and then they can go to making the improved machines to supply future demands.

Mr. FESS Is it not true that we are talking too much about what we are going to do, rather than doing it and keeping quiet about it?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. I said in the beginning that they were too optimistic; that they made promises they were unable to keep. I have stated that time and again, but these things are being corrected. One of the big concerns that lacks organization has been reorganized, and they are now turning out production.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. What is the parliamentary situation?

Mr. PADGETT. We are running along by unanimous consent.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Chairman think that we have now told the Hun all that we know about the motors and that we have not flying machines?

Mr. WALSH. Two or three members of the committee have not spoken yet. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to the gentleman that the members of the committee do not bore the House usually with their talk. It has been a disappointment to everybody that the airplanes are not supplied, but I want to say that the Navy Department and the naval officials have done the best they knew how. I believe the fault is that they have had too many cooks at the food.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask that the Clerk continue the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation: For travel allowance of enlisted men discharged on account of expiration of enlistment; transportation of enlisted men and apprentice seamen and applicants for enlistment at home and abroad, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation to their homes, if residents of the United States, of enlisted men and apprentice seamen discharged on medical survey, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of sick or insane enlisted men and apprentice seamen to hospitals, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of enlisted men of the Naval Reserve Force to and from duty, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of civilian officers and crews of naval auxiliaries; apprehension and delivery of deserters and stragglers, and for railway guides and other expenses incident to transportation; expenses of recruiting for the naval service; rent of rendezvous and expenses of maintaining the same; purchase, rental, maintenance, operation, exchange, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use; advertising for and obtaining men and apprentice seamen; actual and necessary expenses in lieu of mileage to officers on duty with traveling recruiting parties, $5,100,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to call the attention of the committee to a situation that has come to my notice through a letter from a widow whose son was enlisted in the Navy and who for some reason or other was discharged as not fit for the service and was turned loose a thousand miles away from home, sick, refused admission to the hospital, without a cent with which to pay his fare home, and left to find his way as best he could in the condition in which he found himself after his dismissal from the service. I called the attention of the department to this condition and inquired whether or not this boy could not find an asylum in one of the naval hospitals for treatment during his illness, and was told that having been discharged from the service as not fit for the service he was not entitled to any consideration by the department. This boy is in a condition from which I fear he will not recover. I think the treatment that he received from the Navy Department was inhuman. His mother is distracted on account of the condition of her boy, and I believe this is the time and the place to call the attention of the Navy Department to the injustice of such treatment of boys who volunteer their services in defense of the flag. I do not know what the rules of the department may be with respect to men who are discharged as unfit, but if there are rules that permit the commanding officers to turn a boy loose because he happens to be so sick that he is unable to perform his duty, then those rules should also include a provision that will compel the officers in charge of the men to care for him as a human being ought to be cared for.

I know of another case where not long since a boy enlisted on the Pacific coast. He was sick during all his voyage down through as far as the Caribbean Sea. He was unable to perform his duties, and the commanding officer of the ship discharged him, turned him out on foreign soil, in a strange land where he could not speak the language, without a dollar in his pocket, and he was compelled as best he could to find his way back to those who could care for him. If we hope to have the confidence of the American people to an extent that will justify the boys of America in fighting for the flag, we have got to compel the men who are in command of the American ships to treat the boys who volunteer their services in the way in which they ought to be treated.

I have been able to receive no satisfaction whatever from any communications that I have sent to the Navy Department in connection with this boy Kennedy, whose mother lives in Chicago in my district. I am not one of the men who believe in calling the attention of the House to these unjust acts, but I believe the future welfare of the Navy justifies me in calling the attention of the House to this matter at this time, and I want to know if the chairman of the committee in charge of this great bill, appropriating $1,500,000,000, or some such sum as that, for the maintenance of the Navy, knows of any such practice in the Navy; and if there is such practice, why?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more, in order that the gentleman may answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I have never heard, directly or indirectly, of any such practice, and I would like to ask the gentleman if he has investigated that matter. There must be some mistake.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no mistake, because I have the letter of the mother; I have the admission of the admiral in charge of the Bureau of Navigation that the boy was dismissed as unfit for the service, and the fact that he was enlisted in the service must prove that he was qualified for the service when he was enlisted.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it does not prove that.

Mr. MADDEN. Then they had no business enlisting him.

Mr. PADGETT. There may be mistakes made in enlistment, but, as I understand it, under the law a man is not discharged in a foreign country.

Mr. MADDEN. He was discharged here—the one to which I refer.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman mentioned one who was discharged in a foreign country.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and that is true.

Mr. PADGETT. I would like to have the gentleman give me the names of those two men, and I shall investigate those two particular cases. I doubt the accuracy of the gentleman's information. Another thing, the law provides that when they are discharged at home they shall be given transportation back to the place of original enlistment.

Mr. MADDEN. I assert——

Mr. PADGETT. This boy——

Mr. MADDEN. Just one moment. I have the floor, and I object to the gentleman taking up all of my time with a statement to the effect that he doubts the accuracy of my statement.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no, the accuracy of the gentleman's information.

Mr. MADDEN. I have the information based on the letter of the mother of the boy. I have the reply from Admiral Benson in reply to a letter that I wrote him. If there needs to be any further information in connection with it I shall be able to get it. I shall not ask the gentleman from Tennessee to get it for me. If I, as a Member of the House of Representatives, am unable to obtain information I am not going to ask any other Member of the House to intervene in my behalf. I think I am entitled to the information.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit me to state that I do not want to be construed as an interloper in any way. I thought the gentleman was asking me for information.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but the gentleman has not been giving me any. He has been criticizing my statement.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I have not. I was only asking the gentleman to place me in a position where I could be of assistance and service to him.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not need any assistance. If I, as a Member of Congress, have not as much influence as any other Member of Congress, then I have no right here, and if my request for information does not receive the same consideration as the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], then the people of my district ought to send some one else here in my place. I demand proper consideration for the boys who have enlisted in the Navy, and the one I refer to has not received proper consideration, and every word I say on this floor is absolutely true. I state it on my honor as a Member of this House.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me ask the gentleman, will the gentleman give the names of those two boys?

Mr. MADDEN. I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. PADGETT. I would be glad if the gentleman would do so for the sake of the Navy. I want to see if there is any such practice in the Navy.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, there is.

Mr. PADGETT. I wish the gentleman would put the names of the two boys in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN. I made the statement, and it is not necessary to put the names of the boys in. I have made the statement.

I have charged them with the practice. Now, the question is, is the practice pursued in the Navy Department without respect to who the boys are? I say it is; I know it is. I demand that the practice be changed.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I know my friend wants to be fair——

Mr. MADDEN. I am fair, and I am telling the truth as far as I know the facts.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will my friend pardon me? All Members of Congress here have the same interest in their boys——

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. That the distinguished gentleman has in his boys.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Is not it fair to the boys whom I represent that we might have the names of those boys in order that we may protect them against the same injustice being inflicted on them? Will not the gentleman in fairness to us give an opportunity to take such action with the Navy Department that we may protect our boys who are in the Navy?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think the gentleman's statement has anything whatever to do with the merits of the case.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Oh!

Mr. MADDEN. You can protect those you are interested in; I am going to protect those I am interested in. I am not going to ask anybody's assistance to do it. I am going to demand it as a right, and I shall insist upon that right upon the floor of this House in defense of innocent boys from my territory who offer their lives in the service of their country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Outfits on first enlistment: Outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment, at not to exceed $100 each; for the clothing gratuity of officers and men of the Naval Reserve Force, not to exceed $150 each for officers and $60 each for men; for civilian clothing not to exceed $15 per man to men given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, or inaptitude; in all, $9,975,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 8, line 17, strike out the word "men" and insert in lieu thereof the words "every member."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 18, strike out the words "and $60 each for men."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee——

Mr. PADGETT. This is simply because there is a provision for that on a subsequent page.

Mr. BUTLER. All right.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I have a profound respect for the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], but unlike him I do not feel I have as much influence as any man in this House. If any man from my district at any period of time has a gross injustice visited upon him by any department of the Government, I would say to my colleagues here that if I am not able to get him righted I will thank each and all of them if they will lend me their assistance in trying to see that simple justice is done him. My purpose here is not to glorify myself, but to serve my people, and if by chance I have to appeal to a department to relieve the distress of one of my constituents I shall welcome any assistance that may be offered me. I am exceedingly sorry to hear the strictures of the distinguished gentleman upon anyone in our Navy, especially upon that gallant admiral who with singular ability has taken the Stars and Stripes in every water of the globe and has done so much to make a Navy of which the Nation may justly be proud at this time. No navy in the world has done so much, I am informed, to relieve the condition that confronts us on the waters from the submarine attacks, and nobody is more responsible for the present efficiency of the Navy than the admiral whom this gentleman has criticized. I know Admiral Benson personally——

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I have known him for a number of years, and am quite sure any Member of this House needs but to go to him once and point out any injustice that is done to any member of the Navy, whether officer or enlisted man, and Admiral Benson, so far as within him and his power lies, will see that that man who has been wronged gets a "square deal."

Speaking from my intimate knowledge and from the reports coming from the press, reports from a press hostile at one time to this department and criticizing it adversely on more than one occasion, I point with pride to the reports which come from all parts of our country now praising the efficiency of the Navy, the efficiency of Admiral Benson, of Admiral McGowan, and all those who hold offices under them, and to the efficiency of the men who are serving in every department. This criticism, it seems to me, comes at a poor time and with bad grace, that a Member of the House, unwilling to give us an opportunity to try to assist him in righting the wrongs of a constituent, prefers to stand here, outraged himself, and hurl an adverse criticism at our Navy Department, of which all America, of which all our allies, at this time are so justly proud. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE] can not claim any superior patriotism. I think he has criticized every department of the Government more than any other man in the House, without just reason on many occasions. I have never yet criticized any department. I am here to help. I am proud of the Navy. I am proud of those who conduct the Navy. I am opposed to their treatment of the men. The gentleman's speech has nothing to do with the injustice done to the men in whose behalf I speak; none whatever.

Admiral McGowan happens to be in charge of the purchasing division of the Navy. What place has he in this discussion? The gentleman from South Carolina called him into the discussion without any rhyme or reason. What place has he, or can he have, in the injustice done to a young American who happened by some chance to be unfit for naval service?

What I am anxious to know is whether men who go into the Navy are to be treated as he was, whether he is to be left to the mercy of charity without any attempt on the part of the Government of the United States to nurse him back to health. He was refused admission into the naval hospital, where his parents and his friends requested that he should go. The answer to my inquiry as to why he should not be permitted to go into the hospital was that he was discharged "as unfit for service in the Navy"; not because of his character, not that his character was not good, not that he was not an American, not that he was not clean, not that he was not moral, not that he was not everything that a young man ought to be, but that for some reason his health had failed and he was "unfit for service in the Navy."

I make no complaint about the brilliancy of the management of the Navy. I am proud of it, as every other American is. My complaint is upon a totally different proposition. The speech of the gentleman from South Carolina has no place in this discussion. I am surprised that he should have volunteered to inject himself into a discussion where justice was being sought by a Member of the House for an American who had offered his life to his country and had not been treated as he should have been treated by those in command of the Navy. I do not blame the Secretary of the Navy. He perhaps knows nothing about this conduct. I do not blame Admiral Benson. Perhaps he is bound by ironclad rules that compel him to do an injustice to a human being.

I do not know who may be responsible for the injustice that has been meted out to this young man, but I do know that there should be some remedy applied, and that remedy should be applied at once. I know that the Government of the United States can afford to act in a humane way. It can not afford to turn the young men who go into the Navy or the Army onto the streets and compel them to depend upon charity when they are turned out of the service.

This young man should be cared for, cared for by the Government, and cared for until he is nursed back to health; and I demand that the Government of the United States, or that branch of the Government under the direction of the Secretary

of the Navy, shall see to it that the commanding officers of ships in the future shall so conduct themselves that no complaint can be made by the mother of any boy.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUSTED. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows whether the admiral had the legal authority to grant this relief?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know whether he had or not. I am not complaining about the action of the admiral. I am complaining about the act of the Government.

Now I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McKENZIE. The question propounded by the gentleman from New York practically covers the question I intended to ask.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In response to the question of the gentleman from New York, it is my understanding that when a boy is discharged from the Navy for any of the causes mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois, he is not only furnished transportation home but he is furnished with a civilian suit of clothes for that purpose.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to make this statement, that if anything has happened like what the gentleman from Illinois has stated with reference to boys, it has the condemnation of every man that has a humane heart. It would be well to have a statement of the facts, so that they could be investigated, to see whether or not there is any such practice or custom.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent to put the correspondence in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN subsequently said:

Mr. Chairman, I ask to make a statement in connection with the statement I made a short time ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. When I spoke a few minutes ago I said I wanted to put the correspondence into the RECORD that passed between myself and the mother of the young man to whom I referred as being discharged from the Navy for inaptitude. I went to my office to get the correspondence, and I find that all of that correspondence is in the hands of Admiral Benson. I have a copy of the last letter which I sent to the admiral, which reads as follows:

APRIL 9, 1918.

