SENATE.

SATURDAY, *February 1, 1919.*

(Legislative day of Friday, January 31, 1919.)

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

ZINC MINING INDUSTRY.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I present a resolution of the House of Representatives of Missouri and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator have it read?

Mr. SPENCER. There is no need of reading it unless some one calls for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution is as follows:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *January 31, 1919.*

Hon. SELDEN P. SPENCER,
Care Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Am instructed by the Missouri House of Representatives to inform you that there has been offered into and adopted by the house the following resolutions:

"Whereas the zinc-mining industry of southwestern Missouri is the greatest metal-mining industry in the entire State; and

"Whereas that industry is now crippled to the extent of the closing down of 95 per cent of all the mines in said district, said closing down of the mines being occasioned by the vast importations of zinc ore into the United States from foreign countries, amounting in the last four years ending June 30, 1918, to 825,000 tons, being approximately three times the normal prewar production of the entire Joplin district, including Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri; and

"Whereas there are now approximately 350,000 tons of zinc ore on the docks in Australia awaiting shipment; and

"Whereas Mexico has a potential power of production of at least 150,000 tons annually, which must find its market in the United States; and

"Whereas zinc ore concentrates have also been imported into the United States in the last three or four years from 15 different countries, representing every continent and grand division of the world: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri,* That we believe it to be the patriotic duty of the Legislature of the State of Missouri to memorialize Congress of the United States by special resolution asking that there be at once incorporated into the pending revenue bill a provision providing for a protective tariff of 2 cents per pound on the metallic contents of zinc ore in order to keep out further importations of zinc ore and allow the zinc-mining industry of the United States to live and be again built up to its normal condition; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent to our Senators and Representatives at Washington, and that they be asked to protect the mining industry of the United States, and that they support and vote for a bill providing for a tariff of 2 cents per pound on the metallic contents of zinc ore imported into the United States."

W. G. KITCHEN,
Chief Clerk.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is apparent that the Senate is very deeply interested in the pending appropriation bill, carrying about $600,000,000, and, knowing the profound interest which Senators have in a small appropriation bill of that character, I venture to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	King	Pollock	Swanson
Beckham	Knox	Reed	Thomas
Colt	La Follette	Saulsbury	Trammell
Fletcher	Lewis	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hale	McKellar	Sherman	Wadsworth
Hardwick	McLean	Smith, S. C.	Weeks
Johnson, Cal.	Myers	Smoot	
Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Spencer	
Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sutherland	

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is absent owing to illness.

Mr. McKELLAR. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is detained by illness.

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] are absent on official business.

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

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. GAY, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. McNARY, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. STERLING, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. WARREN answered to their names when called.

Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CALDER, and Mr. HOLLIS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce the absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BRANDEGEE, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. MARTIN of Virginia entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. STERLING. I wish to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] are absent on official business of the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. SHAFROTH, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAGE, Mr. KENYON, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. GORE, Mr. RANSDELL, Mr. MOSES, and Mr. TOWNSEND entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 3220. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products; and

S. 5354. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 5503) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the cities of Cleburne, Kenedy, and Yoakum, all in Texas;

A bill (S. 5504) directing delivery of State war-service records to the States requesting same; and

A bill (S. 5505) regulating the salaries of Army field clerks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 5506) granting a pension to Joseph R. Owens (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 5507) granting a pension to Mary L. Bryant (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 5508) to validate and confirm certain erroneously allowed entries in the State of Minnesota (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 5509) granting an increase of pension to William J. Van Hoose; to the Committee on Pensions.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

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

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN TEXAS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I am in receipt of the following telegram, which I desire to read to the Senate:

AUSTIN, TEX., *January 22.*

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
United States Senate, Washington:

I have the honor to transmit to you, with request that you read the same in the Hall of the Senate, the following joint resolution adopted by the house and concurred in by the senate of the State on Monday, January 20, 1919:

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Texas (the Senate concurring),* That—

"Whereas the thirty-fifth legislature in its fourth called session, in response to the unmistakable sentiments of the voters of Texas, awarded to the women of Texas the privilege of suffrage in the primaries; and

"Whereas in the Democratic primaries of July 27, 1918, the women of Texas spoke clearly and emphatically in behalf of civic righteousness and honor in its public servants, thus giving trustworthy proof of their eminent fitness for the ballot without any limitations whatsoever except such as may apply to all voters alike: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (the senate concurring),* That the United States Senate is hereby respectfully but urgently requested to act immediately and favorably upon the woman-suffrage amendment, which has already received proper recognition by the House of Representatives; and be it further

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

"*Resolved*, That such action is in full accordance with enlightened sentiment that sees no reason why further delay should ensue in this regard; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the presiding officer of the United States Senate and to the Senators representing this State therein."

C. D. MIMS,
Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. President, the progress of suffrage sentiment in Texas has been remarkable. In 1916 the Texas State Democratic convention adopted a resolution opposing the nation-wide suffrage amendment. In 1917 the Texas Legislature declined to submit an amendment to the State constitution for suffrage. About a year thereafter the legislature adopted an amendment granting to Texas women suffrage in the primaries. In the primaries last year 386,000 women voted, and an overwhelming majority of the precinct and county conventions declared for the national suffrage amendment. The State Democratic convention in 1918 declared in favor of State and National suffrage.

In January of this year the Texas Legislature submitted an amendment to the State constitution for suffrage, and a vote will be taken on its adoption at an early date. I believe that a similar process is taking place, or will take place, in every other Southern State, and I want to express the earnest hope and the conviction that before this session adjourns the Congress of the United States will submit the suffrage amendment for ratification.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. KING. I have a few minutes left in which to discuss this measure, but I am compelled to be absent from the Chamber for a few moments, so I yield to the Senator from Colorado, and will take the floor upon the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, with regard to the pending amendment, I am not disposed to indulge in any criticism. Personally I think the proposed experiment which the appropriation in that amendment is designed to enable the department to make is a highly desirable one. The expansion of aviation is one of the subjects which the Government should encourage in every direction. The three leading nations of Europe are applying their experiences in the war to the promotion of aviation not only for the carriage of the mail but for its utilization in every possible commercial way. If we fail to pursue the same course, we shall very soon find ourselves as far behind in modern aviation as we were when Germany declared war against France. I believe that the development of aviation will, if properly pursued, result in the creation of an offensive and defensive system of warfare that will largely obviate the necessity of a continued coast defense and of a large Navy. Hence this particular appropriation commends itself very strongly to my judgment, and I wish it were possible to be as well disposed toward other items of the bill.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I propose to discuss for a few minutes the good-roads amendment, and then, so far as I am concerned, I shall be prepared, as usual, to vote with the minority.

A point of order was yesterday raised against section 5 of the bill upon the ground that it proposed general legislation to an appropriation bill. The point was not sustained. The reasons assigned for the ruling of the Chair have added to my humble store of knowledge; I have gained something in the way of experience and feel, therefore, compensated for the effort to secure the excision of the section.

I have learned, Mr. President, that to expand a law is to limit it, and doubtless upon the theory that the more debts a man contracts the more money he owes. I have also learned that if an appropriation otherwise objectionable is appended to an amendment which amounts to general legislation, the existence of the appropriation cures the objection and makes the amendment perfectly legitimate under the rules.

The rules of the Senate, Mr. President, are the most cumbrous and fossilized body of ancient procedure, but subject entirely to the will of the majority, that can be found in any other legislative assembly. The application of the rules depends entirely upon the pleasure of or the interests of a majority of the Senate. Therefore they might just as well be swept, as they should long ago have been, into the limbo of the past and give way to a series of modern regulations having the merit of possible consistency and free from the complicated and irreconcilable series of decisions which have construed them in every possible way, the construction being, for the most part, directed and determined by the interest which a majority had in the particular subject of discussion.

I will address myself at the outset to the effect of section 5, which will, I presume, be enacted into law. This section my distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is pleased to call a limitation upon the method of expenditure of the $200,000,000 which are provided for in the succeeding sections. It amends section 2 of the existing law by the substitution of a very simple phrase, consisting of five words. I read:

The term "rural post roads," as used in section 2 of said act, shall be construed to mean any public road which is now used, or may be made suitable.

If this becomes a law, it commits the United States to the improvement of every cattle trail and every cow path and every right of way in the United States. It makes the alleged appropriation for the construction and improvement of post roads one of the most expensive fictions in Federal legislation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that, in view of the fact that every proposition to which the Federal Government appropriates money must originate in the State, must have the approval of the State authorities, of the State highway commission, and until the road has been located and surveyed and an estimate of its cost made, the Government of the United States has no concern about it; and when they have done that the proposition must be by them submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture, and if he approves it half of the sum provided to be appropriated by the Government may be available, I ask the Senator if he thinks that there is any State highway commission or any State authority that is going to undertake to build a road for the construction of which it must furnish half of the money, while the Government furnishes the other half, of the character which he indicates in his remarks, and provide that such road shall be built anywhere and everywhere, along pig trails in every section of the country?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this legislation will inevitably be followed by other legislation relieving the States from any responsibility in the matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But there is no suggestion like that in this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, there is no suggestion like that in this bill, and there was no suggestion of this amendment in the act of 1916. We proceed by natural law of progression in our advance upon the outposts of the United States Treasury. To storm it in the open daylight would be impossible. Consequently we reach it by a system of sapping and mining.

The Senator from Alabama has correctly stated the proposition; there is no doubt about that. These projects must originate with the State authorities; but my experience is that every State project having a sufficient amount of political influence behind it, every project capable of commanding a respectable number of votes, will receive favorable consideration by the State authorities, and especially so when, as the law is, 50 per cent of the money required for the improvement comes from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I wish to ask the Senator, for information, if it is true that some of the States have already petitioned to be relieved from their share of the contribution for this purpose?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know; but I do know that a few citizens of my State suggested sometime ago the propriety of my making the effort, their view then being that, inasmuch as these roads were post roads, and post roads being under the sole jurisdiction of the United States, it was wrong to ask the States to bear any part of the burden of improvement.

Mr. President, I do not care how preposterous one of these propositions may be, it can be supported before the State authorities upon precisely the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] in support of this appropriation. Good roads mean prosperity; good roads mean better schools; good roads mean more intelligent neighborhoods; in fact, it is difficult to imagine what good roads do not mean in moral, social, financial, and intellectual improvement and development. Of course, I am not gainsaying the fact that good roads are a great asset to any community and to any State; there is no doubt about that; and I would be in favor of constructing good roads and aiding them with Government appropriations liberally if we had the money at present to devote to that purpose. But I will refer to that feature of the subject later.

The theory upon which the Government of the United States is to interest itself in road construction and the basis of the act of 1916 was that under the Constitution Congress, being authorized to establish post offices and post roads, is justified in making these appropriations for that purpose.

That is a doctrine which we all know historically was successfully controverted in the early days of the Republic, when State rights really amounted to something, when the people were too jealous of them to trade them off for Federal money, and when it was the opinion of a majority of the people of the United States that the language of the Constitution was not sufficiently broad to justify the use of the public funds in the making of public improvements. Of course, as the Treasury expanded and the cupidity of the people was enlarged by an occasional appropriation here and there, they gradually forgot the rights of the States and of constitutional limitations in the mad race for the portals of the Treasury, so that now the doctrines then so ably asserted and maintained by our forefathers we at present regard with a sort of good-natured contempt.

I accept the proposition in its entirety that the power to establish post offices and post roads carries with it the power to make these appropriations, but this amendment leaves that situation entirely behind, and it is now proposed to devote the public money to the construction of any road that may be recommended by the local authorities. I do not think we need apprehend that if the highway commission of my State, or of the State of South Dakota, or of the State of Tennessee, makes a recommendation to the Department of Agriculture that department will turn it down. Those things may occur, and so may miracles, but it is safe, I think, to say that any project which passes muster with the people of a State will be accepted by the Agricultural Department or by any other department having jurisdiction of the subject. That department is no worse and no better than the others. I do not know any element of economy that can be discovered in a single department of the Government with a 10,000-power magnifying microscope. In other words, it is as scarce there as it is here. These improvements give employment to additional numbers of men; they bring money to the doors of the taxpayers; they are a good thing for the community, and hence why limit them to post roads? Why not make them applicable to any old road, or any old trail, or all of them together?

That is what this amendment means if it is adopted. It may be that the committee place another interpretation upon it; I am not impugning their good faith; but if I am mistaken about that, then it is perfectly legitimate for me to characterize this little clause of section 5 as a "joker."

Mr. KENYON. As a what?

Mr. THOMAS. As a "joker"—a term which in modern times has received a technical definition that has virtually superseded the broader and original one.

I am not accusing the committee of inserting a "joker" in this bill—far from it—but the effect of the phrase, if crystallized into a statute, will be the same as though it were put in by some interested party and, because of its harmless appearance, escape detection. If we are to have it, let us take it with our eyes open; let us harbor no delusions concerning its practical operation.

But the Senator from Virginia says that the amendment reported by the committee is a limitation upon the appropriation and not an expansion of it. It is true that it has a limit, which is the blue sky; and in the trackless highways of the atmosphere now traversed and soon to be more frequently occupied by fleets of airships it is possible to argue that the limitation being to things terrestrial, there is something beyond, the noninclusion of which makes the term one of limitation and not one of expansion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he would not accept an amendment like this, which I think will meet his views, if they can be met at all: Strike out the words "which is now used," in line 22, page 36, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the major portion of which is now used or forms a connecting link in any road now so used"?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think that helps the situation, but it does not entirely cure it. I am satisfied with the existing law, and I do not want to say to my friend, the Senator from Alabama, that I would accept it, because I am opposed to the appropriation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand that; but I thought perhaps the Senator might be less opposed to it if this amendment were adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that suggestion modifies it. It is an improvement upon the phraseology of the section; but the old law, Mr. President, states the situation as it ought to be. That confines these appropriations to post roads, and that is where these appropriations should be confined.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I will not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is not necessary. I will answer the Senator in my own time.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not want the Senator to feel that I have the slightest objection to his doing so at this time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; that is all right. I do not feel that way.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I stated yesterday that the trouble is that there might be a post road of 25 or 30 miles over which rural delivery is going, and there might be a little link in it of 2 or 3 miles or 1 mile which the Government can not improve on account of the narrow interpretation put upon the word "may." They say you must get an agreement or an assurance from the Post Office Department that you are going to run the mails there.

Mr. THOMAS. I know that the Senator so stated.

Mr. SWANSON. The only desire is, in the case of those small links of road which for short distances connect up rural routes or post routes or star routes, to permit those to be improved like the rest of them.

Mr. THOMAS. I know that the Senator stated that yesterday, and that, no doubt, is the purpose which he has in mind and which may need legislation to meet it; but I want to know why the Government of the United States must use its Treasury for the purpose of perfecting little fragments of roads in the counties and communities of the States. Is there not enough local enterprise—there used to be a little with the people of the United States—is there not enough left in the communities through which these roads are to run to meet the expenses of taking care of these little patches?

The chairman shakes his head. I am inclined to believe that he is not overpessimistic. I am afraid that is the case, because we have reached the point where if a man's family gets the colic he wants the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation under which the Agricultural Department can inquire into the cause of the malady and recommend a cure at the Government expense. From the cradle to the grave, from the beginning of the teething process until man pays the debt of nature, we are now coming to the Government of the United States for financial aid. Our initiative, our independence, our enterprise—those qualities which made the Anglo-Saxon the ruler of the world and by which men of independence everywhere in the past were able to get along—are either dormant or disappearing. If anything happens now, let us run to the Government. Only make the appropriation big enough; let it cover enough territory, and there is no question whatever about what Congress will do.

The question was asked day before yesterday by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] where the money was coming from. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], with that candor which has always distinguished him, said, "That is the business of the Finance Committee." That is true. I happen to be an unfortunate member of that committee. I do not exaggerate when I say that I have a pile of protests, as a humble member of that committee, bulking equivalent to the cubical contents of this desk, protesting against every item of taxation in that bill. To use a homely expression, the whole country is kicking like a steer against it, and yet they have not enterprise enough to organize and demand that their rights be respected in the matter of appropriations. But we may be sure that those desiring the appropriations are organized. There are eight hundred and sixty-four thousand organizations in the United States, and I think eight hundred and sixty-three thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine of them want appropriations from the Treasury, and get them, Mr. President, either through threat, persuasion, entreaty, or all of them combined.

The governor of Pennsylvania, in his inaugural the other day, called attention to the fact that if the revenue bill became a law the taxes of the State of Pennsylvania for the year 1918 would exceed one thousand millions, or more than it has cost to run that State since the days of the Revolution down to the present time; and that is true, Mr. President, of practically every State in the Union. But what do we care? What have they property for if it is not to give it to the Government of the United States? [Laughter.] We want it, and we are going to have it, and we are going to build roads so as to give employment to poor people who have no employment; and from now on we shall build all kinds of roads, at all times, everywhere.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing this bill only. What I say applies to the great bulk of the legislation that is now pending.

Now, let us come to section 6. The Chair held yesterday that inasmuch as section 6 was not subject to a point of order, therefore section 5 was not subject to a point of order. I do not ex-

aggerate. Let the Chair read the RECORD. I suggested that section 6 was subject to a point of order, and I still think so; but a point of order against it, made before a Senate two-thirds of which want this appropriation for their constituents, will simply be a waste of time and of breath.

Section 6, Mr. President, appropriates two hundred insignificant millions of dollars to carry out the provisions of section 5. The act of 1916 appropriated a comparatively insignificant sum—only seventy-five millions—for the same purpose, to be expended in the years 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920. This adds to that appropriation by 266⅔ per cent. In other words, the appropriation of seventy-five millions, before the second installment has been used, is increased by 266⅔ per cent. Puzzle for the schoolboy: If the public-roads system, beginning with seventy-five millions, requires an increase of 266⅔ per cent in two years, how much will it cost in 10 or in 5?