Admiral WILLIAM S. BENSON,
Chief of Naval Operations,
Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL: I have had so much to do lately that I have not had time to take up the letter of Mrs. Elizabeth Kennedy dated March 19, hereto attached, until now. She tells a pitiful story about her boy. It seems to me that the Government ought to do something in a case of this sort. I do not think it is right to take a boy away from home (he must have been qualified or he would not have been accepted) and turn him loose in the condition he seems to be, as if he had no country.

Is there nothing that we can do in such a case? I hope there is.

I know of a case where a young chap enlisted on the Pacific coast. He was put to sea and discharged down in the Caribbean Sea, too sick to stand up, without a dollar in his pocket, in a strange land where he could not speak the language. I wonder if this is the policy of all the commanding officers of the Navy. I do not think it is right.

The boy referred to as having been discharged down in the Caribbean had to work his way back to the Pacific coast the best he knew how, and this boy whose case I take up now seems to have lost his health, and I wouldn't wonder if he has lost his mind.

It looks like an inhuman way to treat men who volunteer their services to their country. There ought not to be any men turned loose without a dollar, in bad health; they at least should be sent home, and if there is anything that the Government can do after they get home to restore them to their former condition it ought to be done.

I shall be glad to hear from you on this subject, especially in respect to the case of Kennedy, and be kind enough to return Mrs. Kennedy's letter and other correspondence, and oblige,

Yours, very truly,

———.

This letter was written to Admiral Benson on the 9th of April and I have not yet had a reply. However, in a former letter from the admiral he stated that the boy had been discharged for inaptitude. My recollection is that he stated that the boy was nervous and could not function in the service, and because of the discharge he was not eligible to admission to the naval hospital.

I make this explanation because I suggested that I would put the correspondence in the RECORD in connection with my statement, but I have it not in my possession, as it is in the possession of Admiral Benson. As soon as I get the correspondence back I will ask permission to insert it all, including the letters from Mrs. Kennedy and Admiral Benson to me, and my own letters in connection with the case. I only rose for the purpose of apologizing for not having the correspondence in the RECORD.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I notice the bill provides for the clothing gratuity of officers and men of the Naval Reserve Force, not to exceed $150 for officers and $60 each for men. It is a fact that the Navy now provides that much?

Mr. PADGETT. The existing law provides that much. That is just under existing law.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Every officer that enters the Navy is allowed $150?

Mr. PADGETT. Not the Regular Navy. That is the Reserve.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The reason why I ask that is because it has been proposed to the Committee on Military Affairs to allow something like that in the Army. It is not done now.

Mr. PADGETT. The officers of the Navy get no such allowance, but those of the Reserve do. The law provides that in time of war, when they are serving in the war, they shall get an initial allowance of $150 or $160, whichever it is, and $60 for the men. That is on the theory that, coming in on an uncertainty and not knowing how long they may serve and how long they may be giving up their business, they are given that much that does not go to the regular officers.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. What does this cost the Government a year? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I can not state, because the Reserve has been growing very rapidly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the same provision exist as to the officers in the Aviation Service? Is there any provision for paying them for clothes?

Mr. PADGETT. If they are in the Reserve and have rank, they get the same as the others.

Instruments and supplies: Supplies for seamen's quarters; and for the purchase of all other articles of equipage at home and abroad; and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith and manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; all pilotage and towage of ships of war; canal tolls, wharfage, dock and port charges, and other necessary incidental expenses of a similar nature; services and materials in repairing, correcting, adjusting, and testing compasses on shore and on board ship; nautical and astronomical instruments and repairs to same; libraries for ships of war, professional books, schoolbooks, and papers; maintenance of gunnery and other training classes; compasses, compass fittings, including binnacles, tripods, and other appendages of ship's compasses; logs and other appliances for measuring the ship's way, and leads and other appliances for sounding; photographs, photographic instruments and materials, printing outfit and materials; and for the necessary civilian electricians for gyrocompass testing and inspection, $3,469,800.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that in line 1, page 9, there is a typographical error, the word "navy" being spelled "navay." Without objection, the Clerk will make the proper correction in the spelling of the word.

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have been criticized by some of my constituents on the ground that I am opposed to a large Navy. I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that in my remarks last year I stated emphatically I was not opposed to a Navy; but, on the contrary, coming from Florida, which is surrounded entirely by water except the northern border, of all the States in the Union we should be in favor of a large Navy. I opposed the naval bill last year because, as I stated, I did not believe it was a preparedness measure or a naval bill. This is not intended in the spirit of criticism of my colleagues who did not agree with me, especially the members of the Naval Committee. I said then, and I say now, I believe there should have been in the bill a time limit in which contracts should be completed. I made that statement because, to my mind, it is not conceivable that any business man would enter into a contract without having a time limit.

I also opposed the bill last year because I believed we should have more fast battle cruisers, submarines, and submarine destroyers. These could be built promptly, and it would take a

good many years to build superdreadnaughts. That my position was true in part was proven by the appropriations that we have since made of nearly $1,000,000,000 to construct smaller vessels. Of course, these are not fast battle cruiers, but the fast battle cruisers could have been turned into vessels for the purpose of carrying food and soldiers across the ocean.

I make this brief statement simply in order that my attitude in the future may not be misunderstood.

I also criticized the appropriation for the Naval Academy. I believed then and I believe now that we are spending too much money on each pupil at the Naval Academy, and I make this statement because of my 10 years' experience in educational work; but I shall not at this time fight or oppose this bill, nor shall I criticize it, because I realize that we are in this war and that we must win it regardless of the cost. I do believe, however, some day my colleagues and the members of the committee will investigate the cost of educating boys, both at the Naval Academy and at West Point, and that some reform may be made.

What I say now is not meant in a spirit of eulogy, but in the spirit of justice. A year ago, when it was not so popular as it is now, I stated that the Secretary of the Navy needed no eulogy at my hands, because I believed history would record him as one of the greatest Secretaries of the Navy the United States has ever had. I am glad that my view is now being agreed to by the press, and that he is receiving commendation instead of condemnation all over the country.

I make these few brief remarks, and shall not take up any more time, because I believe we should legislate and not talk, simply that my attitude last year may be thoroughly understood and not misunderstood, and also that anything I may say in the future will be consistent.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That upon the approval of this act all laws heretofore enacted by the Congress relating to the Naval Militia and the National Naval Volunteers be, and the same hereby are, repealed; that all members of the National Naval Volunteers are hereby automatically transferred to the class "the Naval Reserve," of the Naval Reserve Force, for general service, and confirmed in the rank, grade, or rating they now hold in the National Naval Volunteers, without examination, regardless of their being members of a State military force; that all members of the Naval Reserve Force shall be eligible for reenrollment in the rank, grade, or rating held on the termination of their last enrollment; that no enrollments or promotions shall be made in any rank or grade above that of lieutenant commander, except as herein otherwise provided.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order upon the paragraph. This paragraph and several following it——

Mr. PADGETT. All down to the middle of page 17.

Mr. WALSH. These paragraphs involve a reclassification, or the transfer apparently of some existing branches of the service into the Naval Reserve, and I think it is an opportune time for the chairman or some member of the committee to make a statement with reference to the items under discussion just to vary the monotony a little.

Mr. PADGETT. I shall be very glad, indeed, to explain this legislation. It runs down to the middle of page 17. Up to five or six years ago the Naval Militia existed purely as State organizations, without any Federal connection or Federal legislation. About four or five years ago the committee reported a bill to federalize the Naval Militia, and that was done, and it was organized and constituted a good body. There are at this time about 15,000 or 16,000 in the Naval Militia. The gentleman will bear in mind that under the Constitution the militia can not be sent abroad or to other countries, and the question was raised as to whether that applied to the Naval Militia, the general term in the Constitution being militia, and they being State organizations. So in order to avoid that, in the act of August 29, 1916, if I remember the statute, we enacted legislation creating the National Naval Volunteers, providing that in order to be federalized and to get the benefit of the Federal aid and help to the Naval Militia they must also become members of the National Volunteers. So when the President calls them into service as an organization in an emergency or in time of war he calls them not as the militia but as the National Naval Volunteers, they being members of that organization. There are two organizations running parallel. The State militia organization and officers were represented before the committee, and all of that legislation was congenial and sought and heartily approved by them.

We also established in the act of August 29, 1916, the Naval Reserve Force, consisting of six branches, with which the House is familiar, in order to have a force and to conserve the men who had served heretofore in the Navy and had gone out of the naval service, and also to have available the services of men who possessed seafaring experience and qualifications; and also others from civil life who would associate themselves into the Naval Reserve and be available if called into the naval service in case of war or emergency.

Now, that was started in the act of August 29, 1916. When this emergency came on, I may say, to the Congress belongs the credit of having established that organization, which was largely responsible for the salvation of the situation with the naval matters. We have now somewhere from 65,000 to 70,000 men in the Naval Reserve called into the active service and cooperating with the service, distributed around in the various ships and stations with the Regular Naval Establishments.

Now, we found ourselves in this condition: Here is the Naval Reserve that is running along, and right parallel with it is the Naval Militia and the National Naval Volunteers, forming that composite organization with a similar organization, similar work, similar duties, and costing extra expense.

The Naval Militia and the Naval Volunteers took up the question themselves of being incorporated into the Naval Reserve, where they will have to perform the same duties, the same functions, that they are now performing in this parallel and collateral organization of service. The result of it was that we cut out of the bill an appropriation that had been submitted in the estimates of $1,527,617 for administrative and other expenses for the maintenance of this Naval Militia and National Naval Volunteers by incorporating them into the Naval Reserve Force. The effect of this legislation is just to transfer that organization into and incorporate it with the Naval Reserves.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the chairman if it is the wish of these men to go abroad if necessary that they should go? They made that request?

Mr. PADGETT. They could go abroad as Naval Volunteers, but there is no use of three organizations—the Naval Reserves and Naval Volunteers and the Naval Militia—all of them in auxiliary service, all of them working along parallel lines.

The result is it has saved a million and a half dollars of appropriation. It meets their wishes. They were consulted, and this legislation was the result of conference and work of boards representing the Navy, the Naval Volunteers, and the Naval Militia.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. Is the legal status of men in the two organizations changed in any way by reason of the transfer to the Naval Reserve Force?

Mr. PADGETT. No; they are transferred with the same rank, the same rating, just incorporated into and become a part of the Naval Reserve. They asked it and are seeking it, and this legislation was worked out by a joint conference of the Navy and the Naval Volunteers.

Mr. WALSH. Will not the effect of it be, however, to eliminate, probably in the near future, the National Naval Volunteers?

Mr. PADGETT. It eliminates them at once when they are transferred.

Mr. WALSH. And also the State Naval Militia?

Mr. PADGETT. No; it does not interfere with the Naval Militia of a State organization, but the Federal Government cares and provides for them the facilities for training and all the help that has been afforded under the name of Naval Volunteers or Naval Militia. It will give them the same help and consideration that it gives them now under the name and organization of Naval Reserves.

Mr. WALSH. When the transfer is made they will be in the national service as Naval Reserves?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And their identity as Naval Militia will be lost, and they will not be transferred as a body but as individuals?

Mr. HUSTED. No; they will be transferred bodily.

Mr. WALSH. They lose their bodily identity.

Mr. PADGETT. Not as a State organization. They can still keep up the State organization as a Naval Militia, but they receive Federal help and recognition as members of the Naval Reserve.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman advise us what this language means, on page 12?—

Members of the Naval Reserve Force who have enrolled for general service and are citizens of the United States are eligible for membership in the Naval Reserve.

Mr. PADGETT. The act of August 29, 1916, created the Naval Reserve Force. Now, the Naval Reserve Force consisted of six subdivisions. The first is the Fleet Naval Reserve. I will read from the act:

There is hereby established under the Department of the Navy a Naval Reserve Force to consist of six classes designated as follows and as hereinafter designated: First, the Fleet Naval Reserve; second,

Naval Reserve; third, Naval Auxiliary Reserve; fourth, Naval Coast Defense Reserve; fifth, Volunteer Naval Reserve; sixth, Naval Reserve Flying Corps.

Now you come to the definitions. When you come to the Naval Reserve, it is "All former officers of the United States naval service, including midshipmen, who have left that service under honorable conditions, and those citizens of the United States who have been, or may be entitled to be, honorably discharged from the naval service after not less than one 4-year term of enlistment, or after a term of enlistment during minority, and who shall have enrolled in the Naval Reserve Force, shall be eligible for membership in the Fleet Naval Reserve.

When you come to the Naval Reserve, you will see that the law provides that members of the Naval Reserve force who have been or may be engaged in the seagoing profession and who have been enrolled for general service shall be eligible for membership in the Naval Reserve. That is the second clause. There is a little modification the gentleman will notice in this. All of the men who are in the Naval Militia have not been seafaring men, as, for instance, a city like Chicago or Philadelphia or many inland places upon the Lakes or from other places. They have had this Naval Militia, but they have not been strictly seagoing men, so that to incorporate them into the Naval Reserve the language is changed as to the eligibility of membership in the Naval Reserve by the language which the gentleman quoted, that men who are citizens of the United States, and so forth, and they must have citizenship. Then they must be qualified to become members of the Naval Reserve, but it eliminates that seafaring occupation as a prerequisite to membership.