Of course, Mr. President, roads build schoolhouses. We must not forget that. They uplift the neighborhood. We must not forget that. They are an evidence of progress. We must not forget that. They do not affect anybody adversely except the man who pays the money; and what the devil do we care for him? Let him kick. It is good for him. He needs the exercise. What do we care, as long as we have the money? [Laughter.]

Mr. President, my good friend, the Secretary of the Navy, is one of the leading pacifists of the world and an advocate of the league of nations, based upon the doctrine that it means perpetual and everlasting peace, restore the brotherhood of man, and inaugurate the dawn of the millennium, not for a thousand but for a hundred thousand years; but he proposes that Congress shall give him twelve hundred and fifty billions to build more battleships.

Mr. SMOOT. Twelve hundred and fifty millions.

Mr. THOMAS. Twelve hundred and fifty millions; yes. I am so accustomed to talking about billions that it is difficult to rid myself of the habit. That is what it will be after a while, anyway.

Mr. SMOOT. It is now.

Mr. THOMAS. I know, but this appropriation is twelve hundred and fifty millions; and here arises another query: If a pacifist Secretary wants to increase the Navy at the rate of twelve hundred and fifty millions, in God's name what would a belligerent Secretary of the Navy want? [Laughter.]

Now, we have a pacifist Secretary of War—one of the best friends I have and a man who deserves a great deal more credit than he has received for his management of affairs during the progress of the greatest war the world ever knew. He also believes that a league of nations means perpetual peace, but he wants a trifle of nine hundred or one thousand millions for Army equipment, vigilant, active, and disciplined, evidently to fight the powers of heaven and of hell, because no others are to interfere with this coming age of perpetual peace, and, of course, that costs this additional sum of money.

Our air development will be expensive. Some of us who are not entirely of the view that wars have disappeared forever believe that we should have a development of those more modern implements of war, which I think are the best things in the world to insure peace. That will cost a lot of money.

Mr. President, to show how our natural expenses are to increase let me refer to a letter a day or two ago informing me that a new worm had made its appearance. [Laughter.] It is called the corn borer. It is a sort of a first cousin to the Treasury borer [laughter], except that the Treasury borer has claws and teeth, while this seems to be equipped only with a mouth and with an insatiable appetite for tender corn. This letter informs me that it is necessary to secure a large appropriation, to be crystallized into the Agricultural bill, for the purpose of dissuading the corn borer from proceeding with his ghastly and damnable work, and that unless a great army of greenbacks is soon marshaled in formidable military array against this corn borer he is going to become as invincible as the German Army, and instead of there being a plethora of corn we will have none whatever.

Mr. President, that is a dismal prospect to everybody except those like the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. I can understand how they would regard with philosophic equanimity the disappearance of corn from the products of the world, because whisky is made of corn, and if there is no corn there can be no corn whisky; and I wondered, when I read that letter, whether there might not be some sort of a conspiracy between those distinguished Senators and this infernal corn borer. [Laughter.] I have no doubt that the Senator from Texas, who always supports everything that is in the Agricultural bill, will declare war against the corn borer in the shape of an appropriation, notwithstanding that he seems to be an unconscious but powerful prohibition ally.

Seriously, Mr. President, when we take all the proposed appropriations now pending and add them together and look at them in cold blood, we will probably, like Lord Clive, stand astonished at our own moderation. They amount to thousands of millions. And they will pass, because it is said the country needs them. It will make money plentiful and give employment to returning soldiers. These seem to be the chief arguments for them if arguments be needed.

Yesterday's Post contained this item:

WAR COST CONTINUES—$1,600,000,000 IN JANUARY, EXCLUSIVE OF LOANS—PRODUCTION BEING REDUCED—BOND ISSUE OF FIVE OR SIX BILLIONS NECESSARY, AS PAYMENTS ARE MADE BY BORROWING AGAINST FUTURE—$26,356,000,000 AGGREGATE EXPENSE DURING WAR MONTHS.

Although nearly three months have passed since the signing of the armistice, the American Government's war expenses show no signs of decreasing materially except in loans to allies.

In January the Treasury paid out $1,600,000,000 for ordinary war expenses, exclusive of allied loans, or only $70,000,000 less than in December, $55,000,000 less than in November and considerably more than in any month theretofore.

It is not necessary to read the remainder. Our expenses are over $50,000,000 a day, and which will not fall below that figure for a long time. In the face of that situation at this time, we propose, among other things, to increase our previous and unexpended good roads appropriation 266⅔ per cent by an addition of $200,000,000.

Mr. President, if any measure of legislation in the past has encountered public criticism which, however, has been wasted as to results, it is what we call the rivers and harbors bill. That has heretofore been regarded as the quintessence of the pork barrel. But what pikers the advocates of that bill appear to be when confronted with this good-roads proposition! It discloses all the difference between $35,000,000 and $200,000,000.

Does it not appear that the good-roads propaganda is not only distancing the public buildings and grounds propaganda and the rivers and harbors propaganda, but augurs such a fruitful field for exploitation in the future as to tempt those conservative gentlemen hitherto engaged in the delightful process of getting money for these other projects to strike and join the good-roads union as soon as possible, not, of course, abandoning their own pet appropriations, but adding to the joys of the Nation by their enthusiastic approval of something absolutely beyond all their enterprising efforts and their consummate genius for securing public funds for local expenditure.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up too much time in the discussion of a project that will doubtless command a large majority of this body, but in view of the large number of telegrams and letters which I have received from my own constituents who are, like all other constituents, urging me to support this measure, I felt bound to give the reasons in public why it would be impossible for me to support it. So much, then, for the general proposition. I wish now to call attention to a proviso which occurs in section 6 and also in section 8, which I will read:

That in the expenditure of this fund for labor preference shall be given, other conditions being equal, to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Let us not forget that this is a Democratic measure and it comes from a Democratic committee, elected by a party whose shibboleth is anticlass legislation and which demands equal rights for all and special privileges for none. How many times, Mr. President, have I repeated that sublime and beautiful doctrine on the stump before Democratic audiences? How many times have I, with others, insisted that it should be blazoned upon the front page of every National Democratic platform? How often have we told the Republicans, the representatives and embodiment of privilege, that ours is the only party wrapped in the apparel of special privileges for none and equal rights for all? How often have I seen them shrink from our terrific denunciations of their class tendencies and privilege dispensation? I make bold to say, Mr. President, that during my six years' service in the Congress of the United States we have, Democrats and Republicans, enacted more class legislation than had been placed upon the statute books in all the period of the history of the United States before that time. And we are only beginning. Both parties are alike in proposing and enacting it. I know of men in this city who, when some particular species of class legislation is pending, will appear in the gallery, and their appearance indicates how the majority vote will go.

We have exempted farmers, we have exempted union-labor men, we have exempted all classes and conditions of men when the occasion requires from the operation of general laws, and we have done it so often we are getting fond of it. Of course, there is no sweeter thing in the world for an appropriation than love for the soldier. Oh, Mr. President, how that sentiment does gild

and enamel arguments for securing millions from the Treasury! Let us give work to the returned soldiers. Let us see to it that they are rewarded for their sublime sacrifice. Let us make their lives hereafter one long holiday season. They have offered the supreme test of civic duty and have discharged that duty like the heroes they are. Nobody doubts it.

Mr. President, I would be the last to detract one jot or tittle from the honorable and glorious record of the American soldier, notwithstanding which I recognize that he has done the duty and only the duty which American citizenship imposes upon every one of us, and has done it well. I recognize, too, that the man who stayed at home and tilled the soil and ran the factory and the man whose physical deficiencies made it impossible to wear his country's uniform have done their part, and have always done their part, in the crises that have overtaken the Nation in its onward progress.

I would like to ask my Democratic friends in all seriousness, independently of the class nature of this legislation, is it fair to take $200,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States for a public purpose and then say to the great majority of our citizens, "You shall have no right to enjoy any of the benefits flowing from the expenditure of this money until a certain class is first satisfied"?

I have sons. One of them is in the war; he is still in the service and in uniform. I have another who pays a very considerable amount of taxes, and who has devoted himself to war work. The one is privileged by this law, the other is not. I merely mention that as illustrating the general principle. Mr. President, it is absolutely wrong, and I believe that every man wearing khaki who stops to reflect for a moment will agree with me. But it is in the bill. The query may well be asked, Will you vote against this appropriation and by that means deprive our noble boys of the privilege of handling pick and shovel on the roads? They have preference in the administration of the Federal statute. They are a select class under this law. Speaking to a Senator the other day about it, he said that appears in all the State bills, hence we should insert it also; which, I suppose, means that two wrongs make a right.

No, Mr. President, this is the commencement. The fact is that there are three or four million men wearing the uniform of the United States who will doubtless organize, as other armies have organized, and become a potent force in governing the destinies of the Republic; Democrats and Republicans want to see which can "beat the other to it" and secure the favor of a great organized host of voters.

Let us not undeceive ourselves about it. These species of special legislation, humanitarian in form, are at bottom prompted by a desire of political influence. The Democrats want these votes, the Republicans want these votes, and in the race, of course, there being no overbalancing incentive, the boys vote as they ought to vote, just as they please, and doubtless laugh in their sleeves at our tremendous efforts each to overtake the other through the aid of gifts from the Public Treasury in securing their political favor.

Mr. President, I have no doubt I will be taken seriously to task—I do not mean here, but in other parts of the country—for objecting to legislation of this kind as an evidence of my nonappreciation of the services and the valor of the greatest Army the world ever knew. I can not help it. I believe it is my duty to call attention to it, to the end that, if possible, it may be obviated, else we shall have a flood of similar legislation, because, once begun, the parties emulate each other in carrying it to extremes, and always upon the theory that patriotism and a desire to reward worthy men stand behind them.

Mr. President, one word and I am done. The question was asked yesterday by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], What is to be the end of it all? Our bonded debt by the end of this year, in all probability, will be $35,000,000,000. At 4 per cent a year that imposes a standing burden upon the people of one and one-half billion dollars. That is the interest only. Outside of the Post Office appropriations, that is about twice as much as the ordinary expenses of the Government amounted to prior to the war. It is evident that our annual expenditure list from now on, particularly if these huge appropriations are to be made—and once they get upon the statute they reappear in all succeeding bills—will not be under $3,000,000,000, or an annual charge of four and one-half billion dollars.

This must come from the consumer ultimately, with here and there an exception, and from 100,000,000 of people. In other words, in addition to the profits they must make to live, the people in the aggregate must raise and pay, exclusive of local taxation, into the Treasury of the United States between four and five billion dollars per annum, while the principal of the bonded debt suffers no diminution.

On the other hand, as the article which I have read states, production seems to be falling off. Hours of labor are decreasing. Wages, though not rising now, are said to be stationary, and we are warned by the laboring men that under no circumstances will they peaceably consent to a reduction, even though that means resistance to a commercial law of nature.

How long will the taxpayers endure it? I concede that they are more patient and long-suffering than I supposed possible. Suppose they do not resist, how long will they be able to endure it as a matter of fact? In other words, how long will the Government remain solvent? I do not know. Perhaps I ought not to care; I have not very much more time to spend upon this earth, and the problem is one for others rather than for myself.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, it is a subject which gives me the most serious concern. If I read history correctly, revolutions are born and governments are overthrown because of the enormous burdens placed upon people through public extravagance. As the pressure of taxation increases the element of discontent spreads, and justly spreads, until it finds expression somewhere in a local explosion which is the signal for widespread insurrection. We are headed, in my judgment, directly for the rocks of national insolvency, and the Congress of the United States with serene indifference is entertaining bills for appropriations that exceed anything in the past, unmindful of the enormous burdens of the war and apparently indifferent to anything and everything except to satisfy the local demands of their constituents.

Mr. President, the time has come when Congressmen and Senators must be Congressmen and Senators for all the United States instead of Congressmen and Senators from the States and the districts. The time has come when we must perceive our duty in terms of the interest and welfare of this mighty Nation as a whole, subordinating all local and State requirements to those mightier and greater problems upon the solution of which depends the ultimate destiny of the Republic. That is the solemn obligation imposed upon us by our constituents and by the Constitution we have sworn to support. Let us become sensible of it. Let us respond to it. For if we fail there are none others to discharge it and the Nation, disregarded by its representatives, will be rent in twain by its despoilers.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want the remarks of the Senator to be taken by the people at large as a positive statement that the expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, will be only $5,000,000,000. I wish to say to the Senator now that the expenditures of our Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, that is, the coming fiscal year, will be nothing less than $10,000,000,000. After that I am quite sure the figures that have been mentioned to-day by the Senator will be about right.

Mr. THOMAS. I thought it expedient to give the situation to the country in homeopathic doses.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself very briefly to the proposition which is before the Senate. Before doing so, however, I want to say that I am not in dissent with what the Senator from Colorado has just said to the Senate. No man of financial responsibility, no legislator, certainly, ought to doubt for a moment the serious financial burden which this country has undertaken. As the Senator has very truly said, not only is there great local pressure for all kinds of expenditures, but that pressure comes from every department of the Government, and there is only one place where the interests of the people who pay the taxes can be protected, and that is in the Halls of Congress.

We are seeing on every hand the attempt of every bureau in the Government to increase the usual expenditures with which we have become familiar, and that is particularly so in connection with our military and naval establishments. The recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy for an increase in the Navy for the next three years is, to my mind, an astounding proposition. I have for 14 years in Congress urged over and over again larger expenditures for the Naval Establishment.

I think I have been a consistent preparedness man, and yet under the conditions that prevail to-day an expenditure anything like what has been recommended by the Secretary of the Navy, and which has been recommended to him, I have no doubt, by his advisers in the Naval Establishment, is an astounding proposition, and one which, in my judgment, should not be imposed upon this country.

I went to the Secretary of the Navy the other day about another matter, and, as an indication of the desire of regular officers of the service to augment the Military Establishment, the Secretary told me that officers of high rank in the Navy had objected to taking a part of the crews from the second and

third class battleships, which are now being used as transports in order to bring our men home from Europe, but desired to keep not only the dreadnaughts and the destroyers and other craft, which were quite up to date, on a war basis, but every ship of the Navy. That means an actual expenditure, without any construction policy, of four or five hundred million dollars a year. Those who are at all familiar with the recommendations to the Military Committee, having the desire to finish the great number of propositions which have been undertaken as war measures, must recognize the desirability of stopping somewhere in making these unusual expenditures.

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

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; for a question.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact, I ask the Senator, that the same arguments are being made now by the officers in the Army and Navy for a large Army and for a big Navy that were made in Germany by the military party there, and under which contention militarism ruled Germany and was responsible for this titanic conflict through which we have just passed?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I do not wish to agree with that proposition. Militarism is a mental disease; it is a disease that had been gradually gotten into the minds of a people; and it is only possible to have militarism in a country where the military caste is higher than that occupied by the average man. There are really only two countries in the world where militarism existed, and one of them was Germany. I do not believe that the people of this country are going to put the Military Establishment in a caste higher than that occupied by the professional and industrial elements in this country, and therefore there is no danger of militarism.

It is the duty, however, of the officers of the Army and of the Navy to recommend what they consider an establishment which may meet every military and naval requirement. It is not their duty to consider the expenditures which may be involved; they should tell Congress and tell the country what they think is a satisfactory estabishment. Then it is the duty of Congress to determine whether or not the finances of the country will warrant the undertakings which they recommend.

But what I wish, Mr. President, to say is a word about the proposition which is now before the Senate. I think that Senators sometimes forget that the appropriations made for the post-office service are supposed to be returned in the receipts of that service. If we had a post-office service that was just exactly what was contemplated, and what it should be, the receipts would exactly offset the expenditures, and we would extend the service wherever it was necessary to give the people better facilities whenever receipts from the service warranted those expenditures. Now, we have come to a new proposition in connection with the postal establishment, that relating to the carrying of mails in the air, and, in my judgment, it is a promising undertaking.

That service was not satisfactory, Mr. President, in the experiment that was made last year. There was a loss somewhat larger than has been quoted on the floor; I am not sure that those carrying on that experiment know exactly what the loss is. I think the returns are to some degree experimental, as is the service. By establishing routes for long distances, it seems to me, it is almost conclusive that at a proper rate charged for the service a return can be made which will benefit the business and professional men of this country. I do not want to stop in this new undertaking until we have given it a thorough investigation. I think that almost everyone will admit that the airplane, which has been a great military accomplishment, may become as great in industrial and other ways. Indeed, if we had been as wise as was the Government of Great Britain, we would months and almost years ago have undertaken experiments relating to this service and relating to every other kind of service which may be used after the war. They appointed, as everyone knows, I think, committees to investigate the conditions surrounding every kind of industry; the airplane service was one of the matters which they, as early as the beginning of 1917, brought to the attention of the Parliament; and that was included in the general scheme to make recommendations for conditions after the war.

I have in my hand the final report made by the committee on the airplane service. There was an interim report, even more voluminous than this. The members of the commission included officers of the army and navy, several men of high rank in the Parliament of Great Britain, and many men who were more or less familiar with the industrial phase of this question. I want to take the time to read an extract from this report, because it will indicate to the Senate what is being done in Great Britain to prepare for what was the inevitable and what has come to pass in regard to such matters as the airplane service. The report states:

1. The terms of reference under which we, the civil aerial transport committee, were appointed are as follows:

To consider and report to the air board with regard to—

1. The steps which should be taken with a view to the development and regulation after the war of aviation for civil and commercial purposes from a domestic and imperial and an international standpoint.

2. The extent to which it will be possible to utilize for the above purpose the trained personnel and the aircraft which the conclusion of peace may leave surplus to the requirements of the naval and military air service of the United Kingdom and overseas dominions.

3. As explained in paragraph 2 of our interim report on international questions, the subjects covered by these terms of reference were of such a wide character and required so much detailed investigation that we thought it advisable to divide them into five headings, which were referred to five special committees. Those headings were broadly as follows:

1. Questions of law and policy.

2. Technical and practical questions as to the possibilities of performance of aircraft and as to the requirements of aerial services.

3. Business questions relating to the position of the aircraft manufacturing industry after the war, the probabilities of the establishment of aerial transport services, and the steps which would be necessary for the maintenance of this industry and for the development of these services.

4. Questions of labor arising in the aircraft manufacturing industry and in aerial transport services.

5. Problems of scientific research and the special education of expert designers, engineers, and pilots. The successive chapters of this report follow the above headings.

That simply indicates, Mr. President, what has been done by those with whom we are going to be brought in rivalry in the conduct of the affairs of the world now and in the immediate future, and I think, as this is the only place where we are making any experiments relating to aircraft service, that we can ill afford to fail to adopt the recommendation by the committee.

It is true that the route from Washington to New York is not quite a satisfactory route. While the Government dispatches a great amount of mail from here, Washington is not a business locality, and the Government would not ordinarily use the additional rates which are required for this service. We would get a much better result as a matter of experiment if we carried this service a longer distance and between two great commercial communities.

It was suggested in the committee that the route to be adopted be from the city of Boston to New York, possibly with a stop at Providence, which is a city of nearly 300,000 people; thence to Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, and to Norfolk. That would cover practically the eastern coast or the thickly settled portion of the Atlantic coast, and would be, I think, a route which would more definitely determine the desirability of conducting this service than the route between Washington and New York. It may be concluded to send airplanes by a similar route, omitting Norfolk, to Atlanta, Ga. In any case, however, we are going to get back substantially the amount of money which is appropriated in this item. It is not proposed to appropriate $800,000 or thereabouts, which is going to be charged against the Treasury, for, even if we do no better than we did with the experiment made last year, there will not be a loss of more than $100,000 or $150,000 in conducting the route. Perhaps it may be necessary to increase the charge for carrying the mail in this manner. If it is of sufficient importance to those who are being served by it, they will undoubtedly stand that additional charge in case it becomes necessary to make the service self-supporting.

I hope that Senators will view the subject from that standpoint. In order to get something that I think will be more definite than the report which is before the committee, and which is now before Congress, something more valuable as an indication of what may be expected in the future in connection with this service, a report which will indicate to some degree whether this service can be used in commercial pursuits advisedly and wisely, I think it would be unwise to fail to adopt the committee recommendation.

Mr. JONES of Washington obtained the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to some figures with reference to the statement that the Post Office Department is practically self-sustaining. Last year the Post Office Department collected from stamps and in other ways $332,631,000. In addition to that—and this is the point to which I wish to call the Senator's especial attention—$166,315,000 was paid into the Treasury as the result of the extra 1 cent that was paid upon first-class matter, so that the total amount which was covered into the Treasury was $498,946,000. I thought it might be well to call the Senator's attention to those figures in connection with the statement which he has made.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I did not hear all the remarks of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] yesterday, but I understand that, as a general proposition, he urged that all of our airplane activities be placed under the control of one central organization. With that idea I am in hearty accord. I think it ought to be done; and I think the sooner it is done the better it will be for the development of aerial service. I think there should be special attention given to the development of this service, not only as a military arm of the Government but also as a commercial or business proposition. The availability of the airplane for these various lines of activity is beyond the experimental stage; there can not now be any question about that. Our activities should be along the line of developing the airplane for special purposes and special uses.

In considering the practicability of using the airplanes of the Military Establishment for the Postal Service I think we should not overlook the fact that our activities and energies during the last two, three, or four years in airplane development have all been directed along war lines. Airplanes have been developed with the special object and purpose of making them available as military machines and military instruments. I can see that this would lead to the development of machines that might not really be very serviceable in connection with the activities the Post Office Department must carry on. So it seems to me that, until we get this central body, this central organization, the Post Office Department should be encouraged and aided in experimenting along the line of developing an airplane, an "airship," as they call it, that will be especially suitable for the carrying of mail rather than for high flights and doing special "stunts," as they are called, in the air, and all that sort of thing. I can see reasons for the construction of a machine in a different way, especially the body of it, for carrying mail than for carrying a man up in the air whose duty and business it is to find somebody else and try to overthrow him. So I am inclined to favor the provision in the bill; and the only reason I asked to have it go over the other day was to have an opportunity to examine its terms and to ascertain whether or not, under the terms of the amendment proposed by the committee, the Post Office Department would have the authority to make some experiments in southeastern Alaska.

I remember last year when the proposal was made to appropriate money for experimental purposes in connection with the development of the airplane service it was said by some of the members of the committee that the purpose was to use this money in developing airplane service in Alaska, and it related largely to the interior of Alaska. I can not see how it could be very well used in the interior of Alaska, especially where the settlements are; but in southeastern Alaska the conditions are such that it does seem to me that we could very profitably use the hydroplane; that is, the airplane that lands on the water. There would be abundance of landing places; they would be available everywhere and anywhere where they were wanted, and all of the towns of southeastern Alaska could be served in this way, it seems to me, very profitably and very well.

The mail service in Alaska now is in a very deplorable condition. It has practically broken down. I have here an editorial from the Pacific Fisherman, which I wish to read to the Senate, describing the condition of the mail service in Alaska. I thought I had the date of it here; I have not, but it is of recent date, and is as follows:

ALASKA'S NEED FOR EFFICIENT POSTAL SERVICE.

Since the termination of the old Alaska mail contracts last summer the postal service of the Territory has suffered a lamentable breakdown, resulting in general complaint in all parts of Alaska.

Note how the mail is carried in Alaska now:

The present system, under which the mail is handled as express or freight in southeastern Alaska, and by a small boat to points to westward along the Alaska Peninsula, is not only unsatisfactory but altogether inadequate, and if continued will greatly hamper and retard the development of the fisheries, as well as of other Alaskan resources.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. About what is the population of the southeastern part of Alaska, that which ought to be served with airplane mail service, according to the Senator?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, it is the most thickly settled and the most substantial and permanently located business part of Alaska. I do not know just what the population is. I know that there are several very substantial towns there—Ketchikan, Wrangell, Skagway, Juneau, Sitka, and quite a number of other points.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the entire population of Alaska, aside from the natives—that is, what we might call the white population—does not exceed 25,000, does it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The governor of Alaska was before the Appropriations Committee a short while ago, and he testified that the white population of Alaska has been reduced to about 20,000 or 25,000 people. That probably is true.

Mr. KIRBY. The natives would not care so much for the mail facilities.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know, however, that the reports now are that the people are starting back to Alaska, and that the indications are that the coming year will see a great addition to the white population of Alaska. There are many reasons for the diminution of the population of Alaska that I am not going to go into now. This is one of the reasons for a diminution in the population of Alaska. Their business and mail facilities are simply breaking down, and that discourages a great many; but the points that I mentioned and have in mind are the real, permanent localities in Alaska.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Does not the Senator think the national land policy has had a great deal to do with the decrease of population there?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that has had a great deal to do with it.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say, while I am on my feet, that I am in hearty sympathy with the Senator's idea. I do not think the small population is so important as the necessity of giving them a proper mail service.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that is right.

The result of the present policy in southeastern Alaska has been irregular and infrequent service, long delay in the delivery and distribution of mail at points even a short distance off the main lines of steamer travel, and general inconvenience. With no special obligation as to the handling of the mail, instead of going on a regular schedule it is delivered whenever a boat happens to have sufficient freight to warrant a call. On arrival it is often among the last freight to be discharged, and if landed at night has to wait until the next day before being distributed and forwarded; while outgoing mail from Alaska points, instead of being received up to the time of sailing, must be posted many hours in advance. Many communities on the Alaska coast, open to transportation throughout the year—

And that is true of these points that I have mentioned in southeastern Alaska. They are open to transportation at all seasons of the year—

are now often entirely without mail for weeks at a time, where it was formerly received every few days.

Then the editorial goes on to discuss the matter. I will ask that I may insert in the RECORD the remainder of the editorial without reading.

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

The remainder of the editorial is as follows:

Freight and passenger service also has suffered greatly on account of the present system. Where formerly regular schedules were maintained in accordance with the mail contracts, steamer service is now dependent on the accumulation of enough freight to pay for the trip. Thus both passenger travel and the shipment of freight to and from many points in Alaska, where calls were formerly made with some regularity, have become exceedingly difficult and uncertain.

The result of these conditions to the communities along the Alaska Peninsula, among the adjacent islands, and in Bering Sea has been far more serious than in southeastern Alaska. The mail steamer was formerly the sole reliance of these communities for freight and passenger service during the winter months; but the boat now handling the mail for this district is without freight or passenger facilities and has been unable even to maintain mail service with regularity through the winter. When this condition arose many communities to westward were short of food and other winter supplies, and while this condition has been partly relieved through private effort, with the cooperation of the Pacific American Fisheries and the Revenue Service, further service is needed to prevent serious hardship in these communities before spring.

This country in former years took just pride in the universal and efficient service rendered by the Post Office Department, which was of incalculable importance in the early development of the West. The carrying of the mails with promptness and regularity was regarded as a vital function, to be fulfilled to the limit of possibility. At the same time the placing of mail contracts often made it possible to furnish regular means of transportation, which otherwise would have been lacking. Such pioneer countries as Alaska are peculiarly dependent upon such facilities, and the only practical way in which they can be provided is through the maintenance of an efficient Postal Service, with a liberal policy on the part of the postal authorities. Mail in a frontier country like Alaska can not be successfully handled on the basis of the lowest possible cost. Service, rather than economy, is the proper aim of the Post Office Department; and the service must be maintained on an efficient basis—without extravagance, indeed, but if necessary even at a cost greater than any immediate return—if the development of Alaska is to continue.

Mr. JONES of Washington. A few days ago I received a communication from the representatives of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, who are especially interested in Alaskan

matters, stating that mail is now taken to the boats, thrown down into the hold, where freight is piled on top of it, and then, of course, when it gets to the points where it should be delivered, it can not be delivered, as this editorial says, until the freight has all been taken off. In other words, it is handled as any other freight package is handled. Now, you can not have good mail service in that way.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether you get it as soon as you get your freight?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They get a good deal of freight sooner than they get the mail.

Mr. REED. Do they get it right after the freight is delivered?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. REED. Is not that a better mail service than we have been having between here and France?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I rather think it is. I know that the mail service to which the Senator refers is very deplorable. I receive a good many letters from people of my State, saying that they have sent letters to their boys for the last four, five, or six months, and they have not received any of them; and their boys send mail to them, and they get their letters maybe once every month, or every two months, or every three months; but that has nothing to do with this particular situation.

Mr. President, as I said, there are open waterways connecting with Seattle and all of these southeastern Alaskan points. The hydroplane has been developed to probably as great a state of efficiency as the ordinary airplane. At Seattle, for instance, there is a manufacturing plant that manufactures a great many airplanes for the Navy. These airplanes fly all over that country out there and land anywhere that they desire in Puget Sound. They made a trip a short time ago from Seattle to Tacoma, a distance of 30 or 40 miles, and back in 40 minutes without any stop. With the development that has taken place with reference to these machines, it seems to me there is no reason in the world why an airplane route should not be established from Seattle, touching all of these points in southeastern Alaska, making a round trip at any rate in two days, and furnishing ample mail facilities—for first-class mail at any rate.

Mr. President, if the Post Office Department desires to establish an airplane mail service that will be of real, substantial benefit, it seems to me there is the place to do it. It may be desirable to get mail between Washington City and New York in half the time that the train takes it—five hours. That may be desirable, but there is not very much inconvenience suffered by having a letter delivered from Washington to New York or New York to Washington in five hours instead of two and a half.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. REED. I should like to inquire whether, as a matter of fact, they save any time on the mail carried by airplanes? I mean, now, whether they save any time counting from the time the mail leaves the post office at one destination to the time it reaches the post office at the other?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have not investigated that particular phase of the matter, but it does seem to me that it looks reasonable that if we can start mail from Washington City, say, at 9 o'clock in the morning, and it gets to New York by 11, it ought to be distributed there a little more promptly and a little bit sooner than mail leaving here at 9 o'clock and getting there in five hours.

Mr. REED. I do not want to interrupt the Senator——

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is no interruption at all.

Mr. REED. But the question that occurs to me is this: At the present time, when the mail goes through the post office, it goes either by direct automobile route or by tube to the station. There is very little loss of time. If that occurs in Washington on outgoing mail, when it gets into the city of New York it is handled with the same machinery, the same dispatch and rapidity. Now, when they undertake to carry it by airplane, the mail has to be carried down to the airplane station, and the machines there have to be trimmed up or cranked up, and they carry it to New York; and the question that occurred to me was whether the loss of time in going to and from the post office with the new method does not fully absorb all the difference between train time and airplane time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It must absorb considerable of the difference in time.

Mr. REED. I do not believe it will save a minute. It may be all right to work along this line for the purpose of development, and I am not criticizing it, but any claim that up to this date it is a practical thing that has resulted in any saving seems to me absurd.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will yield to the Senator from South Dakota in just a moment. Referring to the particular point of the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, I will say that the mail landing place for airplanes at Philadelphia is at what is known as the Bustleton Field, and that is clear outside of the populated area, really, of Philadelphia; and in order to get the mail down, of course, it must be met there at that field, which must be at any rate 3, 4, or 5 miles from the central part of the city, and then taken down to the post office or wherever it is to be distributed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the landing point in New York is 20 miles from the post office.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was going to say that I did not know how far it was in New York. I did not inquire as to where they landed there.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from South Dakota rose first. I yield to him, and then I will yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I just rose to ask the Senator a question as to the distance from Seattle to the farthest interior point into Alaska that his proposition would involve?

Mr. JONES of Washington. What I have in mind now is especially to serve such points as Ketchikan, Skagway, Haines Mission, Juneau, Sitka, and any other points between—my recollection is that in going to those different points you must retrace your steps along some of the routes—a trip of about 1,100 miles.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CALDER. The inquiry of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] prompts me to suggest to the Senator from Washington that the aerial mail is delivered by special delivery, and in view of that fact sometimes it is delivered quicker. Then, again, our mail service has been so very poor of late that in the case of an ordinary letter going from Washington to New York it takes about 24 hours before it is delivered, and I have observed that in the case of some document mail I have sent out it takes three days to deliver it, so that with aerial mail going over in two hours, and then being distributed by special delivery, I think under existing conditions perhaps it is a little quicker.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Those conditions exist everywhere. My experience in the last few months in Washington City has been that it takes about two days and a half to send mail from one point in Washington City to another. At least, I have had that experience myself; but that does not affect what I am anxious that the Post Office Department shall look into, and I want to have them given the authority if we are going to give them this money to carry on these experiments to see what can be done in sections of the country where hydroplanes can be used, where they will not have to pay anything whatever for landing places, and where there is practically no mail service now.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for just a minute?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. I have here the report of the Postmaster General regarding the expedition of mail from Washington to New York and from New York to Washington, which I should like to read.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well; I will yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. SWANSON. The report says:

The aerial mail route between Washington and New York was inaugurated on May 15, 1918. One round trip daily except Sunday is being made without fail. The trip from Washington to New York is performed in an average of 2 hours and 30 minutes, and from New York to Washington in 2 hours and 50 minutes, the difference in time being due to the resistance offered by the prevailing winds, which are usually from a westerly direction. A stop for the exchange of mail on each trip is made at Philadelphia. An average of 7¾ tons of letter mail is being carried each month. The cost of the operation of the service since it began, including development of new routes, is at the rate of $108,223.41 per year, or 79 cents per mile operated. The cost per ton-mile of mail carried is $5.35. By this service, mail between New York and Washington is advanced from two and one-half to three hours over the train service. In addition to the aeroplane mail carried there is dispatched daily from Washington to New York letter mail from southern connections made up to carrier districts in New York City, which mail is thereby delivered to all parts of New York the same afternoon instead of the following morning.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to ask the Senator a question, too, because he has given this matter much more careful study than I have and knows more about it. I want to know whether or not the department is experimenting with any machine specially constructed for carrying mail or whether it is using the ordinary military or naval machine.

Mr. SWANSON. I think they have been equipping machines that they have obtained from the Government. I do not think they have yet constructed any special machines for this purpose. All of the development, as the Senator has well stated, has been in connection with machines for war purposes; and these are being used, as far as they can be, now for mail service.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not believe they can fully demonstrate the possibilities of aerial service in mail carrying without having machines that are constructed with a view to that service, and when we talk about carrying on experiments in the mail service we are not carrying on the experiment in the right sort of a way unless we are trying to get and use machines that are adapted to that service and that work, and not machines that are suitable for scout and military operations.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. I think probably in the final analysis there is a good deal of truth in what the Senator from Washington has just stated, and yet we have the other machines; they can not be used, all of them, and quite likely they will be out of date within the next two or three years. The Senator must remember, too, that every manufacturer of machines is going to be advancing every conceivable argument why the machines owned by the Government should not be used. We ought to segregate the wheat from the chaff in those arguments and have a care that we are not led into purchasing machines when we have something which may be fairly satisfactory.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I agree entirely with the Senator from Massachusetts; but, nevertheless, if we have machines on hand and if those machines are not suitable for the purpose we want to develop we are not making very much headway by using them for that purpose. I am simply giving my views from what little experience I have had in connection with these matters. I have not talked with any of the manufacturers of these machines, or anything of the kind; but it hardly needs the experience of a manufacturer or of anybody else to know that a machine especially constructed and developed for special war purposes in the air is not likely to be suitable for the purposes of peace, the carrying of mail, and things like that.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him right there?