Mr. WALSH. But it still requires a man to establish his qualification for the performance of duty aboard combatant ships.

Mr. PADGETT. Those are qualifications as to his moral character, as to his physical condition and fitness, and things of that kind to perform the duties.

Mr. WALSH. And past experience would neither militate against him nor work in his favor?

Mr. PADGETT. No. It is put in there for the very purpose of getting rid of the seafaring experience that was required, in order to enable these men to get into the service.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask one or two specific questions. I am a little confused yet as to this organization. The Naval Militia is not totally destroyed, then, by the creation of the Naval Volunteers?

Mr. PADGETT. Not as a State organization.

Mr. FESS. And that is still retained?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it would be still in the same fix as though Congress had simply repealed the law that was passed about five years ago federalizing the State militia. The State Naval Militia existed as State organizations for years before the Federal Government attempted to legislate or to have anything to do with them, and then we passed an act, I think about five years ago, to federalize them and organize them, bring them under the Federal help.

Mr. FESS. And the Naval Volunteers is made up of more than the Naval Militia?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. FESS. The Naval Militia is federalized to make the Naval Volunteers?

Mr. PADGETT. No. We had the Naval Militia federalized for two or three years before we passed the National Naval Volunteers act, but, as I stated a moment ago, the question arose as to whether the Naval Militia could be used except in our own territorial waters.

Mr. FESS. I understand that. I am trying to differentiate between the Naval Militia and the Naval Volunteers.

Mr. PADGETT. The whole thing is this: The membership is identical. The Naval Militia, in order to get the benefit of Federal legislation, must become members of the Naval Volunteers. When they become members of the Naval Volunteers they perform the same service as they would in the Naval Militia, but when the President calls them into the service he does not call the Naval Militia into the service, he calls the Naval Volunteers into the service, and they are called in as that organization, but the individuals that compose the two are the same.

Mr. FESS. If I should be asked what is the fighting ability and numbers of the Navy and undertook to designate, first, the Naval Militia, then by the Naval Volunteers, then by the Naval Reserves, what would be the fact? Such a question is frequently asked.

Mr. PADGETT. The Naval Militia and the Naval Volunteers are identical. The same persons that constitute one constitute the other. You would say, just as we do in the Navy, that we have so many enlisted men in the Navy, we have so many apprentice seamen in the Navy, we have so many enlisted in the Flying Corps of the Navy, we have so many in the Medical Corps of the Navy, we have so many in the Dental Corps of the Navy, and then you would say that we have so many in the Naval Reserve. We have now in the Naval Reserve between 65,000 and 70,000.

Mr. FESS. And in active service, how many? How many outside of the reserve? What is your naval equipment now in personnel?

Mr. PADGETT. There are about 304,000 men.

Mr. FESS. Including the reserve?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. That is what I am trying to get.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Take the paragraph on page 10. I think that will illustrate what runs through several other paragraphs. It provides:

That all laws heretofore enacted by Congress relating to the Medical Reserve Corps and Dental Reserve Corps be, and the same hereby are, repealed: *Provided*, That members of the Medical Reserve Corps and Dental Reserve Corps may be enrolled in the Naval Reserve Force in their present grades and ranks.

In referring to the act of August 29, 1916, I do not find any provision for the Dental Corps or the Medical Corps under the Naval Reserve forces. If we repeal that law, then we will have no law with regard to the Medical Corps or the Dental Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes; you would. The Medical Reserve Corps and the Dental Reserve Corps were created under other acts as a part of the reserve. When they are incorporated into it they become a part of the Naval Reserve Force. It is just simply an additional branch of that.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but if we repeal all of the laws covering those two we will have no law at all.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; you will. You will have the act of August 29, 1916, the reserve force that gives them all of their rights as a part and parcel of the Naval Reserve Force.

Mr. GOOD. But I do not find under the act of August 29 any provision regarding the Medical Corps or the Dental Reserve Corps in the Naval Reserve Force. That is provided for on pages 20 and 21 under the Medical Reserve Corps and Dental Reserve Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Where?

Mr. GOOD. But the provision in regard to the Naval Reserve Force——

Mr. PADGETT. What page is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. GOOD. Commencing on page 35 of the act.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman means the act of August, 1916?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but it simply gives them, or, rather, I should say, they just come bodily in and get the benefits of the Medical Reserve Corps just like the Flying Naval Reserve or the Naval Reserve or the Naval Auxiliary Reserve or all of these others. There is general legislation creating the reserve, and these men come into it and become a part of it, and they are incorporated in there with the same rank that they have now and then become a part of the Naval Reserve.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman may be right about that.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there is any conflict about it. There is no objection at all, and it has been all worked out.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. HUSTED. When this paragraph becomes effective the Naval Marine Corps Reserve and State organizations will still remain in existence and the National Naval Volunteers as an organization will pass out of existence?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUSTED. That is correct?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs I think has given a very comprehensive explanation of the provisions of the paragraph to which I reserve the point of order and also the following paragraph down to the middle of page 17 and as I understand they all relate to this transfer and the continuation, so to speak, of this force——

Mr. PADGETT. It is a simplification of them; it is consolidating into one three organizations.

Mr. WALSH. I have read its provisions very carefully and as the questions have been answered I think that the plan is worthy of adoption and I am therefore going to withdraw the point of order, and I would suggest to the Chairman that if there be any discussion of the matter that the Clerk might read

the paragraph to the middle of page 17 and debate be upon it as a whole.

Mr. PADGETT. I will be very glad to have that done. There are two verbal amendments which I wish to offer, and if we can read the whole as one paragraph, then I can offer those amendments.

Mr. WALSH and Mr. BUTLER. Then the gentleman had better ask permission.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment at the end of line 23, page 10.

Mr. PADGETT. As I said to the gentleman when he was talking to me a while ago in reference to his amendment, I would like to look into it and I will ask the gentleman if he will not withhold it and then I will ask to return to that paragraph.

Mr. GOOD. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. PADGETT. And then the gentleman can offer his amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee that he adopt the suggestion made by the gentleman from Massachuset s and read this as one paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. I am going to ask that.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to ask if it is possible under unanimous-consent agreement to defer the reading of these seven long pages of closely printed matter?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules of the House they have to be read; the House can do anything by unanimous consent, but it would be unusual.

Mr. PADGETT. I would not want to put in the RECORD that we waived the actual reading. I do not think that would be proper.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his point of order; and the gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be permit ed to read down to the middle of page 17, all the matter so read to be considered as one paragraph, and after it is read the part so read be open to amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

That all members of the National Naval Volunteers for aeronautic duties only are hereby transferred to the Naval Reserve Flying Corps, and that all members of the National Naval Volunteers of the Marine Corps branch are hereby transferred to the Marine Corps Reserve under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

That all laws heretofore enacted by Congress relating to the Medical Reserve Corps and Dental Reserve Corps be, and the same hereby are, repealed: *Provided*, That members of the Medical Reserve Corps and Dental Reserve Corps may be enrolled in the Naval Reserve Force in their present grades and ranks.

That the provisions of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1916, are hereby amended as follows:

Strike out that part of the fourth paragraph under the subcaption "Fleet Naval Reserve," which reads as follows: "Men enrolled in the Fleet Naval Reserve with less than 8 years' naval service shall be paid at the rate of $50 per annum, those with 8 or more years' and less than 12 years' naval service shall be paid at the rate of $72 per annum; and those with 12 or more years' naval service shall be paid at the rate of $100 per annum, such pay to be considered as retainer pay for the obligation on the part of such members to serve in the Navy in time of war or national emergency," and substitute therefor the following:

"The retainer pay of the enrolled men of the Fleet Naval Reserve shall be the same as for the enrolled men of the Naval Reserve and shall be computed in like manner: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall operate to reduce the retainer pay allowed by existing law to enlisted men who, after 16 years' or more naval service, are transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve," nor to deny to such enlisted men their privilege of retirement upon completing 30 years' naval service as now provided by law.

Strike out the first paragraph under the subcaption "Naval Reserve" and substitute the following:

"Members of the Naval Reserve Force who have enrolled for general service and are citizens of the United States are eligible for membership in the Naval Reserve. No person shall be enrolled in or transferred to this class unless he establishes satisfactory evidence as to his qualifications for duty on board combatant ships of the Navy."

That the age limits for the several ranks, grades, and ratings and on first enrollment in the Naval Reserve shall be as prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

That the minimum active service required for maintaining the efficiency of a member of the Naval Reserve shall be two months during each term of enrollment and an attendance at not less than 36 drills during each year, or other equivalent duty. The active service may be in one period or in periods of not less than 15 days each.

That the annual retainer pay of members of the Naval Reserve Force, except officers in the Naval Auxiliary Reserve, after confirmation in rank, grade, or rating, shall be the equivalent of two months' base pay of the corresponding rank, grade, or rating in the Navy, but the highest base pay upon which the retainer pay of officers of the Naval Reserve Force shall be computed shall not be greater than the base pay of a lieutenant commander. Service in the Navy, Marine Corps, National Naval Volunteers, and Naval Militia shall be counted as continuous service in the Naval Reserve Force, both for the purpose of retirement and of computing retainer pay: *Provided*, That no member of the Naval Reserve Force shall be eligible for retirement other than for physical disability incurred in line of duty until he has completed at least two continuous enrollments in the Naval Reserve Force: *Provided further*, That no retainer pay of any member of the Naval Reserve Force except those enlisted men transferred to the Fleet Naval Reserve after 16 or 20 or more years' naval service shall be in excess of the amount authorized to members having had 16 years' continuous service therein.

That in time of peace the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to order any member of the Naval Reserve Force, with his consent, who has been confirmed in his rank, grade, or rating, to perform any duty afloat for any period of time for which his services may be required: *Provided*, That such members may be relieved from duty by the Secretary of the Navy at any time and shall upon their own application be released from said duty within four months from the date of their application therefor.

That the uniform gratuity for the enlisted men of each class of the Naval Reserve Force shall be the same as that prescribed for enlisted men of the Navy, but in time of peace the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the portion of the clothing gratuity to be issued to such enlisted men of the Naval Reserve Force.

That in time of peace no member of any class of the Naval Reserve Force shall be entitled to retainer pay when assigned permanently to active duty.

That no part of the clothing gratuity credited to members of the Naval Reserve Force shall be deducted from their accounts where said members accept temporary appointments in the Navy in time of war or other national emergency.

That members of the Naval Reserve Force shall upon reaching the age of 64 years be disenrolled except that in time of war or other national emergency such members of the Naval Reserve Force, if in active service, may be continued therein during such period as the Secretary of the Navy may determine, but not longer than six months after said war or other national emergency shall cease to exist.

That no officer of any class of the Naval Reserve Force shall in time of peace be promoted above the grade of lieutenant commander, but in time of war or other national emergency officers of the Naval Reserve Force of and above the rank of lieutenant commander in active service shall be eligible for selection for promotion to the next higher grade or rank by the same board of officers that selects officers of the United States Navy for promotion to such higher ranks and grades, under the same rules and regulations as apply to the selection for promotion of officers of the United States Navy. The promotion of officers of the Naval Reserve Force below the rank of lieutenant commander shall at all times be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

That when on active duty officers of the Naval Reserve Force shall take precedence among themselves and with other officers of the naval service in their respective grades or ranks according to the dates of their commissions or provisional assignment of rank in the Naval Reserve Force: *Provided*, That all officers of the Naval Reserve Force of and above the rank of lieutenant commander shall rank with but after officers of the same rank or grade in the United States Navy, except that in time of war or other national emergency such officers of the Naval Reserve Force shall have a date of precedence with officers of the United States Navy as of the date of general mobilization, to be established by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That during the present emergency the date of precedence of all officers of the Naval Reserve Force shall be as prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

No officer of the Naval Coast Defense Reserve or officer of the Naval Reserve Flying Corps shall exercise command except within their particular department or service for the due performance of his respective duties.

Officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve Force when employed in active service, ashore or afloat, under the Navy Department shall receive the same pay and allowances as received by the officers and enlisted men of the Regular Navy of the same rank, grades, or ratings and of the same length of service, which shall include service in the Navy, Marine Corps, Naval Reserve Force, Naval Militia, and National Naval Volunteers.

That the unexpended and unobligated portion of all moneys heretofore appropriated, and the appropriation authorized by section 10 of Public No. 57, Sixty-third Congress, approved February 16, 1914, for the training and equipment of the Naval Militia and the National Naval Volunteers, for the clerical force and the office expenses of the Division of Naval Militia Affairs, and the property loaned by the Navy Department for the arming and equipping of the Naval Militia shall be, and hereby are, made available for training and equipping the Naval Reserve Force and for the purchase, rental, and maintenance of suitable armories therefor.

That the clerical force and office expenses provided for the Division of Naval Militia Affairs shall be transferred to the Bureau of Navigation.

Enrolled members of the Naval Reserve Force when in active service shall be subject to the laws, regulations, and orders for the government of the Regular Navy, and the Secretary of the Navy may, in his discretion, permit the members of the Naval Reserve Force to wear the uniform of their respective ranks, grades, or ratings while not in active service, and such members shall, for any act committed by them while wearing the uniform of their respective ranks, grades, or ratings, be subject to the laws, regulations, and orders for the government of the Regular Navy.