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

Mr. VARDAMAN. There was a representative from the Post Office Department who stated before the committee that the engines and everything of that kind were all ready and that all they desire is an additional small amount to be used in reconstructing the machines, suiting them to this particular work, which was entirely feasible and which would be very much cheaper than the purchase of entirely new machines.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that is true.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Some of these machines cost $25,000, and it would probably cost $6,000 or $8,000 to repair them and fit them for this service, which he hopes to do. The machines are of no value now; they do not need them for war purposes. It is a very wise economy, I think, on the part of the Post Office Department to utilize them as far as they can, and that is what they are doing. They have the power and all that, and they will serve every purpose just as though the machines were constructed originally for postal service.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that is true, and what I was trying to bring out is that I think the Post Office Department ought to experiment along the line of developing the machines as mail carriers rather than as scouting machines. It is true, the engines, and no doubt a great part of the machines, are all right as to the power they need, but the body of the machine will need to be changed in some way.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That was the purpose, the representative of the Post Office Department stated.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is all right.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That is what they are going to do.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is all right, and that is one reason why I am in favor of giving them this money, so that they can use it along those lines.

I had the pleasure some time ago of making a trip to New York and back in one of these machines. Of course, in the cockpit, as they call it, in which I rode they could dump a lot of mail sacks if it were necessary, but I could see how the body of that machine could well be modified so as to make it much more suitable for carrying mail than it is now. I hope that experiments and investigations and work along those lines will be carried on under this appropriation.

Mr. President, I am going to ask permission to embody in the RECORD a statement that I myself prepared with reference to that trip in answer to the many questions that were propounded to me in regard to it. I could have asked another Senator, probably, to request permission to put it in the RECORD, but I have no hesitation about asking it myself. I ask the privilege of printing in the RECORD the article I prepared in reference to this matter which appeared in the Star some time ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed as a part of the Senator's remarks.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 12, 1919.]

UNITED STATES SENATOR TELLS OF FLIGHT IN AIRPLANE TO NEW YORK AND RETURN—AFRAID BEFORE STARTING, BUT ENJOYED TRIP—EXPECTED TO BE DIZZY AND SEASICK, BUT ESCAPED BOTH—EVEN "STUNTS" IN THE AIR NOT SO TERRIFYING AS EXPECTED—RELIEF, WHEN THE TRIP APPEARED IMPOSSIBLE, SOON SHATTERED—GLOOM OF FRIENDS MADE EXPECTATIONS OF DISASTER SEEM NATURAL.

(By WESLEY L. JONES, United States Senator from Washington.)

"'That man is a fool or crazy!'

"I made that statement a year and a half ago as I looked toward the Washington Monument from a window in the Capitol at a French aviator turning somersaults, flying sidewise, and doing the falling leaf in a flying machine. Had anyone told me that I would be doing the same thing I would have asked him if he thought I was going crazy; and yet I have done it and liked it, and I hope no one thinks I am crazy, if they may think me reckless.

"I watched from day to day the planes soaring through the air over the Capital like great birds. My confidence in their safety and stability became greater as the days went by. I weighed the dangers of the aeroplane with the dangers of the automobile and convinced myself very easily that a good aeroplane in charge of a well-trained driver is not so dangerous as an automobile.

ASKED COL. LEE FOR RIDE.

"When Col. Lee, the Englishman, came from the front to show the people of the Capital what could be done with an aeroplane I decided to ask him for a ride. I called him on the phone. He said he would be glad to take me up at 4 o'clock the next day.

"That rather took away my breath. It was a little sooner than I expected, but it was settled. I was to go up. My mind, however, began to wander from the beauties of the machine soaring through the air to the effect it might have on me. Would I get sick? Would I be dizzy? What would happen if something should go wrong? Would I come safely through? Things looked a little different now that I was to fly. The thought that I ought to arrange my personal affairs for anything that might happen came into my mind. Things took on a different hue. I began to feel as I thought a man might feel who was going to be executed the next day.

"Three o'clock came very quickly. I started to the aviation field. When I reached it I was told that Col. Lee was at Alexandria with his plane, which had been injured in the high wind the night before and therefore could not go up.

"Really, I felt relieved. Things looked brighter. I was glad. I thought I could enjoy seeing the other men fly, so stayed to watch them.

WISH TO FLY COMES BACK.

"As I watched and saw how gracefully they soared through the air and how safely they came back the bug to fly began its work again, and in a few minutes I wanted to go up. I asked Lieut. Dodge, of our Aviation Corps, who was flying, if he could take me up. He said, 'No; not without a permit from Capt. Salmon.' I was sorry, but was told that Capt. Salmon was expected any moment. I waited for an hour, but he did not come, and I went home disappointed.

"The bug was busy, however, and afterwards I went up with Capt. Salmon, Col. Lee, and Capt. Resnati. We turned over, went sidewise, careened toward the earth like a falling leaf, took the nose dive, went through the air like a wave on the face of the sea, and did all the other stunts learned by the men on the battle front. I did not get sick or dizzy. I was not afraid. I liked the sensation. The rides were too short. We came down too soon. I did not care so much for the stunts. I wanted some straightaway flying. I wanted to soar through the air and watch the earth go by and think.

"Some time ago I met Lieut. David Logg. He is an aviator instructor at Bolling Field and a Seattle boy. That in itself is a fine recommendation. He is a bright, vigorous, stalwart young fellow. His very appearance inspires confidence, and I thought this might be my chance to take a trip. I hinted that I would like to ride to New York. He took me up just as quickly as had Col. Lee, and said he would take me at any time I wanted to go. We set the date and the hour for 10 o'clock Saturday, December 28.

FRIENDS NOT ENCOURAGING.

"Again I began to weigh the possibilities of the trip and to think not so much of the beauties of it as about what might happen. I did not get very much encouragement from those with whom I talked. The day before we were to start I asked Mrs. Jones if she would like to go down and see me off.

"'Well, I guess I will go,' she said. 'It may be your last ride.'

"That cooled me off considerably. The next morning the first thing I saw in the paper was the headline, 'Two aviators killed.' I was in no hurry to start. Some zealous friends who were going urged that we start early. They seemed to be afraid I wouldn't make connections. On the way to the field I didn't have much to say. It seemed a long way to New York and I didn't know about landing places. We reached the field a little after 9. Ten o'clock came and Logg hadn't arrived. Half past 10 and he wasn't there. Secretly I was rejoicing—something had happended, maybe he wouldn't come. Eleven o'clock and still he hadn't come. I was sure he had the 'flu.' And then I saw him coming. Down went my spirits, and nothing was said to raise them. When I was fitted out I said to the adjutant, 'I will see you again in a day or two.' 'Well, I hope so,' said he, with peculiar emphasis on the word 'hope.'

FORMALITIES NOT CHEERFUL.

"Everybody insisted on shaking hands and expressing the wish, in a sad sort of way, that we would reach New York all right, but plainly showed they had doubts. To cap the climax I was asked to sign a paper answering certain questions. 'What is your full name?' 'What is your home address?' 'Where do you keep your bank account?' 'Have you made your will?' 'Where is it?' 'Whom do you want notified if anything should happen?'

"I began to look for the question that was asked the old darky when he went to seek employment in one of the munition plants and was asked, 'Where do you want your remains sent?' and thought that if that question was asked I would make about the same answer as he made—I would 'sho' stay with my remains' and let the flying go.

"You can imagine the kind of happy feeling that I had when I got into the cockpit of the Curtiss training plane 56 to start on the journey from which no one really seemed to think I would get back safely. I looked like an Eskimo or deep-sea diver. I had put on over my regular suit a union suit of khaki, lined with plush, and buttoned up tightly about the neck, ankles, and wrists. On my hands I wore a pair of gauntlets, fleece lined. On my head was a leather hood, plush lined, and over that a helmet that I could pull over my face if desired. I wore a pair of heavy goggles to protect my eyes.

OFF ON LONG FLIGHT.

"Everything was ready. The nose of the plane was turned toward the field. The motor was running fine. Logg was in his place. I climbed into the rear cockpit as gracefully as possible. After much grunting and tugging the 4-inch belt was strapped around me, it being just barely long enough by my shrinking up as much as I could. We waved good-by. The plane started running on the ground. When it reached a speed of about 60 miles an hour, and it actually seemed to be going that fast, it left the ground and took the air like a bird. That is the speed that must be attained on the ground before an aeroplane takes the air.

"Within 15 minutes Washington was nearly out of sight and we were 3,000 feet above the earth. We were going 85 or 90 miles an hour, but looking at the earth, the only object by which we could gauge our speed, we did not seem to be moving more than 10 or 12 miles an hour. The earth looked perfectly level. Hills and hollows had disappeared. Forests looked like carpets of green or black. Division lines, roadways, streams, and farmhouses were remarkably distinct and the country looked like a huge map before and below us. The roar and crackling hum of the motor would have been deafening if I had not had the hood and knitted helmet over my ears. As it was, I could hear the crackling of the motor the next day after our ride was ended. To put my head or hand above or outside the windshield was to feel the wind like a hurricane rushing by, and as it was several degrees below freezing I did not do this very often. Those who have been up on a mountain three or four thousand feet high in the middle of the day know that it is not much colder there than on the level, and so it was with us.

GOT FULL BENEFIT OF COLD.

"The thermometer did not indicate it much colder than when we started, but going through the air as we were and with the thin walls of the aeroplane our only protection, we got the full benefit of the cold, and had we not been clad as we were we would soon have been numbed and chilled through. As it was, we did not suffer, but my feet were rather cold at the end of an hour and a half, not having on any overshoes.

"I had no unusual or peculiar sensations; no dizziness or seasickness. It was a surprise to me not to be dizzy. I have never been seasick, but I can not look over the edge of a high building or precipice without getting dizzy and feeling like I want to jump off. I have no such feeling in an aeroplane. I can look over the side of the cockpit at the earth and objects below without any discomfort. Others say that their sensation is the same. We sailed along at an altitude of from 3,000 to 3,800 feet, reaching 4,000 feet as we went over New York Harbor and Brooklyn, preparatory to landing at Hazlehurst Field, near Mineola. In cross-country flying, I am told, they usually fly at an elevation of from 3,000 to 5,000 feet.

"We passed over Camp Meade, half way to Baltimore. The buildings, streets, and drill fields were very distinct, although the men on the ground looked like insects. We passed over the heart of Baltimore. The buildings seemed like toys and all of the same height, except in the business section, where the very high buildings seemed larger toys overtopping the others. The parks looked like a network of paths, by-paths, driveways, small mirrorlike lakes, streams, and Christmas green. We could get some idea of our speed from the fact that it was but a few moments from the time Baltimore came into sight until it was left in the rear.

AIR BUMP OVER BALTIMORE.

"You will hear aviators talk of air bumps. These are very noticeable. The machine will be going along apparently on a perfectly level course, when suddenly there will be a more or less distinct drop or rise. This is called an air bump, and probably is caused by a different air stratification. While passing over Baltimore we felt an unusually hard bump. It really made me jump, and my heart beat faster. When I mentioned it to Logg he said it was probably caused by the extreme wetness of Baltimore.

"Havre de Grace, Wilmington, Chester, and Philadelphia were passed in rapid succession. Time passed quickly. After the novelty wore off the sameness of the scene below palled and I began to take my eyes from the country to look at the machine. I soon noticed the many wires stretched from wooden brace to brace and plane. As I looked the wires seemed to get tinier, the braces smaller, and the planes thinner. I began to speculate as to what might happen if one should break; then on the chances of two wires breaking at once. I thought I would better watch the scenery, and so I dismissed these things from my mind. This is no new way with me. I do it when I am in an automobile. I never go 25 or 30 miles an hour without wondering what would happen if the steering gear should fail to work, a wheel come off, an axle or a brake rod break. I have always been able to figure out better chances with an aeroplane than an automobile, and on this account, I suppose, I have no fear in an aeroplane.

NO SPEED LAWS IN AIR.

"There are no telegraph poles to hit; no embankments to topple over; no cross streets to watch; no speed rules or traffic regulations to be broken by the other fellow and observed by you; no drunken, reckless drivers to shun. Short of a broken plane or tail, the chances of getting down all right are good. The serious problem is a landing place if anything does go wrong, and that is not so serious in a prairie or farming country, and the higher you are when trouble occurs the better. I am not speaking as an expert, but this is what I am told, and it seems to be very reasonable to me from what little experience I have had.

"The Busselton Field, where the post-office planes stop, is just beyond Philadelphia. We had to land there to take on gasoline, our machine carrying only about 14 gallons of gasoline, and making about 8 or 10 miles to the gallon. As we reached the earth I saw a plane on the ground that had turned over and was pretty well smashed. That didn't look so good. When I got out and went into the hangar while our gasoline was put in I saw three or four more machines that seemed to be pretty badly smashed. This did not add much to my peace of mind, but when the fellows said no one had been hurt I felt better.

"We came to Busselton Field with the sun shining. We had hardly landed till the clouds seemed to come from nowhere. Big snowflakes began to fall and toward New York it looked quite squally. I called this to Logg's attention and suggested we might have to go through a snowstorm. 'Yes,' he said, in a thoughtful sort of way, 'and I have never been through a snowstorm,' but he has a way about him that inspires confidence, whether you think he knows what he is doing or not, and I didn't worry.

PLANES LACK SELF-STARTERS.

"We were delayed at Busselton at least a half hour by difficulties in starting. They don't have self-starters on many of the planes, and they seem to get as contrary as a Ford and you can't crank them so easily. The machine is cranked by turning the propeller to a certain point. A man on the ground gives it a jerk, jumps out of the way, and the fellow in the cockpit gives it the gas or something. It seems to start when it gets ready and not before. After a half hour's work the machine started. We got off past the broken machine and up into the clouds.

"I was surprised at how plainly we could see farms, houses, roads, and streams through the clouds. It is when you get above them that you can not see the earth. In a few minutes we sighted Trenton and the Delaware, and we crossed the Delaware much easier than did Washington. One thought that makes my chest swell out when I am flying is that I am doing something that the fathers and heroes of the past did not and could not do.

"We passed through several snowstorms. It looked to me as though we were passing above them. We could see ahead and below us the snowflakes flying almost horizontal, but we could not see any hit the plane or pass right by us. Logg said we went so fast we could not see them when they were close. Maybe he is right. I won't dispute it, but I 'hae me doots.'

"We passed over Princeton, or, rather, to one side of it. The stadium looked like a great dry dock and the campus like a part of fairyland. In a few minutes the waters that we had been hovering over were covered with boats, big and little, going here and there and yonder, and many of them apparently at anchor. We were passing over and up New York Harbor. The Statue of Liberty showed shadowy in the distance as Logg pointed off to the left. Over Brooklyn we were 4,000 feet high. The skyscrapers of New York appeared in the distance like shadowy giants towering over the small houses below.

DOWN LIKE A GREAT BIRD.

"We passed over Brooklyn and came to the farms of Long Island beyond. The motor stopped, and we began to circle downward. I knew we had reached Hazelhurst Field. We came down like a great bird circling to its nesting place. We neared the earth, skimmed along its surface till the rear shock absorber gently touched the ground, bounded up, and then the machine gently settled on the ground, ran rapidly along it, and came to rest in front of a hangar. The 250-mile trip was safely completed in 2¾ hours, at an average speed of 85 miles an hour.

"Monday came bright, clear, and cold. After a hard time cranking the engine we started back at about 2 o'clock. The trip back was not specially eventful. One spark plug was missing as we passed over Brooklyn, although I did not know it, and Logg thought of turning back, but decided to go on to Philadelphia. There we found one spark plug out and three or four loose. In passing over Brooklyn I happened to look off to the left and saw a big machine, a little higher than we, going in the opposite direction. It was a beautiful sight, but I could not enjoy it long, as we were going away from each other at the rate of more than 200 miles an hour. A little farther on we passed a smaller machine. It looked like a beautiful bird, but was going faster than any bird I ever saw fly.

BUCKED A HEAD WIND.

"We were told when we started from Hazelhurst that we would have a head wind, and that it would be pretty strong at an elevation of 3,000 feet and stronger as we went higher. We found this to be true, and it held us back very considerably. We came in sight of Washington about 5.30 o'clock, sailing along at an elevation of 5,000 feet, the highest of the trip. The Dome of the Capitol was lighted, the bright lights of the avenues formed triangles and rectangles, and the semicircle in front of Union Station shone brightly, while the multitude of other lights twinkling in the darkness below made a most beautiful sight.

"When well over the city Logg stopped his motor, and there we floated with our machine quietly resting in space. He turned around, shoved up his goggles, and we had a short conversation as if sitting in a wicker chair on the front porch at home. It was wonderful, sublime, awe inspiring, and a scene and experience never to be forgotten.

"Logg stopped his talk, pulled down his goggles, let out an Indian warwhoop, turned on his motor, and made that machine act like a young colt out of harness at the end of a warming-up drive. It turned over backwards and forwards; circled with its planes vertical; nose-dived up and down like a bark on the waves of the sea; imitated a falling leaf; took a tail spin and twisted and turned until I did not know whether I was head up or down.

LANDING AT BOLLING FIELD.

"Untying itself, the machine started on a long, straight dive. I breathed a sigh of relief. I knew we were going down to Bolling Field. In a minute we came to the level of the lights on the buildings, skimmed along, settled slowy, touched the ground gently and stopped. A man came out and told us to turn and go to another hangar. Logg tried to start his engine. It did not go. 'Gasoline out,' he said. My heart jumped; my hair began to rise. Just imagine what I was thinking.

"The engine started. We turned and came to another hangar. He had used his emergency tank, which I did not know he had. We had finished our 500-mile trip in about six hours' flying time. We were home safe and sound, and I am more than ever sure that air riding is not reckless.