That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on page 11, line 22, after the word "reserve," I want to strike out the quotation marks.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. And on line 24, page 11, after the word "law," reinsert the quotation marks.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. On page 13, line 6, beginning with the word "until" and ending with the word "force," in line 8, I want to strike out these words: "until he has completed at least two continuous enrollments in the Naval Reserve Force."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 6, after the word "duty," strike out the following language: "until he has completed at least two continuous enrollments in the Naval Reserve Force."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of that amendment, I want to state, is this: You will notice that the proviso

is that "No member of the Naval Reserve Force shall be eligible for retirement other than for physical disability incurred in line of duty until he has completed at least two continuous enrollments in the Naval Reserve Force." Now, a man might enroll from civil life in the Naval Reserve Force and serve eight years and be eligible for retirement. Now, the striking out of those words will limit the right of retirement for disability incurred in the line of duty, and that language is adding to what they have under existing law, and I do not think that a man by enrolling for eight years——

Mr. BUTLER. Ought to be retired.

Mr. PADGETT. Should go on the retired list when in time of peace he has served two months a year for training purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Let us strike it out.

Mr. PADGETT. I think it ought to be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, then, on page 13, line 23, I want to strike out the words "enlisted men." I will send it up.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 23, strike out the words "enlisted men" and insert in lieu thereof the words "members other than officers."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. On page 14, line 2, I offer the following amendment. It is the same as the other one.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 2, strike out the words "enlisted men" and insert in lieu thereof the words "members other than officers."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state why he uses that particular language?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will state it. Heretofore we have had no persons serving in the Navy except men, persons of the masculine gender. Under the exigencies of this war they have taken some women into the service as "yeowomen." If this language is left "enlisted men" there might be a quibble as to the interpretation, and to avoid that, so that there will be no question as to the women to be paid for doing yeomen's clerical work, we change this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer another amendment, Mr. Chairman, on page 14, line 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 6, strike out the word "permanently" and insert after the word "duty" the words "for purposes other than training."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. On page 16, line 3, I offer another amendment about enlisted men. Strike out "enlisted men" and substitute the word "members."

Mr. BUTLER. We are amending this in some particulars so that no exception can be taken of this by members of the Naval Militia?

Mr. PADGETT. No. It is only taking out the words "enlisted men" and inserting "members other than officers" in order to care for the women who have been taken into the service.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FOSS. How many women have been taken into the service?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, doing clerical work in the Navy, there have been two or three hundred.

Mr. BUTLER. "Yeoettes" they call them.

Mr. FOSS. They are doing work here in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; they are doing work here in Washington and in other places.

Mr. BUTLER. Another question. On page 14 you make an amendment "for purposes," and so forth?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. Instead of the word "permanently," which might be construed the permanent Navy, this is "for purposes other than training," so that when they are serving simply for purposes of training they get the two months, as the gentleman will remember.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. When they are called into the general service, as in an emergency, they are to get the benefit provided by law.

Mr. BUTLER. I only asked the question because we all remember that this part of the bill is the result of much conference among the men in the service and the men in the Naval Militia. We are not changing it in any way against their interests.

Mr. PADGETT. There is one change that changes the substance, and that is where we strike out the language authorizing retirement after two enlistments, but they do not have that under existing law. That was incorporated here, and I do not think it should be. I do not take the responsibility for that, because it was not proper.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The substitution of "other than officers" for "enlisted men" is made only in this new part of the law?

Mr. PADGETT. That is all. It is here because they are taking into the Naval Reserve, not into the Navy, these "yeoettes," as they are called, or women.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, referring to page 17, I note that the Secretary of the Navy is given discretion to permit members of the Naval Reserve Force to wear the uniform of the Navy when not on active duty. I would like to ask why that is left in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy? I assume that under that provision he could grant permission to one individual and deny it to others.

Mr. PADGETT. No. It is under regulations prescribed for classes, not individuals.

Mr. HUSTED. Why is it left to the discretion of the Secretary? If it is a good thing to wear the uniform, why not give it to them outright?

Mr. PADGETT. They might want to wear it on special occasions, for instance, in celebrations. It might not be desirable in time of peace that they should wear their uniforms on all occasions and be confused with the men who are regularly in the service, but upon special occasions, under general regulations, for instance, a reunion, or something of that kind, then it could be done.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman permit me to direct his attention to a typographical error on line 6 of page 17? In the spelling of the word "respective" it is spelled "recpective."

Mr. PADGETT. I am glad that the gentleman calls attention to that, because in the print I have it is spelled correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not spelled correctly in the print that the Clerk has?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that it be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. With reference to this matter of members of the reserve force wearing the uniform when not in service, why is this permitted at all? It is not done in the Army, is it?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand that the members of the reserve force of the Army when not in service are not permitted to wear the uniform.

Mr. PADGETT. I can not say about the Army, because I do not know.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Was there any special reason for this provision?

Mr. PADGETT. I can see where, under regulations that apply generally, there might be occasions when these men would come to celebrate some public day or some event, or something of that kind, when they should come as the naval reserve in their uniforms. I do not see any harm in it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Was this asked for by the department or by the members of the reserve?

Mr. PADGETT. It is asked for by both. This bill was framed by the department and by the Naval Reserve people, the Naval Militia and the Naval Volunteers working together. It is a coordinated bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval training station, California: Maintenance of naval training station, Yerba Buena Island, Cal.: Labor and material; buildings and wharves; general care, repairs, and improvements of grounds, buildings, and wharves; wharfage, ferriage, and street car fare; purchase and maintenance of live stock and attendance on same; wagons, carts,

implements, and tools, and repairs to same, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle to be used only for official purposes; fire engines and extinguishers; gymnastic implements, models, and other articles needed in instruction of apprentice seamen; printing outfit and materials and maintenance of same; heating and lighting; stationery, books, schoolbooks, and periodicals; fresh water, and washing; packing boxes and materials; and all other contingent expenses; maintenance of dispensary building; lectures and suitable entertainments for apprentice seamen; in all, $225,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Nothing can be grander in this world than to fight the battles of liberty. Nothing can be more glorious than to fight in defense of one's country, especially when that country is America—America of proud history and historic origin. Born in a struggle, nurtured in an atmosphere of independence, our forefathers wrung from the hands of British tyranny the unhindered right to be free. All of our national life we have been an independent people, but that independence had to be won on the field of carnage by warriors grim, and having been won it must be maintained, even at the point of the bayonet. No liberty has ever been won by an indifferent people, and no liberty will ever be maintained by an indifferent people. All progress comes through struggle, and in this way only may we achieve.

We are engaged in a contest in which autocracy, avarice, and brutality are pitted against democracy, liberty, and humanity. The Kaiser has sought to place a helmet of despair upon the free peoples of earth, but the mask has been torn away, and his sinister purposes have been revealed. The President has stated our unselfish aims, and the pathway is clear. The issues are unclouded. No American wants to turn back. The course, with all its tremendous issues, leads forward, not backward, upward, not downward, to the rising and not to the setting sun. All other issues must and will be subordinated to the one great task of winning the war in the shortest possible time. All of these matters have been fully discussed in this body, and it would be useless for me to enter into a discussion of the causes of our enforced entry into a conflict that was not of our own choosing.

But I would call your attention to another and newer, though not less important, problem of this war; that is, to the reeducation and retraining of those who are injured in this great struggle. For the first time in all our glorious history we are beginning to think in concrete terms of the returned soldier in the aftermath. Picture in your mind the soldier who goes to the front. Lifting up his eyes he has caught a larger vision of justice for the oppressed peoples of earth and has woven this dream into a conviction. Clinging to this ideal, he bids good-by to his native land with its rocks and hills, its vales and its mountains, its springs, its rivulets, and its rivers. Its pleasant associations and its old home ties he leaves behind. He bids good-by to mother, to wife, to sweetheart, and with a wave of the hand he joins his fellow soldiers, crosses the sea, and proves his devotion to that ideal. Inspired by that hope he cheerfully faces the machine gun, endures the weariness, and undergoes the hardships indescribable. He hears the roar of the cannon, the sharp crack of the rifle, the thundering tread of horsemen. He faces death in a thousand forms, fighting for the greatest Republic that was ever fashioned by human intelligence on this or any other continent since time's auspicious beginning—aye, more, struggling for the triumph of justice for all time and which shall be to all peoples. Finally, in going over the top he loses an arm or leg or a fragment of shell crashes into his body. He would fight on. The spirit is unbroken, but the body falters. He is taken to the rear, and others carry on the struggle to victory. With a thrill of joy he hears of the final triumph.

The foe has been crushed. The Army returns with bands playing and colors flying, and with the world freed from militarism. The country applauds. The citizens turn out en masse to do the soldiers honor, and to crown them with cheers. After the wild music of the parade, the crowds disperse and return to their respective vocations. The soldiers disband. Sad to say, many of them are crippled for life. They are unable to fill their accustomed stations. They face a future of enforced inactivity. If neglected they will become morose, melancholy, and despondent. Man can not live by cheers alone. Used to active life, their spirits long for a place of usefulness. Having fought the world's greatest battle in the conflict of war, they want a real part in the warfare of peace.

To meet this great problem and to lighten in a measure the burdens of those who have willingly suffered that liberty might live, France, England, Canada, and other countries have established vocational schools for the reeducation and retraining of the crippled soldier.

In many instances the returned soldier can no longer do the character of work in which he was engaged when his country called. The purpose of these schools is to refit him for any character of work which in his changed circumstances he is capable, or may be made capable, of performing. I can conceive of no greater sorrow that could come to a man than to be deprived of his accustomed vocation, and yet be unequipped for any other calling. A pension, compensation, insurance money—none of these will satisfy the human longing of an active man to be a real part of life. These are all good. These are all necessary. But the greatest joy that can be brought into a life of this kind is the conscious knowledge of being able to do some useful work, of having a part, though it be a small part, in the commercial fabric and onward progress of this country.

Perhaps Canada has done more than any other country for her injured soldiers, at least she was the first to establish these institutions on a national scale. The success has been marvelous. She has a central authority, a military-hospitals commission, which operates a group of hospitals. The retraining is supervised by what is known as the vocational branch of this commission in connection with departments of education in the different Provinces, thus forming an elastic system. There is a district officer in each Province or group of Provinces who examines the disabled soldier, and if he is unable to return to his work refers him to a training board, of which such district officer, a medical officer, and a vocational committeeman are the constituent members. This board submits a report and recommendation to the military-hospitals commission at Ottawa for approval. If approved the ex-soldier is entered for a course of training and is given a monthly cash allowance.

The length of this training depends upon his condition, mental and physical, his nationality, previous education or training, his adaptability, temperament, desire, and the industrial needs of the country. During this training period single men are furnished board, lodging, laundry, and $8 per month. If a man has a wife or children he is given an extra allowance; all of this in addition to his pension, or compensation as it would be called in this country.

The Province of Alberta has perhaps surpassed all others. A great many have been trained there and hundreds are now in school. Dr. James Miller, district vocational officer, declares that 5 per cent of the total assigned to these schools will ultimately be sent to permanent soldiers' homes, but that the remaining 95 per cent can be rendered capable of some character of useful work. This percentage is based upon those accepted after a survey. However, a noted authority, who has long made a study of this problem—for it must be remembered that there are a few magnificent spirits in this world who have devoted their lives to this problem—declares that of the wounded who take training 40 per cent may be restored with proper training to as great a degree of efficiency in different lines of occupation as they possessed in their chosen calling prior to their injury; that 25 per cent may be measurably restored so that their work will be of considerable value both to themselves and to the community, and so that in many instances they may be made self-supporting; that approximately 20 per cent may be assisted in such a way as to enable them to be of some useful service, and thus not be a complete burden to themselves. Thus 85 per cent, according to this authority, of those who are unfortunate enough to be injured in the struggle in which we are engaged may be helped by a process of training. It would be criminal to neglect or delay a work of this character. It must be remembered, however, that of the wounded only about 20 per cent need vocational training, the remaining ones being able, after treatment, to return to their former work.

In the Province of Alberta there are several schools, about one-half of which are in connection with the military hospital. The men are trained to be masters in their trades. Temporary trades are discouraged, and those are encouraged that will probably be most useful in the aftermath of civilian life. About one-tenth are taking to farming or to some form of agricultural work.

Of course, the first treatment is given in the base hospitals in France, but if his injury is such as to prevent his entering war service again, the injured soldier is transported as soon as possible to his native land for a period of recuperation. Those engaged in the work declare that it is very important that the period of training begin as soon as the patient begins to recuperate; that the zest of learning and of doing something to occupy his mind produces a physical reaction that is very beneficial to the disabled soldier and is a very material aid to his recovery. The preliminary training is all important, as otherwise during the months of enforced idleness mental deterioration affects the physical being and hinders and retards recovery. The mind gradually loses its alertness and activity, until it is almost impossible for the injured person to do either mental or physical work of any appreciable kind or character. On the other hand, it is said that those who take the training become

very enthusiastic over their work and over their accomplishments, and in one Province have adopted a bit of doggerel expressive of their attitude, as follows:

Its a long trench that has no turning,
A piffling wage that takes no earning.
And a lazy loon that wants no learning.