"I do not care to make this trip every day. It would get monotonous. You hear nothing but the hum and roar of the motor, which is so loud that you can not hear yourself shout. I tried it, and my voice seemed to stick in my mouth, and the words of Virgil, 'vox faucibus hæsit,' were literally true to me. You get tired sitting in an unchangeable position on a hard seat for an hour or more, although I did not get nearly so tired coming back as I did going.

FUTURE OF THE AIRPLANE.

"What the future of airplanes may be I can not say. The world's energy has been expended during the last four years in developing the aeroplane for war purposes. That development has been wonderful. If now directed to peaceful pursuits, passenger and commercial machines may be constructed so as to make their use for such purposes very desirable and economical.

"I see by the papers the other morning that machines carrying 30 or 40 people are to be put on regular flights between Munich and Berlin. It looks like the practical German is going to put his war experience to commercial use, and I see no reason why we should not do the same. I understand a machine has been built in this country that will carry 50 passengers. Such a machine could certainly be made comfortable, and ought to be of considerable use in commerce aside from passenger travel.

"About the only exciting experiences on the trip were the races we had with Pennsylvania passenger trains. We would see the smoke of a train in the distance right ahead of us, and it was very interesting to note how we overtook and passed them. The race didn't last long and the result wasn't uncertain."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Alabama an amendment that I should like to have put in the bill when it is in order. It is in line 14, page 18. It reads now:

The Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding $850,500 for the purchase of aeroplanes and the operation and maintenance of an aeroplane mail service between such points as he may determine.

The first part of the paragraph reads:

For inland transportation by railroad routes and aeroplanes.

That language would probably exclude their use in Alaska, as it stands now. After the word "points" I wish to insert the words "including service to and between points in Alaska, such as he may determine."

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am glad to hear that from the Senator, and I will offer it when I have an opportunity. There is another amendment to the amendment pending now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now pending an amendment to the amendment, and the amendment of the Senator from Washington can be offered later.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Before I sit down I am going to take the time of the Senate for just a few minutes on another matter that I consider of considerable importance.

I have a letter from one of my constituents about the water-power situation. It is a pointed and rather harsh letter, but has a good deal of real sense in it and, I expect, expresses the views of the average citizen. I am going to read it to the Senate, that we may "see ourselves as others see us." It is as follows:

SKYKOMISH, WASH., *January 21, 1919.*

Hon. Senator JONES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The headlines of an article I read in to-day's Seattle Post-Intelligencer would make a fine subject to write on. It is as follows: "Water-power bill reaches deadlock." For years we have been reading just such rotten stuff. The House says we want it one way; the Senate says it won't do. Now, any blame fool knows that some kind of contract could be made satisfactory to both sides, and it would not take 10 or 15 years to do it, either; but a few hundred of what is supposed to be the smartest and best-posted men of our country can't reach an agreement.

I think likely you fellows just sling a note like this into the waste-basket and declare the writer a crank. I guess we are, but if I had the whole bunch of our Senators and Congressmen out here where they

were on an equal footing with me I would tell them a few things that would make this cranky note look like 30 cents.

Most arguments one hears now for the failure of many kinds of legislation is the political war that's being waged against the administration, which is my opinion all right, but all the people one hears—or nearly all—making those remarks are only stronger for our administration for it.

The majority of the people nowadays are reading for themselves. We know what you fellows are paid for and we know when we get value received, so the time has come that some of this old political fight should be dropped. Three cheers for Wilson.

Yours, respectfully,

A. J. WATKINS.

Mr. President, the suggestions in my friend's letter as to politics and the "Three cheers for Wilson" are rich in unconscious humor to those who know that the only politics played in connection with this subject has been attempted by the administration and that the House and Senate would long ago have settled their differences except for the interference and domination of the President.

Mr. President, the people know the importance of the passage of water-power legislation.

Engineers of high standing estimate that the passage of the water-power bill now in conference would result in the employment of at least 100,000 men in the very near future and that within one year water-power developments would be undertaken in 25 States of the Union to replace steam plants now operated by coal and to furnish cheap power for many new manufacturing purposes. These hydroelectric developments would have an ultimate aggregate capacity of about 2,000,000 horsepower, requiring an investment of $250,000,000. The industrial plants erected to use this vast amount of power would give permanent employment to fully 500,000 operatives.

The passage of the bill would also result in the development of many now-wasting water powers in connection with the electrification of railroads and for the operation of pumping plants to raise water to millions of acres of now barren, arid western land that with water would support a great agricultural population and tend toward the reduction of the cost of living and add greatly to the wealth of the State and Nation.

I call your attention to these Government water-power maps. Map No. 1 shows the location of the 54,000,000 water horsepower contained in the United States and of which 5,000,000 horsepower, or but 10 per cent, has yet been developed. You will note that while great quantities of power exist in the streams of the Eastern and Southern States, yet that 72 per cent of all the water power of the country is contained in the 11 far western States of Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado. You can imagine the profound interest that I as a western man take in the enactment of water-power legislation on behalf of the people of my section of the country.

The water powers of the above-named 11 States are their greatest asset, though at the present time mainly a sleeping and profitless asset, due solely and entirely to the inaction and inertia of Congress in turning a deaf ear to the voice and cry of the West, praying for the passage of laws under which its people can develop the energy contained in our falling waters. I will confess that the voice of the West as to the form of legislation which should be enacted, as expressed through its Senators and Congressmen, has been one of discord, but necessity for action is bringing us closer together, and I believe that the fundamental principles of the water-power bills which have passed both Houses of Congress and which are now in conference can easily be harmonized so that the development of our water power may be brought about with the respective powers of the State and Nation observed and the interests of the people fully conserved.

These bills give to the Federal Government, to the States, and to municipalities the preference right to develop, but also provide fair terms under which private capital may undertake the utilization of the water powers of the country when the privilege is not desired by Government agencies.

If further provision with reference to this important question should be deemed necessary, the subject matter is before the conferees, and they could, it seems to me, unite upon some proposal that would provide ample assurances that if any State or county or municipality desires to utilize these water-power resources it could do so.

Nature has mainly secreted her falling waters in mountain fastnesses, far from civilization and from power markets, where development means pioneer work, means shouldering "the white man's burden," means difficulties in securing capital for construction purposes and in securing a market for the power. Surely men and capital should not be warned away and discouraged if they have the nerve to undertake this great work, which if unsuccessful places all the loss on them and if successful means that while they will enjoy their reasonable and just reward, yet their work will benefit the public a thousand times more than it does themselves.

I rather think the public sometimes overlooks the tremendous benefit that comes to the public itself from the development of these great water-power resources. I know that in my State there are power possibilities which, if developed, might bring a very substantial return to the men who put in their capital, but the benefit to the community and the benefit to the State that would come from this development would be many, many times greater than any possible pecuniary benefit that might come to those who would put in these works.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is not the principal defect of the water-power bill that is before the conferees the fact that there is no way provided in the bill by which capital can be raised? We have had the situation as to the Alaskan coal fields, where it was supposed capitalists would eagerly lease coal lands; but when the people who were to advance the money found that there was nothing but a leasehold estate offered they said, "No; we may have all our rights forfeited under many provisions of the lease, and for that reason we will not lend money on such security."

Mr. President, it seems to me that there ought to be an alternative, and I have presented to the conference committee an alternative proposition, stating that when, upon the declaration of the commission itself, they shall determine that water-power sites can not be leased they shall offer them at public auction for sale.

The difficulty is that when you go to build one of these water-power sites you find enormous capital is required, sometimes as high as twenty or thirty or forty million dollars. When you go to New York for the purpose of raising that capital and getting the loan, they ask, "What title have you," and when you confess to them that you have simply a lease and that that lease may be forfeited, they decline and assert that no financial institution is going to lend money upon a title of that kind.

What I am trying to impress upon the conference committee is that, while giving all the power to the water-power commission to lease, yet when the commission discovers that they can not lease the site they ought to be permitted to sell the site to those who will agree to develop it. That resource being unused makes a terrible loss to the people of the Rocky Mountain region.

As the Senator has said, we can hardly comprehend how much a million horsepower is in productive ability in a State to manufacture anything that might be desired. I heard it stated at one time that each horsepower in the United States produces, on the average, $1,150 worth of products. Now, take a million horsepower and multiply it by 1,150 and you will have $1,150,000,000 as the product that comes to the State in the way of manufactured products for the 1,000,000 of horsepower. I have understood that $524 of that $1,150 goes to labor. You can readily see, if that is true, it means a pay roll in the State that has a million horsepower of $524,000,000 a year. That is on the theory that the horsepower for manufacturing goods pays, on the average, the same as those in the other portions of the United States. If that is true, it means an enormous loss each year to the people of the West from failure to develop water power.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am glad of the interruption of the Senator. He has gone more into detail, emphasizing the importance of the work, than I intended to do.

I think Senators would get a more comprehensive view of the situation if they would just notice these maps [indicating three maps on the wall]. They present the situation with reference to developed power and possibilities very vividly, it seems to me.

On map No. 1 each black spot represents so much horsepower possibility, and you can see how the possibilities in the great western country compare with the possibilities in the eastern country.

Then, the second map shows the actual development of water power, and there you can see the wonderful possibilities, compared to the other sections of the country, of the great eastern industrial section and the small development in the western part, where the first map shows there are great power resources.

Then map No. 3 shows very vividly in one map the water-power resources and the actual resources. The black spot shows the power development in a certain district and the white spot with a black spot in the center indicates the possible development of water-power resources. You will see in the district represented by Washington, Oregon, and California over 20,000,000 horsepower possible of development and not 2,000,000 developed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state to the Senator that in Colorado, according to the estimate of the Geological Survey, we have between one and two million horsepower possible from

flowing water, and the amount that has been developed is less than 5 per cent; it is 4.6 per cent of the amount of the possible water-power development of our State.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Now, on this map Colorado has 4,450,000 total possibility and 1,697,000 developed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think the amount developed is much less than is indicated on the map.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That indicates all the power—steam, gas, and water power.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh!

Mr. McLEAN. Will the Senator state what is the percentage of water power represented in New England?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I did not go into that.

The Senator from Colorado suggests that water power has not been developed because we impose many restrictions on it, and capital will not go into it. That is true, and that seems to be one difficulty in getting legislation, but I think it would not be very difficult to harmonize the two bills that are now in conference and make them so that capital would be ready to invest. But outside of that phase of the question come one or two questions that are largely legal over which Congress has divided and is divided now. That really prevents legislation. I will refer to that later. It would not be difficult, in my judgment, if we would leave out the legal proposition, for the conferees to agree upon a measure under which capital would be available.

A man who has long desired to develop one of the wasting powers of the State of Washington told me the other day that if the development of the water power was all that was to be considered he would not give it 20 minutes consideration, because the business is not primarily attractive, on account of the physical risks, which the Senator has just pointed out, attending the building and operation of water-power plants, and because of the small margin of profit allowed by the public authorities who name the rates that must be charged. This man said he was only interested in developing the water power he has in mind because of the things collateral with it, and out of which a fair return might be expected. He seems to have the desire strong within him to help create something in his day and generation to do his part toward the development of the Northwest, to see our silent valleys fill up with a prosperous agricultural population, to see industrial plants and towns and villages built, and the rivers and railroads teem with freight and traffic.

I know the particular proposition he has in mind. It involves not only the construction of a dam for the development of water power that could be used for great industrial enterprises, but it also means the making available of water to irrigate and reclaim 150,000 acres of desert, sandy, unproductive land that, with water upon it, would be as productive as any upon the face of the earth. He would like to see that desert producing; he would like to see homes built there; he would like to see the cities and towns that would grow up if it were developed. He would like to feel and know that he has had something to do with a work of that kind. I believe he would get far more satisfaction out of doing that and seeing that done than he would out of the pecuniary profit that might come from the development of the water power.

We of the 11 far-Western States have progressed about as far as we can go without the development of our water power. The State of Washington uses 1,190,000 horsepower, but of this 860,000 horsepower is produced from steam through use of coal and but about 330,000 from water power, though the State contains water-power resources of 8,647,000 horsepower. Our supply of coal is limited and fast being mined out, and we daily import trainloads from Canada. The State of California has no coal whatever, and is using up her oil for power purposes. She has available water-power resources of 7,813,000 horsepower, of which less than 10 per cent has thus for been developed.

Given the right to develop their water powers, the Pacific Coast States would go forward with leaps and bounds. It is not too much to say that as a result our population would double within the next 10 years. It would bring us capital as well as population. It would enable us to develop our other manifold resources; and principally it would bring about an agricultural development so great, a production of food so much larger than required to feed the local population, that it would help materially to cheapen the cost of living and thus be of tremendous benefit to the whole country.

Let me call your attention to map No. 2. It represents the location of the use of the 42,000,000 primary horsepower used in the United States, including all power produced from coal, oil, and water power. Of this amount 5,000,000 horsepower is derived from water power and 37,000,000 horsepower from coal and oil. Of the total power in use, 23 per cent is used west of the Mississippi River and 77 per cent east of the Mississippi.

Map No. 3 shows the distribution of hydraulic resources and of primary power of the United States by sections. It will be seen that if all the water power located east of the Mississippi was utilized it would not meet all the power requirements of that part of the country; but with the passage of the water-power bill great hydroelectric developments could be undertaken in the Connecticut and other New England Rivers, in the St. Lawrence, the Delaware, the Susquehanna, and other rivers of the Middle Atlantic States, and in the South in the rivers of Virginia, West Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Arkansas. Thus it is shown that the development of our water powers is of paramount and vital importance to every section of the United States, and it will be nothing short of criminal to delay longer their utilization.

One of the very first things on the program of after-war activities of France, Italy, Norway, and Sweden is the further development of their water powers. New York financial houses are receiving requests from these countries for American money for water-power development purposes. I am informed that the terms offered are most attractive, based upon long-term franchises and liberal terms. If the water-power bill is not passed at this session, foreign water power will be developed with American capital and great industrial plants, which will employ thousands of operatives, will be built which might have been secured for the United States.

In this connection let me call attention again to a matter I mentioned in the Senate a few days ago. Foreign capital seeks the construction of ships in our shipyards. We will not let them do it, and so the foreign capital that could be used here goes elsewhere, to other countries, and employs their labor and gives activity and energy to their industry. Here is one of our own great resources, and our capital wants to invest in it. We do not provide the way by which it can do it, and our own capital is going to foreign countries, developing their water powers, when it ought to be used in this country. How can our country prosper if we will not let foreign capital that seeks investment here be invested, and if we will not let our own capital that would like to be invested here do its work here, but drive it somewhere else?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Is there any law that prevents American capital from building ships in our own yards?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, no; I said foreign capital is seeking to build ships in our yards and can not do it; it can not get a permit to do it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Upon what theory is it denied?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know why it is not done. I got a report a few days ago from the Shipping Board stating that they have been directed by the President not to permit the construction of steel ships in our shipyards for foreign account, and they are prohibited by his order from permitting it to be done. I am glad to say that I hold in my hand a report, authorized by the Commerce Committee of the Senate, directing that hereafter no permit shall be necessary for it. But it is not legislation. We have lost since the armistice was signed practically half a billion dollars in contracts for the construction of steel ships for foreign account in this country by reason of that order.

The speedy development of our water powers is absolutely necessary to our industrial and agricultural development and to enable our manufacturers, through use of cheap hydroelectric energy, to make cheap goods for export and to enable us to secure and to hold our share of the world's trade.

Congress has been considering water-power legislation for many years. Our differences have been very largely over legal questions relating to the respective powers of the State and Nation. We discuss these and differ over them while the water powers are unused, our fuel resources in effect wasted, and great wealth lies undeveloped. The people are getting tired and disgusted at our inaction. They are looking at the big things rather than legal differences or technicalities. They want something done that will conserve our fuel supply, furnish ample and efficient power, develop great industrial enterprises, and give employment to labor, make lands available for the homeless, and add to the wealth of the county, State, and Nation.

The bill passed by the Senate and amended in the House is now in conference. The committee has been appointed, composed of certain Members of the Senate and certain Members of the House, to harmonize the differences between the two Houses. Concessions must be made on both sides and ought to be made in the interest of legislation. I can see no excuse for this not being done at this session. There are only three real differences in controversy, and only one of these goes to the fundamentals. The House favors a commission of three to act on water-power permits. The Senate is opposed to such a commission. This is a mere matter of detail, however important it may be otherwise. The House favors one method of recapture,

the Senate another. This is also a matter of detail that ought not to be difficult to adjust. The House favors giving to the executive or administrative branch unlimited power over charges to be fixed on the power, and the Senate opposes such a provision. This is fundamental and important. I myself do not believe this power should be given to the executive. It is a legislative power. But why can not this be adjusted by giving the executive or administrative branch the power to impose a charge not exceeding a small amount. It seems to me this would be proper, in view of the tremendous benefits to come from legislative action.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, is not one of the fundamental differences which have been involved in the fight which has been continually going on as to the water-power bill that an executive department or even the Government of the United States has no power over the flow of water in nonnavigable streams?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is embraced in this proposal to fix the charge.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes. It seems to me there has been a general concurrence of opinion in the position that the State water commissions or the proper authorities of the State, or later the public utilities commissions, should pass upon and determine what rates for hydroelectric power should be charged in the State.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That, Mr. President, I think is largely the view of the Senate; it is the view of a large majority of the Senate, but that apparently is not the view of the entire body, for there has been inserted in a bill which heretofore passed a provision giving to the commission unlimited discretion and power in the matter of fixing charges. That, as I say, has been one of the great differences between the two bodies.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It seems to me that that is very fundamental, for I do not believe that the United States has any more right to regulate the rates for water power on the Mississippi River or to make any grant with respect to the waters of the Mississippi River than have I, and I have no such right whatever. That, as has been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States, belongs to the States, and it is an infringement of State rights when the Government undertakes to regulate such rates. The power possessed by the Federal Government even as to navigable streams is only a negative power to prevent obstruction to navigation. As to nonnavigable streams the Federal Government possesses no power whatever.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If we can ever settle that proposition, in my judgment there will not be very much delay in reaching a conclusion as to legislation. I did not intend to discuss it in detail, but merely pointed out what it is and what I would be in favor of in the interest of getting practical legislation. As I have said, I would be in favor, as a last resort, of the proposal of a provision that would permit the commission to fix a certain charge, not exceeding a definite amount, and that rather nominal.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to the fact that the view which he holds so strenuously, and which he has just expressed, has prevented affirmative legislation that will permit the development of the water power of the country. So long as he and others in the Senate feel as he does, I do not think that affirmative legislation is possible.