Many men who have gone through this process of reeducation and vocational training are holding more lucrative positions than they held prior to their entering military life.

A lumberman, 42 years of age, had his right leg crushed, took training, passed the civil-service examination, and now draws $2,000 in a position with the Canadian customs.

A locomotive fireman returned without his left arm, studied telegraphy, and now has charge of the Canadian Pacific Railway station at $125 per month.

A youth without previous business experience has become principal of a western school.

An Alberta bulletin announces that of 17 West Indians who took training, 9 of whom had both legs off and 8 of whom had lost a foot, several became shoemakers, three garment makers, one a tinsmith, one a chauffeur, and one a stenographer, and all of them are self-supporting.

The military hospitals commission in one of its bulletins states that it—

Will not rest content until every soldier disabled in his country's service has recovered the utmost possible degree of power and energy for success in civilian life. Every man must be enabled to serve his country still in a position profitable both to it and to him—a position, too, in which his restored capacity will be fully employed.

In England, St. Dustin's Hospital for blind soldiers and sailors teaches typewriting, leather work, basket work, rug work, and poultry keeping. Those who have more than one limb gone may secure industrial training at Queen Mary's, at Brighton, and at Queen Mary's Auxiliary Hospital, at Roehampton. There is a similar institution at Kelso, Scotland. The convalescent period is spent at Brighton, and the artificial limbs, their fitting and use, are to be had at Roehampton. At first there was a disposition to want to establish colonies of cripples, but it was soon found that it was better both for the disabled soldiers and the community that they should mix and mingle with the other men and be woven into the fabric of the business community. England, with her 600,000 crippled soldiers at the beginning of this year, would have been in a sad plight but for her forethought in the work of rehabilitation.

In France the Zander methods of treatment of stiff limbs and deformities and the substitution of machine for hand manipulation has for some time been used. This system has now been modified so that a curative treatment is applied with a definite view to the physical effort required in the occupation the man hopes to assume. There are now more than 70 reeducational establishments in France, most of which receive a Government subsidy as well as support from municipal authorities and private subscriptions.

Grand Plais has nearly 3,000 beds, electrical treatment, whirlpool baths, massage, medicinal exercises, and other treatments incident thereto. In one month 420 men returned to active service in the Army from this institution who would otherwise probably have been disabled. St. Maurice is another important institution. At first the French work was directed by several different heads, but it was found wise to unite all, and now there is a single head officer known as the "office national." They now keep a registry of every disabled soldier. Before leaving the hospital a blank is filled showing his injury, previous training, his dependents, aptitude for retraining, and other information.

At the Anglo-Belgium Hospital, at Rowen, the apparatus required was for the most part manufactured in the workshops by the disabled soldiers themselves. They have accommodations for 1,200 men. Forty-three different trades are taught including bookkeeping, shorthand, typewriting, telegraphy, molding in clay, wood carving, drawing, designing, painting, manufacturing of motor vehicles, electrical machinery, tinsmithing, plumbing, tailoring, poultry farming, fur curing, and numerous other trades. The great institution is not only self-supporting but has paid back to the Belgium Government the entire cost of installation. The institution was so located that many of the articles needed by the countries at war could be furnished, and thus a double purpose accomplished. While in the workshops the men are still mobolized and under military discipline, and when a man has become efficient and able to earn a living he is allowed to take his discharge on condition that he first take three months' furlough and has suitable employment or work of his own to do.

The Anglo-Belgium Hospital feeds the Vernon establishment, which is an institution where real work is performed. How much better it is to make useful men out of those who are unfortunate enough to be injured in the service than to leave them to their own loneliness and suffering or to send them to soldiers' homes.

I have introduced a bill calling for the establishment of a Federal board for vocational retraining and providing a plan of cooperation between the State and National Governments in the establishment of institutions for vocational retraining in all the States of the American Union. These institutions would be useful not only for the period of the war and for the training of the soldiers who are injured in the war but if thought advisable they could then be transformed into vocational educational institutions of a permanent nature in this country, a phase of our business life that has already been neglected too long.

I am glad to say that in recognition of the need which this situation presents, Hon. William C. Gorgas, the Surgeon General, has established hospitals in a number of the different cities of this country and is undertaking to affiliate them with some of the industrial activities of the country in such a way as to give, to a degree, vocational training. This is a laudable undertaking, but the question is so extensive in its scope and so limitless in its possibilities that it should be organized on a very great and complete scale, and the Surgeon General's efforts should be supplemented in every possible way. The genius and intelligence of the best business minds of the country should cooperate in this great work. Provision should be made first for the restoration to health wherever practicable and to as great a degree as possible; second, provision should be made for the best training facilities of every kind and character; and, third, a full and complete effort should be made to secure employment for the soldier as soon as his period of training has elapsed. The discharge of the disabled soldier from military service should not occur when unfit for further military service, as has been our custom, but when made as fit as possible to resume the place and position of a civilian, and to have a part in the economy of the things that are to be.

This is a problem that is medical, educational, and industrial. It is far more than this. It embraces all those phases, and in addition thereto embodies the larger and more important question of increasing the industrial efficiency of the Nation. The question of taking care of our national life after the storm of war shall have passed and destruction shall have wrought its havoc will be a pressing one. After the war competition will be keen, and democracy will be put to another test, the taking care of all its citizens and the protecting of their legal rights throughout the world, to the end that there may be a permanent peace founded on justice. By this course of training life will be made worth living to the brave spirits that have given the full measure of devotion to the cause of human liberty.

This is not a matter of charity but a question of simple justice. We are learning to appreciate more and more in this land that a man's property, to which he has title, is not his alone, but is his subject to the rights of the Government of which he is a part, and to which he must look for protection not only for that property but for himself. In the years that are to come no man should have the right to enjoy property that has been safeguarded and protected by any man who has been disabled in the fight to protect his neighbors' rights until the Government has provided that the one making the sacrifice has the best done for him that money and training and kindly interest can procure. The kind of compensation which simply enables a man, through the medium of money, to keep the wolf from the door is but poor compensation, indeed, for the loss of an eye or the shattering of a limb, especially if by the proper course of training that man may be lifted out of a state of possible gloom and made capable of doing useful service. This transformation from a disabled condition to a state of usefulness will also help to solve an industrial problem that might become a burden upon the public.

After the war rehabilitation will not only be needed for the manhood of the country, but for the destruction wrought by the war, and the best energy and the best minds that our country can produce will be brought to bear in the solution of these great problems.

We are fighting the greatest war of all history, settling issues of terrible moment and after a terrible fashion. We are being forged in the fires of a new world relationship, whose ultimate objects shall one day be attained. To the accomplishment of our declared purposes our people are committed; they understand its sacrifices and have caught its militant spirit. From housetop to hilltop, from the factory to the farm, from the Atlantic to the Pacific this great country, cleft by flowing rivers and framed in eternal hills, is ablaze with patriotism to-day,

its one supreme purpose being to achieve a victory and to weave that victory into the fabric of a just and lasting peace. Surely those who are injured in a cause like this should be cared for regardless of cost. All they ask is an opportunity, and that much they have a right to demand. America, with the rich experience that has been crowded into the brief span of her existence, can not afford to do less. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval training station, Great Lakes: Maintenance of naval training station: Labor and material; general care, repairs, and improvements of grounds, buildings, and piers; street car fare; purchase and maintenance of live stock, and attendance on same; motor-propelled vehicles, wagons, carts, implements, and tools, and repairs to same, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, and one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle to be used only for official purposes; fire apparatus and extinguishers; gymnastic implements; models and other articles needed in instruction of apprentice seamen; printing outfit and material, and maintenance of same; heating and lighting, and repairs to power-plant equipment, distributing mains, tunnel, and conduits; stationery, books, schoolbooks, and periodicals; washing; packing boxes and materials; lectures and suitable entertainments for apprentice seamen; and all other contingent expenses: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, shall not exceed $6,000; in all, naval training station, Great Lakes, $725,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs if it is not his intention to insert certain committee amendments that apply to the Great Lakes Training Station or if it is his intention to take them up later?

Mr. PADGETT. They come under the head of public works.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval War College, Rhode Island: For maintenance of the Naval War College on Coasters Harbor Island, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes; and care of grounds for same, $35,250; services of a professor of international law, $2,000; services of civilian lecturers, rendered at the War College, $300; care and preservation of the library, including the purchase, binding, and repair of books of reference and periodicals, $1,300: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, inspection, drafting, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, shall not exceed $22,500; in all, Naval War College, Rhode Island, $38,850.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee concerning the provision in line 19, page 20, of $2,000 for the services of a professor of international law. How much time does the professor give—evidently not all of his time?

Mr. PADGETT. Not all of it. That appropriation has been carried in the bill for a long time. Heretofore this professor delivered lectures at the War College to the officers upon international law. Now, under war conditions the officers are not there, but he is doing the same work by correspondence with the officers on duty elsewhere.

Mr. FESS. That is satisfactory. Of course, $2,000 would not get a very high-class man if he gave all of his time.

Mr. PADGETT. This has been carried for years at that amount. He does not devote all of his time to it.

Mr. FOSS. I wish to ask a question about the preceding paragraph, about schools and camps of instruction. Is that a new proposition?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. FOSS. It has been in the bill before?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes. With the war going on and the number of recruits and reserves, and so forth, this is for their training and development.

Mr. FOSS. How many schools and camps for instruction have we now?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. We have the regular ones at the Great Lakes, and at San Francisco, and at Newport News, and at Newport, R. I.

Mr. FOSS. And at Jamestown?

Mr. PADGETT. Jamestown, Norfolk, Charleston, Pelham Bay, N. Y., Philadelphia, and every place where they can get men together and train them.

Mr. FOSS. They have been increasing the number of them during the last year, have they?

Mr. PADGETT. Since the war broke out?

Mr. FOSS. But prior to that?

Mr. PADGETT. Prior to that we appropriated only $30,000 a year for summer training. Now we are appropriating nearly two million and three-quarter dollars for the training of all these thousands of men who are coming in.

Mr. FESS. You are utilizing a good many institutions that are not purely governmental also, like the Dunwoodie Institution?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; they are contributing very generously, by making available their grounds and resources.

Mr. FESS. Such as the School of Technology at Boston, the Dunwoodie Institution at Minneapolis, and others. I notice that those are being used.

Mr. PADGETT. The University of Chicago has been very generous, and the State University of Ohio, and various places of that kind.

Mr. BRITTEN. According to the testimony of Admiral Palmer when he was before the committee, we have also students at Hawaii, at the Asiatic station, and in the West Indies, and wherever we have a patrol station.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; wherever we have them they are training the men and developing them.

The Clerk read as follows:

The rank and title of major general of the Marine Corps is hereby created, and the President is authorized to nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint one major general of the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may finish the reading of all this proposed amendment of the act, and then that I may offer several amendments, without interrupting the reading.

Mr. BRITTEN. I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee a question. This is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. BUTLER. What pages is it proposed to read?

Mr. PADGETT. Beginning on page 22 and ending with line 10, on page 29.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee, chairman of the committee, asks unanimous consent that all the bill, from page 23, line 25, down to line 10, page 29, be read without interruption, after which time amendments may be offered to any part of the bill so read. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the said act of May 22, 1917, Statutes at Large, volume 40, page 85, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the word "lieutenant" in lines 5 and 14 of section 4 thereof, and substituting therefor the words "lieutenant commander" and adding at the end of section 4 the following proviso: *Provided further*, That based on the temporary increase of enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps herein authorized, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized, in his discretion, temporarily to appoint not exceeding 4 captains and 7 commanders in the Navy selected for promotion under provisions of existing law; and 3 brigadier generals, 12 colonels, and 12 lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps; said temporary appointments shall continue in force only until otherwise directed by the President or until Congress shall amend or repeal the same and not later than six months after the termination of the present war; by striking out the words "commissioned warrant officers, warrant officers, and" in lines 14 and 15 of section 5 thereof; and by inserting after the semicolon in line 31 of section 5, the following: "*Provided further*, That temporary appointments as chief warrant officers may be made by the President, with the consent of the Senate," so that said sections, as amended, will read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Additional commissioned officers in the Navy and Marine Corps, based upon the temporary increases herein authorized in the number of enlisted men, shall be temporarily appointed by the President, in his discretion, with the advice and consent of the Senate, not above the grades and ranks of lieutenant commander in the line and staff of the Navy and major in the Marine Corps, the distribution in said grades and ranks to be made in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916: *Provided*, That all temporary original appointments shall be made in the lowest commissioned grades of the line and staff of the Navy and Marine Corps, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, and that there shall be no permanent or temporary appointments in or permanent or temporary promotions to any grade or rank above that of lieutenant commander in the Navy or major in the Marine Corps by reason of the temporary appointment of officers authorized by this act in excess of the total number of officers authorized by existing law or on account of the increase of enlisted men herein authorized: *Provided further*, That, during the period of the present war, the deficiency existing prior to the passage of this act in the total number of commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps authorized by the act of August 29, 1916, may also be supplied by temporary appointments in the lowest grades and by temporary promotions to all other grades until a sufficient number of officers shall be available for regular appointment or promotion in accordance with existing law: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be held or construed to limit or abridge the use or service of the officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list or of the officers of the Naval Militia and National Naval Volunteers, Naval Reserve Force, and Marine Corps Reserve, as provided and authorized under existing law: *Provided further*, That temporary chaplains and temporary acting chaplains in the Navy may be appointed for service during the period of the war in the promotion of the personnel of the Navy as now prescribed by existing law: *Provided further*, That, based on the temporary increase of enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps herein authorized, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized, in his discretion, temporarily to appoint not exceeding 4 captains and 7 commanders in the Navy selected for promotion under provisions of existing law; and 3 brigadier generals, 12 colonels, and 12 lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps; said temporary appointments shall continue in force only until otherwise directed by the President or until Congress shall amend or repeal the same and not later than six months after the termination of the present war.