I remember that seven years ago the Committee on Commerce reported in favor of a charter for a water-power plant to be located on the Connecticut River near the city of Hartford, which would have accommodated some 200,000 people within the area of its operation; but the Secretary of War imposed upon that company a small charge to be paid into the Treasury of the United States. The company was perfectly willing to develop the water power subject to that condition, but when the charter came into the Senate the Senator from Colorado and other Senators who agree with him immediately interposed objections and insisted that they never would consent to the granting of a charter that in any way permitted a return from the income of that company to the Treasury of the United States. So that effort was abandoned. Others have been tried in the meantime, but unless the Senators from the Western States are willing that these water powers should be developed under some Federal system it is not the fault of the Eastern States, certainly, that the water powers in the West are not developed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I know what this controversy will develop. I did not intend to go into a discussion of the matter. It has been thrashed out in the Senate time and again, but I dislike to refuse to yield to the Senator from Colorado, and I will yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I merely want to say a word or two. I shall not occupy more than a few minutes.

The trouble with the position which is taken by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] is that such legislation proposes to deal with a subject which the Supreme Court of the United States has stated is beyond the power of Congress.

Whenever we take the waters that belong to a State and apply them to such uses and purposes as the Government of the United States may desire, we violate the rights of the States. Besides there is great objection to the proposition, for we know that the administration of these matters 2,000 miles from where the great water powers are located, is going to result in great detriment to the people of those States. So we hope that by a discussion of the matter and the reading of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States the people of the East will conclude that they will let the Western States develop their own water power.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield a moment to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McLEAN. The opinion of the Senator from Colorado is that the Federal Government has no power under the Constitution to interfere with the development of these water powers by the States; but there are other Members of this body who do not agree with him. And when the question comes up, it is because the Senator from Colorado and those who feel as he feels object, as they do, that we can not get any affirmative legislation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Senator from Washington will permit me for a moment, I desire to ask, Does the Senator from Connecticut recognize that the Federal Government has any jurisdiction whatever over the waters of Colorado, which State does not contain a single navigable stream?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut takes the position that that is a question for the Supreme Court of the United States to have the last guess in answering.

Mr. SHAFROTH. We are very glad to let them guess, and they have guessed.

Mr. McLEAN. My position is that they have not guessed as yet. The Senator from Connecticut is willing to agree to any proposition. He is willing that Congress shall permit the development of these powers, subject to State regulation or Federal regulation. All that the Senator from Connecticut cares for is to have the water wheels turned and to leave the question of regulation to be settled by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Senator from Colorado will not do that; he will not consent to any legislation that permits the Federal Government to exact a charge or exert control over these water powers.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think I will resume the floor now. I think the position of both the Senators is very plain, and it merely emphasizes what I said a moment ago, that the real delay and difficulty in the enactment of this legislation is because of legal differences of opinion in Congress. The people of the country do not pay much attention to such things. They are looking to practical results. They want results; they want these water powers developed; and it seems to me that it is the duty of Senators and Representatives to harmonize these differences just as soon as possible so as to get legislation.

The Senator from Connecticut said that we had this proposal a few years ago, and that those who wanted to develop the water power were willing to pay the charge. Of course, they are willing to pay the charge. They do not care particularly what the charge imposed is, because they pass it on to the consumer, and he has to pay it. Yet the people throughout the country seem to overlook that fact in their radical conservation views, that we should invest administrative officers with unlimited discretion. As one of the western Senators, in the interest of practical results, I am willing to put into the law a provision that the Secretary or the commission—if we should finally adopt a commission—may impose a charge. But I propose that it shall be limited in amount and that the discretion shall be limited. Personally, I would rather see no charge at all. I do not see any reason why any charge should be put in; but in the interest of legislation, I would be perfectly willing to provide that the Secretary or the commission, if we agree to one, may have authority to impose a charge on the horsepower developed up to and not exceeding a certain amount—say 25 cents a horsepower. I should like to see not more than that charged. That would cover the expense of administration if it is deemed necessary to have the National Government collect money to do that, but that would be a concession in the interest of legislation that I think is imperatively needed by this country.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted I was pointing out the differences between the House and the Senate and referring to

the proposition to invest the commission or the Secretary with the power to impose a charge.

Mr. President, I have here an editorial from the Rocky Mountain News, of January 22, 1919, which expresses the same sentiment as my correspondent whose letter I read. It expresses it a little bit more diplomatically, probably, than does he, and it expresses, in my judgment, the very strong sentiment that now exists throughout the country. The editorial says:

A NATION IN ATROPHY.

Yesterday's Washington dispatches stated that Congress was in a deadlock over the water-power bill. The truth of the matter is that Congress and the executive departments have ceased to function on all great issues involved in reconstruction. The sooner the country knows the plight it is being placed in through this failure the better it will be for the country in the long run. Congress is rudderless and pilotless. The water-power bill that is deadlocked has been before Congress since the first Wilson administration took office. In every session it has been fought over and deadlocked. The ultraconservationists take one side, the reactionaries another, and the Nation is left to hold the sack. The West is standing still, due to the inability of Congress to pass such measures as the water-power bill and the oil and coal leasing bill. Development of our water powers would put thousands of men at work, but the soldiers who are home and are coming home in greater numbers every week can not, it seems, rely upon Congress to enact legislation to help give them employment. If a bread line comes, it will be a severe reflection upon the lawmaking authorities of the Nation.

The employment of labor at this time makes it vitally important that we should pass water-power legislation at this session. The progress, development, and prosperity of the Nation demand it. Surely Congress will not allow this great piece of constructive legislation to die upon March 4 next.

Mr. President, I did not intend to take nearly so much of the time of the Senate as I have done, and I should not have done so had I not been interrupted; but I want merely to ask a question of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who has charge of the Post Office bill, and who, as I understand, is the ranking member on the conference committee on the water-power legislation; at least, he is the ranking member who is present. I ask the Senator if he will give the Senate such information as he can as to the progress that is being made by the conference committee and the prospect of our getting legislation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I am very glad to give the Senator from Washington and the Senate the information the Senator desires, so far as I am able to give it.

The Senator from Washington and the Senate understand perfectly well what my attitude is on water-power legislation. I have been an earnest advocate of legislation on that subject for many years. As has been stated by the Senator from Washington, the Senate has passed two different bills in two different Congresses on the question of water-power development. During the present Congress the Senate passed practically, I may say, without an amendment, the original Shields bill, which was passed in a former Congress. That bill was passed without a roll call or a dissenting vote, as I remember, after having been thoroughly discussed in the last Congress. That bill went over to the other House, and in the House they created a water-power commission, composed of members from three different committees in the House, to consider the bill. The Agricultural Committee was represented, the Public Lands Committee was represented, and the Interstate Commerce Committee was represented.

That committee finally reported a substitute for the Shields bill, striking out the whole of the Senate bill that was sent over and substituting a bill prepared by that committee. That substitute for the Shields bill passed the other House, came over here, and a conference was ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] was then in the Senate and was the chairman of that conference committee. Since that time he has been unable to attend the sessions of the Senate on account of the condition of his health. The chairmanship of the conference committee by that process fell to the Senator from Alabama, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] was substituted on the committee of conference in the place of the Senator from Tennessee. We had two or three conferences. The House conferees came over and practically told us, "If you want any legislation on this subject, you will take the House bill." We were not quite prepared to do that without some discussion, hoping that we might get some concessions and that matters might so shape themselves that we would have a real conference, where differences could be discussed, compromises made, and each side give and take in order that we might reach a conclusion. That situation lasted to the end of the second or third conference. It appeared that the conference was in a hopeless deadlock and that it was impossible to make any progress. So the conference adjourned, with the understanding that the chairman should again call it in session when he thought proper to do so.

I promptly announced that when the House conferees were willing to meet the Senate conferees in a fair spirit and were willing to discuss the differences with us without telling us practically that we would take what they offered or nothing I would call another meeting of the conference. I have been waiting, thinking perhaps that something would develop. This morning I have been advised by the chairman of the House conferees that they are willing and ready—in fact, they are getting anxious—for another conference, in order that we may take up, discuss, and agree upon the differences in the bill. So I am going to call a conference for Monday afternoon at 2 o'clock; and I do not think there is any doubt that we will be able to get an agreement within a very reasonable time. That is the way I feel about it; and I make that statement to the Senate, believing that the conferees will report an agreement after one or two further sessions of the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. KING obtained the floor.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested by the Senator from Iowa. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Spencer
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	New	Thomas
Curtis	Kellogg	Nugent	Thompson
Fletcher	Kenyon	Overman	Townsend
France	King	Page	Trammell
Gay	Knox	Ransdell	Underwood
Gore	La Follette	Reed	Vardaman
Gronna	Lenroot	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Hale	Lewis	Shafroth	Walsh
Hardwick	McKellar	Sheppard	Warren
Henderson	McLean	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Hollis	McNary	Smoot	

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to announce the absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], on account of illness.

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

Mr. KING. Mr. President, opposition to appropriation bills in general, as well as to particular items found thereunder, receives but little support either within or outside of Congress, and the opponents of appropriations, whether in the House or in the Senate, seldom succeed in eliminating from proposed appropriation bills any item. It would seem to be a sound proposition upon which to rest legislative enactments carrying appropriations that the condition of the Treasury and the sources of revenue should be considered prior to making the appropriation. There are many projects, enterprises, and programs within the sphere of Federal authority for which under certain circumstances appropriations would be entirely proper; the same appropriations at other times would not only be improper but injurious to the country.

In examining appropriation bills recently reported, and many of the estimates submitted by executive departments for appropriations, I have been astounded at the demands which have been made, and which are daily being made, for Federal appropriations. The necessary demands made upon the Government during the active preparations for war and during the progress of the war were so enormous as to produce at first a feeling of stupefaction and then a strong mental psychosis, the effects of which still linger with the people. We become so habituated to appropriating billions and for so many purposes that the inclination to continue like appropriations and for similar purposes is difficult to overcome. When an appropriation bill is presented, such as the one now being considered, calling for $600,000,000, instinctively we say the amount is small or very moderate because we have enacted so many laws which dealt with billions. It was only a few years ago the expenditures of the Government reached $1,000,000,000 during the Congress, and when that huge sum was announced it provoked Nation-wide criticism and contributed to the defeat of many Senators and Congressmen belonging to the political party which was in power when the appropriation was made. I submit that we should consider, when determining whether an appropriation is meritorious and within the power of the Federal Government, the further question whether the Nation is in a position financially to undertake the same. Now, more than ever in the history of this Nation should we have a budget system. It is imperative that we know the condition of the Public Treasury; the sources of public revenue; and particularly the demands which must be made upon the Government in order that it may avoid financial dis-

honor and bankruptcy. The credit of the Government must at all hazards be maintained. With the surging tides of financial and industrial unrest which sweep around the world, our Nation must stand as a financial Gibraltar. Its credit must not under any circumstances be impaired. It is a source of pride to all true Americans that our Nation has met the staggering financial demands entailed by the war, and has emerged from the conflict as the financial leader of the world.

Wise legislation preceding the war prepared the United States for its premiership among the nations, but the industry, genius, thrift, and patriotism of the American people have been the all-important factors in establishing the splendid and, indeed, unparalleled record made by this Nation. But this marvelous achievement upon the part of our Government has resulted in producing somewhat of a financial indiscretion upon the part of many officials, departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Government, as well as many of the American people. The great burdens borne in such a triumphant and successful manner encourages the people to demand that the Government perform other achievements and undertake other projects calling for billions, the most of which could be postponed to a future day, and the present undertaking of which would involve the Nation in financial disaster. It is time that a halt be called in the appropriations being made by the Government. It is a time for sober, sound, and serious thinking. It is a time when there should be a stock taking; we should reassess our values; ascertain, regardless of the shock which may result or the disappointment which we may encounter, what our liabilities are and what resources are at our command for their discharge. Formerly the prudent business man took stock at the end of each year. Modern and improved business methods enable him to determine his financial condition at the close of each day's business; but many wise and patriotic men do not commend the adoption of such a course by the Government. The important question is to determine whether the request or demand for an appropriation seems meritorious or will be beneficial to some particular section of the country. Local and purely domestic projects are thrust into the national life and the Federal Government called upon to undertake their development and completion. Public buildings, rivers and harbors, roads, education—questions which are purely within the province of the States—all these are laid at the door of the National Legislature and hundreds of millions and billions requested.

The great war has dislocated conditions in all the world—industrial, economic, and social changes have been produced; abnormal conditions abound. To emerge from the clouds and return to normal conditions so far as possible is a task the magnitude of which perhaps none can appreciate. Nevertheless the obligation rests upon those in authority as well as the people everywhere to meet the serious conditions, and with patience and with genuine patriotism strive unitedly to bring the Nation and the world back to sound and enduring conditions. This hour calls for as lofty patriotism as did the days when the blood of brave men flowed freely upon the fields of France. The day of sacrifice and service for our country as well as humanity is not ended. I believe in the intellectual and moral integrity of the American people. I believe that those who live under this flag have that strong moral fiber that will enable them to meet the dangers and the problems of the present and the future and successfully combat whatever dangers menace the security of the Republic and the perpetuity of our national institutions; but we must address ourselves without hysteria, and in a broad, common-sense, and comprehensive way to the mighty problems before us. The financial problem is always one of paramount importance, not only to the individual but to the Nation. It is perhaps the pressing problem in the world to-day. Of course, the industrial and economic problem is so correlated to the financial one as to practically be embraced within it. The nations of Europe need either money or credit, and with either, or both, the industrial and economic situation would quickly be changed and threatening dangers dissipated.

If the people and the municipalities and States within our borders have sufficient money or credit, or both, industries will be developed; the field and farm, the factory and mine will yield their treasures, and peace and prosperity will come to the homes and lives of all. The financial question is not solved, as many affect to believe, by the extension upon the part of the Government of its credit without limit. The Nation, like the individual, has limits to its borrowing or lending capacity. Many nations of Europe have neither credit nor money. Such a situation can not indefinitely be prolonged. Our Nation, as I have stated, must in this great crisis have unimpaired credit. It must be in a position to steady in a legitimate and constitutional way the business structure of our own land, and aid morally or otherwise those nations, at least, with whom we were associated in the mighty war which we are bringing to a close. Extravagance and waste, enormous or, indeed, small appropriations not imperatively needed, must be avoided. There are so many demands which must be made that the appropriations made will still be stupendous. It would be not only unwise but morally wrong to make the appropriation of a single dollar at this time which is not absolutely required. But in periods of this kind all sorts of Utopian schemes are usually presented. The faddist and the reformer and the uplifter, the visionary, the radical, the man who has failed in his own undertakings, these and others of similar intellectual characteristics vehemently and often with a hysteria bordering upon frenzy attack the Treasury and assail the legislative and executive branches of the Government, clamoring and demanding recognition of their schemes and panaceas. It matters not that our Government is one of delegated and limited powers. It is immaterial that this is a Republic and not a radical socialistic organization. It matters not that human experiences show that civilization is a product of slow growth and rests upon individual development and initiative and the growth of the individual character, and that governmental control of matters and enterprises which belong to the field of individual effort results in mental and intellectual stagnation and torpor. And so daily we are besieged by the classes above referred to, who are seeking governmental recognition of their plans and appropriations to aid in their execution.

Unfortunately many faddists and unwise and ill-balanced persons get into some branch of the public service and they attempt to fasten upon the Government as a permanent policy some absurd or visionary scheme which is bound to prove a failure, but not until the Government has expended immense sums in experimenting with the same. I have had occasion heretofore to call attention to the fact that in many executive branches of the Government ingenious and plausible plans and schemes are developed to extend the power, authority, and jurisdiction of officials. It is human nature to desire power and to increase one's authority, and so we are constantly met with appeals to increase the authority of bureaus, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government, as well as officials in various branches of the public service. A little twig upon the branch seeks to become a branch, and when declared to be a branch by the appropriate authority, we witness a miracle and it becomes a mighty branch, which produces twigs, which in turn become branches, and so on, ad infinitum. This shows one aspect of the rise of bureaucracy.

Let me say in passing that though the war is practically over and it was supposed with the signing of the armistice that thousands of those in the service of the Government other than in the military and naval service would soon be separated from their employment and be returned to private life, the number who have left the service is comparatively small, and it is becoming apparent that there is an effort upon the part of many in the Government service to perpetuate agencies, branches, and bureaus that were created only for war purposes and which were to last only during the war. In my opinion there has not been that earnest cooperation upon the part of many of the officials of the Government to reduce expenses that there should have been; and I venture to say, not in any offensive spirit, that the legislative department of the Government is not cutting to the bone the appropriation bills which are being reported. The demand should be insistent for economy, more economy, and still more and greater economy. If this spirit is not manifested there will be placed in the appropriation bills hundreds and millions of dollars which at this time should not be appropriated and the payment of which will be a grievous burden to the Treasury and to the people.