"SEC. 5. That the additional temporary officers authorized in the various grades and ranks of the Navy and Marine Corps in accordance with the next preceding section may be temporarily appointed to serve in the grades or ranks to which appointed or promoted by the temporary advancement of officers holding permanent and probationary commissions, by temporary appointment of commissioned warrant officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Navy, and warrant officers, noncommissioned officers, and clerks to assistant paymasters of

the Marine Corps, commissioned and warrant officers of the United States Coast Guard, citizens of the United States who have had previous naval or military service or training, and other citizens of the United States specially qualified: *Provided*, That in making appointments authorized herein the maximum age limit shall be 50 years for enlisted men to ensign, enlisted men of the Navy to warrant rank, candidates for assistant surgeon, noncommissioned officers of the Marine Corps to commissioned rank, members of the Marine Corps branch of the Naval Militia and National Naval Volunteers, Marine Corps Reserve, and civilians specially qualified to commissioned rank, and warrant officers of the active list of the Marine Corps appointed to commissioned rank, and temporary chaplains and temporary acting chaplains: *Provided further*, That graduates of the Naval Academy and warrant officers duly commissioned in the Navy or Marine Corps in accordance with existing law shall not, by virtue of this act, be required to receive temporary appointments; and the class of midshipmen graduated from the Naval Academy on March 29, 1917, and the classes to be graduated hereby may be commissioned effective from date of graduation: *Provided further*, That temporary appointments as warrant officers of the Navy may be made by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That temporary appointments as chief warrant officers may be made by the President with the consent of the Senate: *Provided further*, That lieutenants (junior grade) and ensigns may be considered eligible for temporary promotions to the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade), respectively, without regard to length of service in grade."

That hereafter the Chief of Naval Operations shall receive the allowances which are now or may hereafter be prescribed by or in pursuance of law for the grade of general in the Army, and the officers of the Navy holding the rank and title of admiral and vice admiral in the Navy while holding such rank and title shall receive the allowances of a general and lieutenant general of the Army, respectively. And hereafter chiefs of bureaus of the Navy Department, including the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, shall, while so serving, have corresponding rank and shall receive the same pay and allowances as are now or may hereafter be prescribed by or in pursuance of law for chiefs of bureaus of the War Department and the Judge Advocate General of the Army.

That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to reduce the pay or allowances now authorized by law for any commissioned, warrant, or appointed officer or any enlisted man of the active or retired lists of the Navy, and all laws inconsistent with the provisions of this section are hereby repealed.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I will not consume the five minutes, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a few short remarks made by Food Commissioner Hoover to the Hotel Men's Association in response to their pledging their whole-hearted support to the maintenance of a wheatless program until the end of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I could not understand what the remarks were.

Mr. ELSTON. Short remarks made by Mr. Hoover, who met the National Hotel Men's Association, in response to the chairman of that association pledging their whole-hearted support to the maintenance of a wheatless program until the end of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer several amendments. First, I want to offer one on page 22, line 18, to strike out the word "section" and in lieu thereof to insert the words "and second section."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 18, strike out the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof "and second section."

Mr. PADGETT. I want to insert "first and second sections," because we are amending both the first and the second sections.

The amendment was considered and agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. On page 23, line 12, at the beginning of the line, insert "Section 2."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 12, before the word "that" insert "Section 2."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. In line 14, page 23, strike out the words "thirty thousand to fifty thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "seventeen thousand four hundred to seventy-five thousand five hundred."

I want to state to the committee that the effect of that amendment is to increase the enlisted personnel of the Marine Corps from 30,000 to 75,500, on account of the word we have received from abroad and the request of Gen. Pershing and the Secretary of War that additional marines be sent abroad. As we have a number of highly trained marines ready to send, it is the purpose and intention of the Navy Department to comply with that request, and it becomes necessary to grant an additional increase. This is a committee amendment that was agreed to unanimously without any opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his amendment again?

Mr. PADGETT. In line 14 strike out the words "thirty thousand to fifty thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "seventeen thousand four hundred to seventy-five thousand five hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 14, strike out the words "thirty thousand to fifty thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "seventeen thousand four hundred to seventy-five thousand five hundred.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman why he inserts "17,400"?

Mr. PADGETT. Seventeen thousand four hundred is the permanent strength of the Marine Corps.

Mr. FOSS. That is, the Marine Corps will go back to that after the war?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; that is what we will go back to after the war, unless there is subsequent legislation changing it.

Mr. FOSS. What is the temporary increase at the present time?

Mr. PADGETT. Thirty thousand; and those are the words used here. But as it is a temporary increase, that temporary increase should be made from the basis of the permanent increase, and as it was phrased in the bill as reported it was increasing it from a temporary increase, and that increase should be based on the permanent strength.

Mr. FOSS. So that at the present time we have really a temporary increase of 12,600?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the parts of the bill to which I called the attention of the House when I urged expedition this forenoon. It will not be out of place, perhaps, to say here that we hope within 30 days the marines may be increased on the fighting line in France to a division of men. [Applause.] Therefore it becomes necessary to ask for this increase in order that the wastage may be taken care of. A division, as I understand, will mean about 28,000 men. We will have to have replacements, so that when casualties occur we will have a supply to draw from immediately. When the marines go, let me say to the House—and I am willing to have this appear in the RECORD—they will go thoroughly equipped. They will take men who have been trained for months under the cannon fire, what is known as barrage. These men will leave America directly for the front, with no other training, and, as my friend from Illinois [Mr. Foss] suggests, there is a lot of them over there now.

Mr. BRITTEN. Right on the firing line.

Mr. BUTLER. Right on the fighting line. Therefore I think that the Naval Affairs Committee of the House was justified, in view of what the chairman of our committee has said and what I am now saying, in asking for expedition in the passage of this bill. These men must be supplied and supplied at once. Let me further say to this committee that during the month of May they will have no trouble whatever in enlisting 10,000 marines. Let me say further, for the information of the committee, that thousands and thousands of men are standing waiting to be enlisted in the Marine Corps, men of the highest order and character to be found in America. Unless we can have this legislation and authorize headquarters to take these men we will be at a disadvantage.

When these marines go to Europe they will take with them 2,000 expert riflemen; they will take with them a class of men 92 per cent of whom are sharpshooters. Furthermore, when they go they will take their own flying machines. We want to see this body of expert soldiers in Europe immediately, and that is the reason why I ask for expedition. [Applause.]

I want this committee to know the reason why I asked for expedition, and I have now given it. You may expect good results from these men who have been trained, some of them one year, some six, and some eight.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman ought to be commended.

Mr. BUTLER. And following up what my young friend from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] said the other day, it all appears now plain why they have not gone. They were waiting for Gen. Pershing to make the statement that he desired them to put among his own men, and they will all be soldiers, when they reach there, in Pershing's Army. The chairman of this committee has stated that Gen. Pershing has asked for them. He has asked for many more, and now let me say to you that they will fully sustain the reputation that the American people have given to this corps for 140 years and more. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to revise his remarks, and that will give him authority to cut out such parts as he desires. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an opportune time to say just a few words about some of the officers of the

Marine Corps and the corps generally. My good friend and colleague on the committee, Mr. BUTLER, has always stood for that which the Marine Corps desired, morning, noon, and night. The committee, generally, I think, is almost unanimously for anything the Marine Corps wants.

I want to call to the attention of the House a little incident that occurred the other day when I left Chicago. A young man stepped up to me in one of the big garages, where I was getting my car out to send down here, and he said, "Mr. BRITTEN, I think I shall go back into the Marine Corps." He was a young mechanic about the garage. And I said, "Back into the Marine Corps?" He said, "Yes; I think I shall go back into the Marine Corps, and if I go back, will you help me get under Col. Butler?"

I said, "Do you know Col. Butler?" He said, "Yes; I have fought under him, and there is not a man in the country I would rather go to Europe under than Col. Butler." Mr. Chairman, that same Col. Smedley Butler is none other than the distinguished son of a distinguished father, my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTLER. [Applause.]

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The fourth precinct in the city of Yankton, S. Dak., which is the city in which I live, has 240 voters. To show how they have subscribed to the third liberty loan, I send to the desk the following telegram and ask that it be read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

YANKTON, S. DAK., *April 19, 1918.*

Hon. C. H. DILLON,
Washington, D. C.:

Fourth precinct, city of Yankton, voting population 240 individuals. Subscribers to third liberty loan, 313; total subscription, $70,400; allotment, $35,000. We challenge any precinct in the United States to beat the number of subscribers for precinct population.

WM. J. FANTLE.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, strike out all of lines 21, 22, 23, and 24 and in lieu thereof insert the following: "The rank and title of major general is hereby created in the Marine Corps, and the President is authorized to nominate and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to appoint one major general, who shall at all times be junior in rank to the major general commandant; and also one temporary major general in the Marine Corps who shall at all times be junior to the permanent major general."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer another amendment. I will have to give it to the Clerk. Page 24, line 11, strike out the word "three" and substitute "six." That gives six temporary brigadiers general instead of three.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 11, strike out the word "three" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. This is only temporary?

Mr. PADGETT. It is temporary for the war and six months thereafter. The existing law provides that all of these temporary officers must go out not exceeding six months after the termination of the war.

Mr. BUTLER. I just wanted to hear the gentleman say it again, that is all.

Mr. PADGETT. I have put it in here time and again.

Mr. BUTLER. I like to hear it.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer the following amendment: Page 24, line 12, strike out the word "twelve," before the word "colonels," and insert "twenty-two."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 12, before the word "colonels," strike out the word "twelve" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-two."

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether he thinks we have not plenty of colonels?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not with the increased——

Mr. BUTLER. My question was this: Does the gentleman think we have plenty of colonels? and the answer was, "No; we have not."

Mr. PADGETT. No; I said we had not, authorized by existing law. I took up this matter yesterday with Gen. Barnett, and this is not one-third of what they would be if they were operating under the law of August 29, 1916.

Mr. BUTLER. I want to say to the gentleman I am going to be as good as I know how in these troublesome times, but if this was in peace times you could not get it through without dragging it around the House several times.

Mr. PADGETT. I would not ask for it.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: Page 24, line 12, before the word "lieutenants," strike out "twelve" and insert "twenty-two."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 12, before the word "lieutenants," strike out the word "twelve" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-two."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, in line 13, after the word "corps," I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 13, after the word "corps" and before the semicolon, insert the following: "in addition to the number permanently allowed by law in these grades."

Mr. PADGETT. Showing they are temporary and in addition to the permanent colonels, that is all.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, page 26, line 19, it is the same amendment I offered a while ago, in line 19, strike out the word "three" and insert "six."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 19, strike out the word "three" and insert in lieu thereof "six."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. In the same line 12, same page, strike out the word "twelve" before the semicolon and insert "twenty-two."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 19, before the word "colonels," strike out the word "twelve" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-two."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. In the same line, before the word "lieu," strike out the word "twelve" and insert "twenty-two."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 19, before the word "lieu," strike out the word "twelve" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-two."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Page 26, line 20, after the words "Marine Corps," and before the semicolon, insert the words I sent up a while ago, "in addition to the number permanently allowed by law in those grades."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 20, after the word "Corps," and before the semicolon, insert the following: "in addition to the number permanently allowed by law in those grades."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. On page 26, line 11, there is an error there of a misprint. I move to strike out the word "promotion" and insert "proportion."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 11, strike out the word "promotion" and insert in lieu thereof the word "proportion."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Page 27, lines 22 and 23, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "and warrant officers of the active list of the Marine Corps appointed to commissioned rank."

Mr. PADGETT. This strikes out the words "and warrant officers of the active list of the Marine Corps appointed to commissioned rank." Under the act of August 29, 1916, there was a limitation on the promotion or the appointment of men to the rank of ensign before the age of 50. Now the age of retirement in the Navy is 64. There is 14 years of service. Now, these warrant officers that have been serving and possessed capacity and character and have served up to 50 years under the existing law could not be promoted to ensign. This simply exempts them from that limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the chairman of the committee any other amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. I offer another amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PADGETT moves to insert the following, on page 27, line 14, after the word "*Provided*": "That such chief warrant officers as are given a temporary appointment provided herein shall take rank and precedence with the other chief warrant officers temporarily appointed as of July 1, 1917, and according to their seniority as chief warrant officers in the permanent service: *Provided further.*"

Mr. BUTLER. The chairman will understand that this affects the very desirable personnel of this Marine Corps, and therefore I understand from his amendment that the chief warrant officers that are taken into the service temporarily will rank along with those who are in permanently, not taking precedence over them?