A year ago the proposition which we are now considering for the appropriation for aerial mail service was before the Senate for consideration. I objected at that time to the appropriation, as I am now opposing the appropriation carried in this bill of nearly a million dollars. I insisted then, as I do now, that it was in the nature of an experiment, and that with the heavy exactions made upon the Government it was impolitic to devote money for such experiments. I stated then, as I believe now, that aircraft has come to stay, and will become of greater importance for many purposes as the years go by. I am not attacking the feasibility of transporting certain portions of mail by means of airplanes. It is quite likely they will be used more and more for such purposes. I am only contending that with the excellent mail service which we now have, and in view of the fact that we have telephones and telegraph systems extending to almost every village and hamlet of the land, we can afford to defer the experiments which some officials of the Post Office Department desire to carry on until pressing financial

burdens have been met and until we have had opportunity to assess the results which the war has produced in connection with the use of airplanes.

When I submitted a few observations a year ago the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] rather took me to task, contending that I was somewhat provincial, and he compared my attitude to the position taken by Mr. Webster in his opposition to appropriations for the territory lying west of the Missouri River. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. Swanson] contends that this is a proper time for experimentation, and his position is that the amount called for is so small as to be really unimportant. He only asks for $850,000 for the coming year. My understanding is that this does not include all of the amount that will be required to secure planes for mail service.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator is mistaken. The Army and Navy have planes. They are not using them. They are stored away. They will be of very little use in four or five years. In fact, they will be of very little use in one year. If you are ever going to experiment to see whether or not aircraft can be successfully used to transport the mails, now is the time. This bill provides that they can buy these planes from the War and Navy Departments and pay for them out of this fund. It is not to be done simply as a matter of bookkeeping, for the Army or Navy would not like to turn them over and have it appear like a loss; so they will have to purchase them, and out of this money it is expected to pay the War and the Navy Departments for these planes. That is provided for here. This $850,000 includes planes, all expenses, places of landing, and everything for whichever one of those routes they shall think they can make profitable.

Mr. KING. I am very glad to hear the explanation of the Senator; but upon reading the various provisions of this bill relating to that subject it is not very clear or certain that the $850,000 appropriation requires that the planes shall be purchased from the War Department.

Mr. SWANSON. It is so plain that I do not see how the Senator can make that mistake. It says:

> Said departments are authorized to sell such equipment and supplies to the Post Office Department under the conditions specified, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. KING. The provision to which the Senator has just called my attention, if that is the only one which bears upon the subject—but I do not think it is—would support the proposition for which he is contending.

Mr. SWANSON (reading)—

> All articles purchased from either of said departments, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, a reasonable price shall be paid therefor, considering wear and tear and general condition. Said departments are authorized to sell such equipment and supplies to the Post Office Department under the conditions specified, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

We put in that language about those that had been used and those that had not been used so that we may know exactly what this thing costs. We do not want any guessing about this experiment; and we also require them to keep a separate, detailed account. It is useless to keep on appropriating two hundred thousand or three hundred thousand dollars for an experiment and never have a real experiment, never have the books kept so that you can reach a definite conclusion. We were determined to reach a conclusion next year as to whether aircraft could or could not be used profitably and successfully as a part of the Post Office Department; and we simply gave them, not two routes, not the three routes that they first asked for, but simply one route, and provided that all the expenses of it should be paid out of that appropriation, even to the purchase of the airplanes from the Navy and the Army.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if what the Senator has read is the only provision in the bill relating to this question, then I think his position is correct. However, under his contention $850,000 is required to further experiment in aerial mail service, and the experiments are to be conducted by the Post Office Department, not by those who have familiarized themselves with aircraft or by a department or agency that has, as a result of the war, gained valuable experience in connection with the use of airplanes. It is insisted by the Second Assistant Postmaster General, who is the chief proponent of this plan of experimentation, that certain persons are urging the establishment of aerial mail service routes. My information is that the manufacturers of planes are strongly urging this plan.

The report of the official referred to, as I understand, calls attention to the fact that in Europe airplanes are used for the carrying of mail. From my understanding of the report, as well as information which I have obtained from other sources, the mail service by airplane is very limited in Europe, indeed, the service, as I understand, was rather of a military character, and in connection with military operations. Of course during the war the airplane was a most important factor. It was used not only for fighting purposes but for carrying messages and orders of a military nature. However, I do not think the argument for an appropriation for experimental purposes here by the Post Office Department finds any strong basis for support in the use of airplanes in Europe for mail purposes. By this statement I do not mean that airplanes may not be successfully employed in transmitting mail, and that the future may not find them extensively utilized for such purpose. I know that many appeals are being made here for large appropriations for aerial mail service. Many of these appeals come from those who would be financially interested in the establishment of aerial mail-service routes. Others come from patriotic and progressive citizens whose wishes and views are entitled to the greatest consideration, and I do not mean to criticize those who would be benefited by the Government establishing aerial mail-service routes and purchase hundreds, if not thousands, of airplanes. The manufacturers of planes have a perfect right to urge their adoption for all proper purposes. I am not opposing this appropriation because manufacturers will be benefited by the purchase of planes by the Government.

My contention is that the condition of the Treasury and the heavy exactions that are made upon it compel the most rigid economy and cry out loudly for retrenchment and reform in the matter of public expenditures. Moreover, it would be far wiser and safer to get from the experiences of the war the strong and the weak points involved in airplane service. The experiences of the various nations in the use of aircraft differ. There is not yet a concord of judgment in regard to planes, their virtues and their imperfections, the character required for mail service, and so forth. Of course, with the termination of the war there will be conferences between those who have had experiences in the use of airplanes, and as the result of experiments, investigations, and the use of airplanes there will be evolved plans for the most suitable kinds of planes for various purposes. My thought is that we should wait to hear these reports, learn the results of the war, and profit by these experiments and experiences of our own and of the allied nations as well as our adversaries. But, I repeat, my principal objection is grounded upon the condition of the Treasury and the necessity for the most rigid economy. Senators can not close their eyes to the difficulties and dangers before us. Unfortunately, authentic reports indicate industrial unrest and stagnation in business. Manufacturers are not receiving orders for their products, and as a result cut down their output and discharge a portion of their employees.

The producers of raw materials find but few purchasers, and those who do purchase obtain limited quantities. There is hesitation and uncertainty in the business world. The producers of copper find no market. The Government has hundreds of millions of pounds of wool on hand, and the domestic producer finds himself confronted with a falling market for this year's clip, which was produced upon the standard of war prices, and also with the enormous quantity which the Government has purchased and holds for sale. He also finds another menace in the fact that Great Britain acquired during the war and now has between two and three billion pounds for sale. The business conditions will greatly reduce the incomes and profits of those engaged therein, and this will have a serious effect upon the taxes for the coming fiscal year. The tax bill which will become a law within a few days, calling for $6,000,000,000, will bear oppressively upon the country. Many who made large profits during the past year expended the same in development and expanding their plants and their business enterprises. The close of the war abruptly halted their production and in many instances left them with plants partially completed, which are of comparatively little value now, or plants which, if completed, are shut down for want of contracts calling for production. The war greatly increased the expenses of the States and municipalities. As a result, the taxes in the various States and for municipal and other purposes have been greatly increased.

I have not been able to learn what the taxes were called for by the Nation and the States and other political subdivisions for the year 1918, but they go far into the billions. The taxes for the calendar year 1919 will likewise be very heavy. The revenue bill which is in conference calls for $4,000,000,000 taxes for the calendar year 1919 for the Federal Government. That amount will meet but a portion of the expenditures of the Federal Government. We will undoubtedly be compelled to issue more bonds, and for from four to six billions of dollars, to meet the expenses

of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920. Mr. President, in view of these conditions, so imperfectly sketched, it is time, as I stated, to halt every effort made to take money from the Public Treasury. Every project calling for money should be carefully examined, every demand minutely scrutinized, and not one penny appropriated that can possibly be avoided. The departments and bureaus are submitting estimates calling for billions. These various estimates go not to one, but to various committees. These committees, generally speaking, act independently; there is no coordination between them. They do not meet jointly, and each committee is interested only in the estimates and claims presented to it. Each committee prepares its own appropriation bill, regardless of the amounts carried in appropriation bills submitted by other committees. Of course, such a plan or system is unwise, unbusinesslike, and does not result in the highest economy. Moreover, duplications inevitably result. Appropriations are made by one committee for objects and purposes which in part are provided for by some other committee and some other appropriation bill. With the well-known proclivity of bureaus to expand and aggrandize their powers, to extend their operations, it is manifest that there will be duplications of work by different departments. This situation shows the necessity of a budget system or some different plan of preparing appropriation bills.

I have discovered that the executive branches of the Government are not as careful and painstaking in preparing their estimates as they should be. There is not that consideration for the Treasury and for the public weal that should be exhibited. I have thought at times there had been a spirit of rivalry to see which could get the greatest appropriations. I think it a mistake to rely so implicitly upon the bureaus and departments for information employed in framing appropriation bills. This information comes from interested parties, too often from those who are ambitious to extend their authority or desirous of increasing the jurisdiction and power of the organization with which they are identified. This is the exhibition of a human trait of character, and I am not now speaking of it in a critical way. However, I think it is apparent to those who come in contact with the claims and demands made by the various departments, bureaus, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government that there is, generally speaking, not that fine and nice sense of discrimination and that fine feeling for the country's welfare that should always be found in a public servant. We are now besieged in every direction by thousands and tens of thousands of employees of the Government and by all sorts of influences to increase compensation and salaries. The pressure is great to increase the offices, multiply positions, augment the power of public officials, and add to the authority of departments, bureaus, and governmental agencies. Extensive propagandas are being carried on urging governmental ownership and control of transportation companies, telephone and telegraph lines, the taking over and operation of packing plants, as well as other enterprises which have been built up through the genius and enterprise of individuals. These and many other plans are being presented and affirmative and favorable action demanded.

The question of cost is not always considered, and the theory and spirit of our Government are too often overlooked. Many people seem to forget that this is a Republic, not a paternalistic Nation, not a socialistic Government, not a Prussian Government. I have sometimes said that a mania takes possession of many individuals who enter the executive branch of the public service, and they devise ingenious and plausible schemes calculated to convert this Republic into a bureaucracy. The limitations of their organizations are ignored, they want to soar out into a larger and different world, and to engage in activities wholly beyond the purpose of the agency or department with which they are identified, and, as stated, activities which in many instances are not within the power or province of our Government, and which, if persisted in, would destroy the initiative of the people and convert them into lifeless, nerveless, devitalized organisms depending upon a socialistic or paternalistic government for life, for food, and being.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party has always claimed to be the party of economy in the administration of public affairs. It has insisted that to take one penny from the people under the guise of taxation that was not imperatively required for the public welfare, for the purpose of the Government when it was economically administered, was not only a legal but a moral wrong and a violation of the fundamental law of the land. It has charged the Republican Party with gross extravagances and with the use of public funds for purposes other than governmental. I think, in the main, it was entitled to carry the banner representing the party of economy and of honesty in the administration of public affairs. It can not afford to lower that banner or to have it seized by some other party. By its devotion to economy and good government it has earned the right to uphold that banner.

A Democratic President said that "public office is a public trust." In looking at the estimates coming from public officials, in learning of the demands that are made for appropriations from the Government, in examining the schemes and plans and programs submitted calling for Federal support, and in becoming acquainted with the record of some of the executive departments of the Government, I am led to believe that some public officials have forgotten the significance and the importance of the words just quoted; forgotten they are holding "a public trust" and should be limited by constitutional provisions.

I again ask, Where are we to obtain immense sums required to meet the appropriations for this fiscal year and for the next and for the years immediately following? The Senator having this bill in charge stated yesterday, when I propounded a similar question, "Oh, we will leave to the Committee on Ways and Means the task of providing the funds we appropriate."

It is an easy task to appropriate money, but I submit that we should not vote for an appropriation bill unless we have some clear conception of the source from which the money is to come to meet the appropriation. And even then the appropriation should not be made unless it is absolutely necessary; that it is for a public purpose; that it is within the letter and the spirit of the fundamental law of the Republic; and unless the money required can be obtained without destroying business or undermining the confidence of the people in the Government. The funds of the Treasury should be regarded as a sacred trust. They should be more zealously guarded by every public official than would his own treasures be protected. And in making appropriations the psychology of acting en masse where the responsibility rests en masse should be ignored and destroyed, and the awakened conscience of each public official should direct and guide his vote and conduct to the same extent as if he were acting alone and the entire responsibility for the protection of the fund were with him.

It has been charged that there is too much reciprocity in legislation, particularly legislation relating to appropriations, and in support of this claim so often made by writers and speakers, rivers and harbor bills and those providing for public buildings are referred to.

Mr. President, no one knows exactly the appropriations which we will be called upon to make between now and the 4th of March when this Congress adjourns, but they are so enormous as to stagger those who attempt to comprehend them. The human mind can not grasp what these billions mean; and the demands are daily increasing, and the amounts agreed upon to be appropriated constantly augmented.

The bill under consideration was increased by the Senate committee more than $44,000,000 after it left the House. It carries $400,000,000 by way of appropriations. Many nations of the world, some of them regarded as great nations with large populations, vast business interests, do not have an annual revenue of that amount.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator says that this bill has been increased $44,000,000. He surely does not overlook the proposed good roads increase of $200,000,000.

Mr. KING. I thank the Senator for inviting my attention to that. I intended to advert to that in a moment, but this is a very appropriate place to add that to the already swelling demand that this bill makes upon the Public Treasury. The bill calls for $600,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator says that there are many European countries whose entire appropriations do not amount to the sum mentioned in this bill. That is true; and there are many European countries that are not like America in any other respect. I am glad that America is different and greater and better than those countries.

Mr. KING. Oh, Mr. President, we get nowhere in such statements as that. I know the disposition of many Americans to be rather boastful and to claim a great superiority over all other peoples of the world. It is a habit with some of us, probably a sort of Fourth of July exotic manifestation, that clings to us from the time we leave high school until we go to the grave. We become a little vain because we are so great a Nation and have so glorious a history that we are tempted to become pharisaical, and thank God because we are bigger and better and grander than any other people in the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it is not only a Fourth of July matter, but it is a Chateau-

Thierry matter, an Argonne matter, a successful termination of the present war matter.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the record of the American soldiers and marines at the places mentioned by the Senator, as well as wherever they have fought in this great struggle, is one which thrills all true Americans and will be an enduring page in the history of our country. But, Mr. President, though we are justified in speaking with pride of the achievements of our great Nation and our gallant sons on land and sea, we can not afford to be ungenerous to the brave and heroic peoples with whom we have been associated. France, with a population of but about 44,000,000 of people, lost more than 1,000,000 men upon the battle fields. Great Britain's losses from death alone exceeded 1,000,000 men. Senators will recall the frightful casualties which Italy sustained; Belgium's losses in proportion to the men engaged in arms were enormous; and Russia, the land of tragedy and sorrows, lost millions in killed and wounded. A short time prior to the termination of the war Great Britain was losing from forty to fifty thousand men each month.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yet they could not win the war without us.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I submit in all courtesy and gentleness that my friend is indulging in another Americanism.

Mr. McKELLAR. Maybe so; I am delighted to have that kind.

Mr. KING. I do not desire to indulge in any comparisons as to the value of the services rendered in this great war by the United States and her allies. Many persons will agree with the Senator that if the United States had not entered the war the central powers would have triumphed. That position is stoutly denied by many others who have given close attention to the military problems and to the strategy of the war. Some say that we could not have won the war if it had not been for England's ships. Others state that the war would have been lost to the central powers if it had not been for the heroic and invincible courage of the Belgians when the Prussian hordes invaded her consecrated soil in August, 1914. Still others contend that the intrepid and the glorious conduct of the French during all the dark hours from the invasion of her territory until Gen. Foch signed the armistice was the most important factor in accomplishing the defeat of the central powers. There are those who say that the sacrifices, deep and terrible sacrifices—sacrifices not yet fully known to the world—made by the poor Russian peasant was one of the controlling factors in determining the conflict. There are many who speak of bleeding and sorrowing Italy. We have not yet learned all that she did to aid in winning the war. The Italians suffered from privations that we can not comprehend, and in the face of obstacles that seem humanly impossible to surmount they built up a great army and valorously contended against tremendous odds upon many bloody battle fields. Nor can Serbia be forgotten when we attempt to assess the various elements and factors entering into the triumphant conclusion of the war. Her people have passed through a Gethsemane.

No page of history will show greater heroism and more uncomplaining sacrifices than that devoted to Serbia's contribution to this world conflict; and Great Britain and her dominions gave so much to this contest that future ages can not detract from their glory. All Americans are proud to bear tribute to the valor, courage, and devotion of the nations with which our Nation was associated in this great struggle for freedom and civilization. A distinguished Senator said upon the floor this morning that we won the war and that England and France were now engaged in a game of "grab" regarding the colonies formerly possessed by Germany. That is not exactly his language, but it represents the idea which he expressed.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. Mr. President, from the little island of England the premier of Great Britain has indicated more than once that Great Britain does not seek one rood of territory as the result of this great contest. He intimated, however, that at least some of her dominions—Canada and Australia and New Zealand—might make claim with respect to territory that had been taken from Germany. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I assume the Senator wishes to state the figures accurately and does not wish to depreciate the contention he is making. As a matter of fact, Great Britain was having about twice the number of casualties which the Senator referred to in the statement he just made.

Mr. KING. The Senator is correct. I had in mind when I spoke an earlier period in the war. As I now remember Great Britain's casualties for a considerable period prior to the signing of the armistice were so heavy that if continued for a year at the same rate they would have amounted to perhaps a million and a half.

Mr. SMOOT. They were over 36,000 a week at the time the war closed.