Mr. PADGETT. It fixes the date as of July 1, and among the officers according to their precedence it is to establish military uniformity.

Mr. BUTLER. I would not want these men who have been taken in temporarily to have precedence over the old fellows who have done good work for the Government for many years.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not intended that that should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the chairman any other amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. On page 28, line 6, change the word "hereby" to "hereafter." It is a misprint. It is the classes to be graduated hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Page 28, line 6, strike out "hereby" and insert "hereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, on page 28, line 11, after the word "Senate," I wish to offer an additional proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Page 28, line 11, after the word "Senate," insert the following additional proviso: "*Provided further,* That the temporary appointment for the war of 76 additional marine gunners, 76 additional quartermaster clerks, and 29 additional clerks for assistant paymasters in the Marine Corps is authorized."

Mr. PADGETT. This is the temporary appointment of these additional marine gunners and quartermaster clerks and assistant pay clerks on account of the increase in the Marine Corps from 30,000 to 75,000.

Mr. BUTLER. All temporary?

Mr. PADGETT. All temporary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, on page 28, line 24, after the word "Navy," I move to insert the words "and the heads of existing staff corps of the Marine Corps." That places them on the same basis.

Mr. BUTLER. That I am going to object to. You will have to have a full House to get it through.

Mr. PADGETT. I will leave it out, then.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is a very important question, Mr. Chairman. If the question has merit in it, it should be considered whether it requires the entire House or not.

Mr. BUTLER. That means to appoint three major generals in the staff corps of the Marine Corps?

Mr. PADGETT. It means to give the heads of three bureaus in the staff corps the same temporary grade—that is, while they are serving in that capacity, the same rank—that they would have in the Navy and in the Army.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say right now that I will not play any longer. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague on the committee allow me a minute to change his views on this subject?

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman should talk three years I would listen to him, because I like him, but he could not change my opinion, because it is not right to take advantage of the condition we are in to have three major generals of the staff and when this war is over the line will have only one, the fighting men one, and the staff three. Never; if you want to, I will fight it out along that line.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the status of the amendment would be if it is withdrawn now? I would like to know from the chairman of the committee if it is going to be reintroduced?

Mr. PADGETT. Not by myself. I can withdraw it at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that in the House the proposer of an amendment has the right to withdraw it at any time, but in Committee of the Whole, under the practice, it takes unanimous consent to withdraw it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I hate awfully to disagree with my pleasant friend [Mr. BUTLER] on the Committee on Naval Affairs, but here is the situation with reference to these staff officers: They are occupying the same relative positions in the Marine Corps that are occupied by officers in the Army and officers in the Navy doing their character of duty, and we now are going to single out these three officers, and we are going to say to them, "You stay where you are as brigadier generals. We are going to keep major generals in the Army doing the same character of work that you are doing; we are going to keep officers of corresponding rank in the Navy, rear admirals, doing the same work you are doing, but we are going to keep you down to brigadier generals, because the corps is small and because after the war is over we may have only one major general in the Marine Corps, and he will be a fighting man and you gentlemen are not fighting men."

Now, let us see if that is fair. I know every Member now on the floor of the House wants to be fair, and particularly so with the Marine Corps. Let us see if that is fair. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] a few moments ago remarked about these glorious troops going over to France, thoroughly equipped with machine guns, supplies, and fully officered. They have acquired their own aeroplanes, and they are a corps to be proud of. Yet these very three officers, the paymaster of the Marine Corps, the adjutant and inspector of the Marine Corps, and the quartermaster of the Marine Corps are directly responsible, under Gen. Barnett, for this wonderful state of affairs. But we are going to say to them, "You are responsible for this great efficiency. You have supplied these troops with the guns and with the uniforms and everything that is necessary for them to go immediately into the battle field, but now we are going to keep you down to brigadier generals, because we do not think it is quite fair for you three to go up. We are not going to raise you to the level of the officers in the Army who are doing the work that you are doing or to the level of the officers in the Navy who are doing the work that you are doing." Is there any reason, in all justice, why these three particular men, who are doing the same duty that others are doing, should be so embarrassed in the eyes of the country?

If you are going to keep them down, then reduce all of the others to a corresponding rank. Then I will say there is some justice in this thing.

If the Marine Corps were not thoroughly supplied right up to the minute, I would say yes, that it would be a rebuke from Congress to these men for not keeping the corps up to what it ought to be. You gentlemen all know Rear Admiral McGowan, of the Navy, and there is no better supply officer living than McGowan. Yet I will say to you that Laurie McCauley in the Marine Corps is his equal in every particular. The most wonderful efficiency possible is demonstrated in the Marine Corps; but we are going to say to McCauley, "You are doing the same work that McGowan is doing, you are doing the same work that major generals in the Army are doing, supplying troops, but we are going to keep you down to a brigadier general."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I proceed for two minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Brig. Gen. Henry Lauchheimer, the corps adjutant and inspector, is on the job morning, noon, and night, and is one of the most efficient public servants in our entire Government, not excepting any branch of the Government. I know that Lauchheimer is one of the most efficient men we have. He is on the job 24 hours a day, if need be, and yet you hesitate to do him the same honor and justice you have extended to others. Brig. Gen. George Richards, paymaster of the corps, is the same kind of a man, always at his post; and we are going to say to these three men, "Your corps probably is the most efficient fighting unit on earth, but we can not recognize

your value." They talk about the efficiency of the Navy. No one loves the Navy more than I do, and yet I say to you gentlemen, in all seriousness, that the Marine Corps is better equipped for fighting to-day with any enemy of its size than the Navy itself is, and these three men are largely responsible for that state of affairs—the adjutant general, the paymaster, and the quartermaster. I called up Gen. Barnett only a few minutes ago, and I said, "General, have you heard what the committee and the House did on your increases?" He said, "No; I have not." I said, "They have given you exactly what you have asked for, 75,500 men, notwithstanding that the Secretary of the Navy recommended a lesser number to the committee." The committee unanimously gave the Marine Corps just exactly what Gen. Barnett asked for, excepting this particular item here. Gen. Barnett asked for this. He begs for it, and says the efficiency of his corps, in its equipment, in its readiness to fight, is due almost entirely to these three bureaus. We are going to say to them, "We are not going to put you on the same level with your corresponding officers in the Army and the Navy. No; we are going to keep you down." If the Marine Corps were not properly supplied and equipped, I would say, "Yes; keep them down"; but if they are properly supplied and equipped and, as my friend from Pennsylvania said a few minutes ago, ready to fight and go to Europe to-day if you have got the transportation for them, let us give these three officers the same credit, the same distinction, the same glory, and the same salary that goes to corresponding positions in the Navy and the Army. I am willing to rest the matter with the fairness and justice that the House always displays in matters of this kind. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, of course you understand what this means. All the grades that we have raised the marines to to-day are temporary except these. When this war is over the Marine Corps will again resolve itself into a force of 17,000 men. The head of the corps is a major general. One major general is provided permanently. One major general is included in this bill, to be provided temporarily. All those men lose their grades at the conclusion of the war except those now considered. And I will say now, Mr. Chairman, there are always plenty of men here in the House to stand up for the men who do not go to war. I always stand up for the fighting men. Now, do this thing if you want to, and when the war is over you will have three major generals on the staff in this little corps, and only one among the fighting men. Are you going to do it? Will you agree to the proposed amendment?

Who makes the corps? It is true that I never knew a more efficient quartermaster than McCauley. I knew him before you drew a breath. I know these men well. You can not praise them too highly but what I will try to help you. But I will not consent to giving these same men, stationed always in Washington, these grades, to the disadvantage of the fighting men of the Marine Corps.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee did not offer this amendment before the committee this morning. I heard that he had it; if he had, I would have made my protest there as I make it here.

I say now, at the risk of being called unpatriotic or disloyal, that I will fight this amendment to the last ditch. Too bad, taking advantage of the present trouble to favor friends of men in the effort to obtain increase in grades. Two years ago the heads of these departments were colonels. Now they are brigadiers, and their friends now ask them to be made major generals. For one, I will not submit to it, because it is not right.

What are you going to do with the fighting men? You give them temporary grades only. They may lose an arm or a leg, and they will go back to their permanent grades—captains, majors, and colonels. Let all of these men retain these grades and ranks. Are you going to do a thing so unfair toward the men who are to draw the blood of our enemies at the great risk of spilling their own?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the President is hereby authorized to drop from the rolls of the Navy or Marine Corps any officer thereof who is absent from duty without leave for a period of three months or more, or who, having been found guilty by the civil authorities of any offense, is finally sentenced to confinement in a State or Federal penitentiary: *Provided*, That no officer so dropped shall be eligible for reappointment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to move to strike out lines 23 and 24, on page 29, and lines 1 to 5, inclusive, on page 30. It has already been enacted into law.

Mr. WALSH. Then I withdraw the reservation of my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his point of order, and the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 23, strike out all of the language beginning with the word "That," on line 23, to and including the word "reappointment," on line 5, page 30.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter, during the existence of war or of a national emergency declared by the President to exist, any commissioned or warrant officer of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States on the retired list may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be ordered to active duty at sea or on shore; and any retired officer performing such active duty in time of war or national emergency, declared as aforesaid, shall be entitled to promotion on the retired list to the grade or rank, not above that of lieutenant commander in the Navy or major in the Marine Corps or captain in the Coast Guard, and shall thereafter receive the pay and allowances thereof, which his total active service as an officer both prior and subsequent to retirement, in the manner rendered by him, would have enabled him to attain in due course of promotion had such service been rendered continuously on the active list during the period of time last past.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this is a section which gives permanent rank to the retired officers after the war is over.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; there is a separate bill pending for that, and if the gentleman from Alabama objects to it I will move to strike it out and we will fight it out on a separate bill.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think that is better.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out on page 30, from line 6, page 30, to and including line 19 on page 31. There are two paragraphs.

Mr. BUTLER. This is a provision we put in in the committee on a division?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and I stated then if there was a fight on it I would not insist on it.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to strike that out, because the two paragraphs are all the same proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to strike out the language beginning with line 6, page 30, down to line 19, page 31. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter the allowances of officers, enlisted men, and student fliers of the naval service shall in no case be increased by reason of the performance of aviation duty.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask the Chairman if the present law does not give men in the actual flying service increased compensation?

Mr. PADGETT. This does not interfere with compensation at all. Under the law student fliers get 35 per cent increased pay while engaged in actual flying and qualified fliers get 50 per cent. But the law that was passed embraced allowances also. For instance, traveling from one place to another under the general law, ordinary service, a man would get 8 cents a mile. This would give the flier 12 cents a mile. It does not cost him any more to travel than it does anybody else. If he gets commutation of rations, he would get 35 or 50 per cent more than the ordinary man. This is only as far as the allowance is concerned, and leaves his increased pay untouched.

Mr. WALSH. On what theory were the allowances increased?

Mr. PADGETT. We did not realize that they were getting an increased allowance. We intended originally to give them increased pay and the ordinary allowances. It was so framed that the increase applied not only to the pay but the allowances. That is the interpretation placed upon it by the paying officers, and this will only give them the same commutation of allowances that everybody else gets but leaves the increase of pay the same.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter all candidates for admission to the Naval Academy must be between the ages of 16 and 20 years on July 1 of the calendar year in which they enter the academy: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not apply to candidates for midshipmen designated for entrance to the academy in 1918

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

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that. I would state now, for information, what that amendment is. On line 24, page 31, I desire to strike out the words "between the ages of 16 and 20 years on July," and to

insert in lieu thereof the words "not less than 16 years of age nor more than 20 years of age on April." That makes it definite. The examinations are now held, some in February and some in April—about the middle of April. Under the law authorizing Members of the House and Senate to appoint the age depends upon the date of examination, which is a varying date. It has been held as late as July, so that there would be an age in February, an age in April, and an age if another was held later. Under the law authorizing the appointment of men from the service it provides that their age is determined upon the date of their admission to the academy, so that you have two laws on the subject. This is intended to fix a definite date of the age, and I have selected the 1st of April because it is practically under the law authorizing the Members to appoint at the present time, the examinations being held in February and in April, and this takes the 1st day of April and provides not less than 16 years of age nor more than 20 years of age on the 1st day of April.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has a special bill pending, which was taken up some few days ago, but was laid aside because of an amendment that was offered.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I think a matter of this sort ought to be given a little more consideration than is possible here. As the gentleman proposes to amend, I do not think it would be objectionable; but I think it would be better to have it considered as a separate measure. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman to make a point of order to the entire paragraph?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the matter beginning on page 32, with line 4, and embracing all the remainder of page 32, all of page 33, and on page 34 down to and including line 18, has heretofore been enacted into law. I ask unanimous consent to have it stricken from the bill without reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to strike from the bill without reading all from line 4, page 32, down to and including the word "consideration," in line 18, page 34. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is rather unusual to consider a bill in this way, but in view of the very large attendance here this evening, and everyone understanding the great desire to expedite the passage of the bill, I shall not object; but I trust that the chairman's desire for haste will not lead him to make similar requests too often.

Mr. PADGETT. This has all been passed as separate bills.

Mr. WALSH. Even so, I think it is bad practice.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 1570 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1570. Every seaman, landsman, or marine who performs the duty of a fireman on board any vessel of war shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his compensation as seaman, landsman, or marine, a compensation at the rate of 33 cents a day for the time he is employed as fireman."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the matter beginning with line 13, on page 35, down to and including line 20 on the same page, has already been enacted into law, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that lines 13 to 20, on page 35, both inclusive, be stricken from the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beginning at a 4 by 4 pine post, marked "U. S. L. H. E.," at the northwest angle of the United States Life Saving Station situated in section 23, township 4 south, range 19 west, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan; thence south 54° and 30′ east 193 feet to a 4 by 4 pine post, marked "U. S. L. H. E.," at shore line; thence north 74° and 11′ east 300 feet to a 4 by 4 pine post, marked "U. S. L. H. E.," following the line of the shore; thence north 15° and 49′ west 150 feet to a 4 by 4 pine post, marked "U. S. L. H. E."; thence north 87° and 11′ west 313 feet to a 4 by 4 pine post, marked "U. S. L. H. E."; thence south 35° and 30′ west 159 feet to the place of beginning, containing approximately 1.724 acres, more or less, together with all buildings and improvements thereon, which property is shown on drawing No. 17321, bearing the legend, "Office of the Lighthouse Inspector, Twelfth District, Milwaukee, Wis. Lighthouse Depot, St. Joseph, Mich. General plan of depot. Scale as noted. Approved July 31, 1917. N. M. Works, superintendent. Lewis M. Stoddard, inspector," on file in the Navy Department.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. PADGETT. I was about to move to rise.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withhold that for a moment.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. KITCHIN having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10854 and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I would state to the gentleman that I went home a few days ago and delivered a speech dedicating a public building in my home town——

Mr. WALSH. I think that is worthy of preservation in the RECORD of Congress and I have no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HICKS until April 28, to continue campaigning for liberty loan.

To Mr. DENISON (at the request of Mr. WILLIAMS), for two weeks, on account of speaking engagement on liberty loan.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4292. An act to conserve the gold supply of the United States; to permit the settlement in silver of trade balances adverse to the United States; to provide silver for subsidiary coinage and for commercial use; to assist foreign Governments at war with the enemies of the United States; and for the above purposes to stabilize the price and encourage the production of silver; and

S. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

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

S. 4292. An act to conserve the gold supply of the United States; to permit the settlement in silver of trade balances adverse to the United States; to provide silver for subsidiary coinage and for commercial use; to assist foreign Governments at war with the enemies of the United States; and for the above purposes to stabilize the price and encourage the production of silver; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

THE BRITISH TANK BRITANNIA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to state to the House that it is invited to attend a demonstration of the British tank on Sunday at 3.30 o'clock at the Million Dollar Bridge, where the Members of the House and Senate will witness its operation.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Where is that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is at Woodley Road and Connecticut Avenue. The operation of the tank will be under the bridge, and no badge for admission is required except the face of the Member.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Can a Member take any member of his family?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Well, the invitation says the House and Senate, but I think I would venture mine if I had my family with me.

Mr. MADDEN. It is a very flattering prospect.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 20, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation for rent of building, Muskegon, Mich., with the request that it

be given favorable consideration for inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. Doc. No. 1058), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. McKENZIE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4418) to correct the military record of Alfred Rebsamen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 499), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3894) for the relief of Charles L. Schroeder, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 500), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. IRELAND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2506) for the relief of Morris Busch, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 501), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 11548) to amend section 5 of the act approved March 3, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1918"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 11549) to provide for the promotion of vocational retraining for disabled soldiers; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11550) to reserve as a part of the Crater National Forest, in Oregon, cetain lands formerly a part of the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co., but revested in the United States in accordance with a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States recorded in 238 United States Reports, page 393; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE: A bill (H. R. 11551) granting pensions to certain members of the former Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAGSDALE: A bill (H. R. 11552) granting the consent of Congress to Marion and Horry Counties to construct a bridge across Little Peedee River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 11553) placing within competitive classified civil service all clerical assistants under section 12 of the act of June 29, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11554) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws; and to punish the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 11555) to authorize leasing deposits of oil shale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11556) to subject to trial by court-martial persons who endanger the good discipline, order, movements, health, safety, or successful operations of the land or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the legislature of the State of New York favoring the retention and extension of pneumatic-tube mail service in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the legislature of the State of New York favoring the retention and extension of pneumatic-tube mail service in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11557) granting a pension to Arthur Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 11558) granting an increase of pension to James K. Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 11559) granting an increase of pension to Herbert S. Coheley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 11560) for the relief of Warren V. Howard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11561) granting an increase of pension to Patrick M. Droney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11562) granting an increase of pension to Mary Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11563) granting an increase of pension to Elbert N. Cowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11564) granting an increase of pension to Ada J. Schwatka; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11565) granting an increase of pension to John W. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 11566) granting an increase of pension to James Harrold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 11567) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 11568) granting an increase of pension to George Burks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 11569) granting a pension to John Ream; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 11570) granting an increase of pension to James C. Burwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11571) granting an increase of pension to Rollin T. Waller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 11572) granting an increase of pension to Christian Harr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 11573) granting an increase of pension to Reuben T. Hewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11574) granting a pension to Carrie S. Warner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 11575) granting an increase of pension to James B. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11576) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McCafferty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 11577) granting a pension to Louise B. Rice; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

The SPEAKER (by request): Petition of members of the Farmers' Club of Montrose, Mo., protesting against the proposed reduction in the price of corn; also a letter from a delegate of the United States, International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, Italy, proposing measures to raise a great liberty crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), resolutions of the Washington Chamber of Commerce, urging a minimum salary to teachers in the District of Columbia of $1,200 per annum; also resolution of the Maryland State and District of Columbia, urging the two-platoon system for the firemen of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petitions and resolutions, urging the repeal of the second-class postage provision of the war-revenue act from the following: The Mansfield Tire & Rubber Co., Mansfield, Ohio; the El Paso County Medical Society, El Paso, Tex.; Trenton Chamber of Commerce, Trenton, N. J.; Second Church, Disciples of Christ, New York City; and the executive committee of the Society of Illustrators of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, advocating the retention and extension of the pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the La Crosse (Wis.) Trades and Labor Council, asking that the price of all substitute grains be fixed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of the United Presbyterian Church, of Alexis, Ill., for the passage of proper legislation prohibiting the use of all food products in the manufacture

of alcoholic beverages for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of various citizens of Tacoma, Wash., and resolutions of Tacoma Central Labor Council, Tacoma, Wash., opposing universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, relating to the fixing of the price of cereals by the Congress of the United States, asking that prices for cereals other than wheat should be made and based upon the present established price of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Fifteenth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, Spanish-American War Veterans, in convention assembled, pledging allegiance to our country and tendering their services, condemning any influence tending to weaken our cause, and asking that no compromise peace be made; to the Committee on the Judciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Keystone Division No. 16, Sons of Temperance, of Pennsylvania, favoring prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, favoring free zones in the ports of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution by the Boot and Shoe Travelers' Association of New York, protesting against the zone system and demanding its repeal; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Department of Rhode Island, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring passage of the Smoot pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *April 20, 1918.*

The House was called to order by Mr. KITCHIN as Speaker pro tempore at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Great Spirit, in whose all-encircling love we dwell, which reflects itself in splendor from all the works of Thy hands, and which poured itself out in humble submission, in a sublime sacrifice, on the Hill of Calvary, we thank Thee that we were born and reared under the divine influences of the Christian religion; that we are citizens of the United States of America; both of which are calculated to bring out all that is purest, noblest, best, in man. The world is facing a great crisis. We are involved in it, and we most earnestly pray that we may reflect our loyalty to Thee and to the principles embodied in the Constitution of the United States, in a patriotism sublime in its sacrifices; that righteousness, liberty, truth, justice, may live, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for the payment of annual installments on the purchase price for land in the Standing Rock Indian Reservations.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JONES, OF VIRGINIA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House a communication, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

SAN JUAN, P. R., *April 19.*

SPEAKER HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.:

Porto Rico House takes part in mourning of Congress and Nation for death of illustrious Representative WILLIAM A. JONES, who devoted such noble thoughts and continuous labor to this country, where his memory will be always kept with gratitude.

JOS. E. DE DIEGO, *Speaker.*

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE SULLOWAY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Mr. WASON rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from New Hampshire rise?

Mr. WASON. For the purpose of offering a resolution setting aside Sunday, April 28, for memorial exercises in honor of the late Representative SULLOWAY, of New Hampshire. I move the adoption of the following order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That Sunday, the 28th day of April, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. CYRUS ADAMS SULLOWAY, late a Representative from the State of New Hampshire.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE CHARACTER OF A STATEMENT CONTAINED IN A LETTER FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC INFORMATION AND TRANSMITTED TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN A REPORT MADE BY THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Mr. CARAWAY, from the special committee appointed by the Speaker on the 11th day of April, 1918, in response to a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives to inquire into certain remarks alleged to have been included in a letter addressed to the Postmaster General by the chairman of the Committee on Public Information and by the Postmaster General transmitted to the House of Representatives on April 10, 1918, which language so complained of is as follows: "When Mr. TREADWAY stated in the House that he was 'reliably informed that there has been a very large amount of that class of mail matter sent over, and 'it is a well-known fact that great quantities of that class of matter have been placed in their hands overseas,' he made assertions the absolute baselessness of which could have been ascertained by a telephone inquiry," begs leave to make the following report:

After a careful search of the precedents, the committee finds that the House of Representatives has uniformly refused to receive and make a part of its records communications reflecting upon the House as a whole or any Member thereof.

December 14, 1842, the Speaker laid before the House a communication from S. Pleasonton, Fifth Auditor of the Treasury Department, which was as follows:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
"FIFTH AUDITOR'S OFFICE,
"*December 14, 1842.*

"SIR: In a report of a debate in the House of Representatives on Monday last, contained in the National Intelligencer of yesterday, it is stated that Mr. Sprigg, among other things, observed: 'He remembered, too, that the House at this instance had made a call upon the department (Treasury) for full and detailed information as to the whole system of managing the lighthouses of the United States, the contracts for buildings, for supplying oil, paying inspectors, etc., but no answer had ever been obtained, notwithstanding the clerks which the House had voted them and notwithstanding numerous and repeated promises made to him personally.'

"It was with extreme surprise I read this statement, as I had a perfect recollection that it was wholly erroneous; and as it is calculated, uncorrected, to injure the Treasury Department unjustly in the public estimation, I hope you and the House will excuse me for setting the Member right.

"It is sufficient to state that the whole of the information called for by the House in relation to lighthouses on Mr. Sprigg's motion was transmitted, as required by the resolution, partly to the Committee on Commerce on the 8th of March last and is contained in their printed report, No. 811, and partly to the House of Representatives direct by the Secretary of the Treasury on the 11th of March last, and by the House ordered to be printed, and will be found in Document No. 140 of the last session. These two documents contain all the information which was called for by the House.

"Mr. Sprigg individually called for the cessions of jurisdiction by the States over all the lighthouse sites, from the adoption of the Constitution; and, although so much labor and time as it required might have been declined on his individual call, yet, as I was desirous of furnishing all the information in my power to every person who sought it, the information was prepared and furnished as far as it was to be found in the office.

"I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"S. PLEASONTON.

"Hon. JOHN WHITE,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

The communication was by the House, after full consideration, adjudged objectionable and a resolution adopted as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the communication addressed to the Speaker of this House by S. Pleasonton on the 14th instant in relation to some remarks made in the House before that time by Mr. Sprigg, a Member from Kentucky, which paper was received by the Speaker and laid before the House without knowledge of its contents, was not such a communication as ought to have been received and presented to the House; that the same be withheld from the Journal and files of the House and the original be returned to the writer." (See Congressional Globe, 3d sess. 27th Cong., p. 101.)

In 1848 Mr. Medill, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, addressed the following communication to the House of Representatives:

"*To the honorable the House of Representatives of the United States:*

"During the debate which took place in the House of Representatives on an amendment made by the Senate to the civil and diplomatic bill allowing to David Taylor the sum of $12,800 for a certain reservation claimed by him under the treaties of 1817 and 1835 with the Cherokees, as reported in the National Intelligencer of this morning, I find the following, viz:

"'Mr. Clingman supported the claim and took occasion to warn the committee against any opposition which might have been made to it by Mr. Medill, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who, he understood, had endeavored to prejudice the claim because the agents of the claimant peremptorily refused to make an allowance for his favoring the claim. Mr. C. denounced the Indian Bureau as thoroughly corrupt. He had been credibly informed that the books in that bureau had been altered and falsified for corrupt purposes (though this, he believed, had been done during the incumbency of Mr. Crawford, the predecessor of the present commissioner). He had no confidence in Mr. Medill, nor would he believe any statement he should make. An application had been made to the department to have the books taken out of his office and deposited in some place where they would be safe from alterations.'