Mr. KING. I have been diverted from the bill which I was discussing, but in view of what was said by the Senator from Tennessee and the other Senator to whom I just referred I desire to refer for a moment to the attitude of France and England as I understand their position concerning the German colonies. England, as I understand the facts, has disclaimed any desire to take over any of the German colonies. Indeed, she requested that the United States accept the trusteeship for some of Germany's lost colonies. However, Australia and Great Britain's South African dominions desired that some of these colonies should pass to them. I am sure that France has indicated no desire to "grab" territory. She doubtless feels entitled to some territory in South Africa formerly held by Germany. I might say in passing that I do not think the United States could be accused of grabbing territory because at the conclusion of its contest with Spain the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico were acquired by it.

It must not be forgotten that France has suffered far more than many comprehend as a result of the war. She is now so weakened in man power that she will have difficulty in building up her industries and carrying on the ordinary pursuits which engaged her people. France is a small country, and possesses limited resources. She is burdened with a debt of more than $30,000,000,000. Her lands have been devastated, cities and towns have been destroyed; rich manufacturing centers have been plundered and most of her people have been left homeless. While at peace, and desiring peace, she was struck by a powerful enemy, and for four years held back the invading forces, not knowing with each passing day what the night or the coming morn would witness. We were 3,000 miles away from that carnage and devastation. When Germany made war upon us our Nation was finally compelled to enter the conflict. We sent our gallant soldiers to do their duty with the English and the French, the Belgians and the Italians, and the brave nations allied with us in humanity's cause; and the American soldier and sailor upheld the traditions of the past and brought unfading glory to themselves and honor to our Nation. Of course, Mr. President, no one will gainsay the greatness of this Republic. While I have just said in a kindly critical way that sometimes we are given a little to vanity in speaking of our Nation, still I rejoice in the fact that this Government is the greatest and the freest that the world has ever seen. From a little fringe upon the Atlantic coast this Republic has developed until it is the colossus of the world. She has become great because of the sturdy manhood, and virtue and courage of the men and the women of our land.

The foundations of a free Republic were deeply laid in the soil of this New World, and upon that foundation has been erected an enduring Government, under which the American people have enjoyed liberty and become great in material wealth and rich in spiritual achievements, great ideals, and noble aspirations. And so to-day we rejoice with the nations with whom we have participated in the struggle against the gross materialism and the military autocracy of the central empires in the victory which crowned the joint efforts of all. We are proud to have been associated with the peoples of all these nations. We pay our tribute of praise and homage for their valor and courage and the steadfast devotion which animated them during all the dark hours through which they passed. We would not detract one iota from the honor and glory to which each and all of our allies are entitled, and in all the ages yet to come this Republic will be acclaimed for its contribution to the success of the cause of liberty and justice. A peaceful, democratic Nation within a few months became transformed into a powerful fighting Nation. Its people were stirred to the depths by a patriotic fervor that led them to gladly and cheerfully make every sacrifice which was involved. Within a few months more than 2,000,000 men crossed the sea, and hundreds of thousands of American soldiers, as brave as the world has ever seen, stood in battle array against the formidable military forces of the enemy. Along the entire battle front, from the British Channel to Switzerland, Americans fought and died. Their blood mingles with the blood of England, and France, and Belgium, and Italy, and other allied nations, and by these sacrifices and upon the graves of these undying heroes will be erected a temple of amity and friendship, peace and fraternity, within which the peoples from all lands may reverently enter and from which they all emerge purified from selfishness and consecrated anew to the cause of liberty and justice throughout the world.

Mr. President, I was discussing, when diverted by the questions of Senators, the question of appropriations, and inquiring where the vast sum was coming from to meet the heavy exactions that are being made upon the Government. I called attention to the precarious situation of business, the heavy taxes

imposed by the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities. There is a limit to the power of the Government to meet obligations. The Government has only two sources from which to obtain money to meet its expenditures. It may tax or it may borrow. It may not be inappropriate at this time to call attention to the attitude of so many people in our country today. From the petitions forwarded to Congress and the demands made, it is apparent that the belief exists upon the part of some that appropriations by the Federal Government in behalf of and to aid States or limited or sectional areas will not be a burden upon the people of such State or district. They seem to forget that ultimately every dollar taken from the Treasury of the United States must come from the people, not from the people of one State alone but from all classes in all sections of the country. If money is appropriated for roads, it must be taken by taxation from the people of all the States and placed in the Treasury of the United States. It is no advantage to the people in the long run to receive appropriations for roads or bridges or purely local and domestic affairs, because they will be called upon to pay for the same. It is an unwise policy to appropriate money for purely domestic and local matters, matters that the States under our form of government should control. Of course, the policy is vicious and in contravention of our form of government. Moreover, it involves the creation of additional Federal machinery; more bureaus and agencies are created, more Federal employees result, and additional expenses for administration are incurred.

It seems so foolish to take money from the people and transfer it to the Federal Treasury and then by means of appropriation bills filter it back through a thousand bureaus, agencies, instrumentalities, and employees into the States from which it came. The waste resulting from such a policy is enormous and the additional costs are difficult to estimate. Certainly from 10 to 50 per cent of the amount collected is wasted and lost. If the people themselves collected the money and expended it where their own agents and servants could be watched and controlled, the results would be very much better. The evils of the Federal policy are observable in the handling of many matters by the United States which should be handled by the States. It is a long way from Washington to the various parts of the Union. The multiplication of governmental agencies and the enormous increase in the number of employees result from the policy which so many of the people foolishly clamor for, namely, governmental control, agencies, business concerns, activities, and matters purely local and domestic in character, and in many instances solely individual in nature and extent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator referred to the fact that I had taken him severely to task for his position on this matter last year. I hope the Senator does not feel that I have taken him severely to task about anything. In a general way I agree with what the Senator says about appropriations. I think we ought to be exceedingly careful. The Senator knows my view and my vote on such matters of extravagance.

Mr. KING. The Senator is going to vote for this appropriation, is he not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and assuming that the Senator is entirely correct and was correct last year, if the Senator's amendment to strike out this item last year had prevailed, according to the actual figures the Senator would have saved $15,000 for the Government, because we lost $15,000 by this experimental service.

If we lose in the same proportion for this year, we will lose $45,000, assuming that it is still an experimental service. The fact shows that it is almost out of the realm of experimentation, because it has practically paid for itself. The gentleman who has it in charge believes that when a route is established from Boston to New York and from New York to Chicago it will actually pay for itself. Surely on the facts that have been stated we can reasonably assume that it will pay for itself. So assuming that everything the Senator says on economy is correct, we are wasting time fooling with a loss that can amount to but a few thousand dollars. Let us get at the appropriations that go into millions, matters of contracts involving billions of dollars, where we can save the Government, and do not let us be bothering about small matters when there are large matters that ought to have our attention.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was taught when a boy that the little things made the big things, and if you watch the little leaks there need be no concern about the big leaks.

The Senator says approximately $15,000 only was lost in conducting the air service mail experiment for 1918.

Mr. McKELLAR. Less.

Mr. KING. The Senator says less than $15,000. I do not accept his figures. I think the statement of the Senator——

Mr. McKELLAR. I take the statement of the department.

Mr. KING. I think the statement of the Senator is a verbal inexactitude resting upon erroneous conclusions, if not erroneous statements, made by a branch of a department which is anxious to build up more machinery and extend its power and influence in the land.

I notice in the report which was submitted that only 33⅓ per cent were allowed for depreciation in property. It is claimed by many familiar with aeroplanes that they have served their day when they have been in the air approximately 140 hours. They are delicate instrumentalities. They have to be handled with the greatest care, and they last, like the shadows of the morning, but for a fleeting moment. Where in this report is there a proper debit charge that should be made for the loss of aeroplanes?

From my information concerning the use of planes in France I am led to state that the machines used by the Post Office Department in carrying mails are not of much value now; indeed, if they have been operated for more than 140 hours—that is, have been in the air for that period—they have ceased to be of much value.

[At this point Mr. KING yielded the floor for the day.]

Saturday, February 1, 1919.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have learned since I have been here two lessons more or less important—one is that a committee rather resents opposition to an appropriation bill reported by it, and the impatience is exhibited if there should be criticism of any of the items carried in the bill. Is it possible that the theory must prevail that it is the duty of Senators to take the bill, good or bad, without criticism, without analysis, and without understanding of its terms?

Another thing that I am learning is that there is not very much of an aisle of separation between the Democrats and the Republicans when an appropriation bill is before the Senate for consideration. Such a bill seems to be a golden bridge that united both sides of the Chamber and over which Senators from both sides freely pass in their beautiful fraternization.

Mr. President, I was calling attention yesterday at the hour of adjournment to the expenditures that were being made, colossal and stupendous in amount, and I propounded a query as to the source from which the revenue was to be obtained in order to meet the growing expenditures. My colleague (Mr. SMOOT) stated this morning that the expenditures for the fiscal year 1920 would be at least $10,000,000,000. In my opinion they will reach and perhaps will exceed that amount. I have before me some estimates for required appropriations for the year 1920. They are very incomplete, and yet they total more than $8,000,000,000. They do not include the $750,000,000 required by the Railroad Administration for the operation of the railroads for that year; nor do they include the two hundred and eighty odd million dollars required by the Navy Department over the original estimates submitted by it. There is still another large item, demanded for the purpose of caring for the wheat crop of the current year. No one knows, Mr. President, what that amount will be. I understand the Agricultural Department asks for $1,000,000,000 for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LENROOT in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. KING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMOOT. Those estimates do not include any judgments that may be entered against the Government for unfulfilled contracts with the Government, nor do they include the amount of goods which it will ultimately develop the Government must purchase because of the fact that contracts covering them could not be canceled.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have that included in my item as contingent liabilities, the most of which will probably have to be met. As to what those contingent liabilities are, no one can determine. I think it may be safely said that the contingent liabilities of the Government growing out of contracts and claims for damages—many of them legal, and most of them perhaps equitable—will aggregate from two to three billions of dollars.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me——

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. May I call the attention of the honorable Senator to another item that should be included in his estimate of the possible expenditures of the Government? It is this: If the Bolshevists and the dissatisfied people of Europe should get hungry again after eating the $100,000,000 worth of food which this Government of the United States has recently

donated to them as a reward for letting us have peace, in order to get a little more food they may raise a revolution, demand another hundred millions or a billion dollars; and if it should be asked for as a peace measure, the probabilities are that it will be voted by the Congress. That matter should not be overlooked in making an estimate of the liabilities of the Government.

Mr. KING. Of course that, as well as many other items that may be conceived of by Senators, is not included in the estimates which I am giving. I am inclined to think that the obligations that will have to be met by the Government during the fiscal year 1920 will be considerably in excess of $10,000,000,000. In times of peace, with such stupendous liabilities as that, it seems to me that Senators should hesitate now with respect to appropriations which are made, and should guard the Treasury with greater care and caution than ever before.

It has been estimated that when we were in prosperous conditions the aggregate earnings of all the people were between thirty-five and forty-five billions of dollars, and that the amount saved and available for investment was only five billions of dollars. Based upon these figures it is obvious that the fiscal year 1920 will not realize five billions of dollars (unless there should be an unexpected business revival) which will be available for investment. From that amount the additional taxes caused by the war would be deducted; therefore, if we assume the same financial and industrial conditions as existed before the war, which yielded five billions of dollars per annum for investment and for savings, there will be considerably less than that amount because of increased taxation. But even if there were five billion dollars available for investment, that amount would be insufficient for the next few years to meet the obligations of the Government. A considerable portion of this sum unquestionably will be invested by the owners and holders of the same in business and in private undertakings. A portion only, therefore, will be available for the purchase of Government securities. The amounts so available will be insufficient, plus the amount derived by taxation, to discharge the obligations of the Government for the next year or two. It means, therefore, national insolvency, unless the most heroic steps are taken to cut down the expenses of the Government.

In view of these conditions, I do not quite comprehend the attitude of so many upon whom responsibility rests; they look complacently upon the situation and give support to appropriations of the most varied kind, and in amounts so great as to be appalling. I do not intend to be critical or to be an alarmist, but I do confess to a feeling of disquietude when I behold the almost reckless manner in which the moneys of the Government are being appropriated and expended. During what might be called the rush period of war there is greater excuse for extravagance, but when the war is over, and there is full opportunity to investigate every appropriation and ascertain the channel into which it goes, improvident appropriations can not be excused.

A friend of mine rebuked me for criticizing legislation, because he stated I was criticizing my own party. Mr. President, by some in my State I have been regarded as partisan. I have denounced the Republican Party because of legislation which I regarded as hurtful to the Republic. I have criticized that party because of its extravagance and have declared that its policies made for a strong central government, which in the end would be destructive of the spirit of democracy, which this Republic was organized to perpetuate and to preserve; but I would as quickly, and I hope with as much severity, condemn extravagance in my own party. There are few occasions in the National Legislature where questions that are strictly partisan arise. I have tried to follow what I conceived to be the proper and just course and treat questions affecting the welfare of my country not as a partisan but as a lover and defender of the Republic and the institutions of our country. I believe that in the consideration of questions and problems affecting the welfare of our Nation all should approach their discussion imbued with the highest spirit of patriotism and permeated by a sincere desire to serve the public weal.

Mr. President, I will detain the Senate but a moment longer, and shall briefly refer to the item in the bill which was under discussion yesterday and which is receiving attention now. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] improves the bill and should be adopted, although I am frank to confess that in my opinion it would be wiser to make no appropriation for aerial mail service at this time. The contention is made that the Post Office Department can continue experiments with a view to determining the feasibility of employing airplanes for mail service. In my opinion that department is not equipped in such manner as to enable it to conduct experiments in a satisfactory way. It has nothing to do with the subject of aeronautics. It does not have the necessary buildings, shops, and establishments for the purpose of repairing and handling aircraft. Moreover, it does not have in its employ mechanicians and those who have had experience in the use of airplanes. If Congress acted prudently and wisely in the matter, a commission would be appointed consisting of persons who have had experience in the manufacture and use of aircraft. The war has developed men of experience—those who have made extensive use of aircraft, and their judgment with respect to the subject would be of great value. It seems to me to be an unwise, not to say foolish, thing to have the Post Office Department undertake experiments along these lines, particularly in view of the fact that there are two departments of the Government, namely, the War and Navy Departments, that have for a number of years given a great deal of attention to this important subject and whose information perhaps is greater than that of any other branch of the public service.

The War Department, particularly, has many in its service who are well equipped to handle machines, not only to perform the mechanical work in connection with their construction and repair, but who by reason of experience, are competent to perform the duties of aviators. If the determination is to spend this or any other amount for aerial mail service for the coming year it would be the proper and sensible thing to have the Post Office Department collaborate with that branch of the War Department that has control of the subject of aeronautics. In hastily reading the testimony of the Second Assistant Postmaster General, I noticed that he asked for the appropriation of two and a half millions of dollars for the coming year, and, as I recall, this would provide for 3,000 mechanicians. His plan contemplated but a very limited aerial mail service. If this service was Nation-wide, or of any general extent, upon the basis estimated by the official referred to, many millions of dollars would be required and many thousands of employees needed. Let me add in passing that from the information which we have received concerning the use of machines in France a large number of persons are required to keep each machine in repair. I do not remember the number per machine. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], who has given considerable attention to the subject, doubtless can fully advise us in regard to that matter. However, the point I am insisting upon is that the Post Office Department does not have sufficient information to enable it to undertake experiments along the line of aerial mail service, and moreover, it is not the proper department to which should be committed the important duty of experimentation. The War and Navy Departments have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in developing aircraft and we should await the results of their investigations and work, before determining whether to adopt airplanes as instrumentalities for the transmission of mail.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator recommend that we take this matter out of the hands of the Post Office Department, with the experiment we have already had, where there was a loss of only $15,000, and put it in the hands of the War Department, with that department's record in airplane service? The Senator is familiar with the record of the War Department on that subject—the fact that it has expended $640,000,000 and that an investigation had to be made about it. Does the Senator want to turn this matter over to the War Department?

Mr. KING. In the first place, Mr. President, I disagree with my distinguished friend from Tennessee as to the department's expenses during the experimental period thus far passed over. I find that they have spent for machines alone more than $118,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. And they have those machines in operation to-day. They own them.

Mr. KING. In the report submitted by Mr. Praeger he states that the expenses were $75,000 and that the receipts were $60,000.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President——

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. NEW. If the Senator will permit me just a moment, I will say, in response to what the Senator from Tennessee has just said, that while it is true that an immense amount of money was wasted by the War Department, at the end of it all the War Department has at least something—not enough; even to-day it is not well equipped; but it at least has something. The Post Office Department has absolutely nothing; and while the War Department may be in some degree fitted to supply

machines and to go ahead with these experiments, I do not think the Post Office Department has the first single qualification for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. In reply to the Senator from Indiana I will say that the record was that out of the $640,000,000 the War Department had practically no machines to show for it, and that it took another appropriation of probably as much money or more before we got any machines that amounted to anything; whereas the Post Office Department started out with six machines, and they are running those six machines to-day.

Mr. NEW. Yes; but, if the Senator will pardon me just a moment more, I think I am fairly familiar with the record of the War Department's experiments and expenditures.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Senator satisfied with it?

Mr. NEW. Not by any manner of means; and I would be no better satisfied at the end of this proposed Post Office experiment than I am with what the War Department has done, either. I am fairly familiar with what was done by the War Department, for I was a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs that went through with that investigation, and one of those who signed the report to the Senate; and I know that an immense amount of money was absolutely wasted. I think the money that is going to be given to the Post Office Department under this proposed appropriation will simply be added to what was sunk by the War Department, and I think money appropriated in this haphazard way for that purpose will all be wasted.

I believe that we should have one centralized department of the Government for the management and conduct of our whole airplane program. Great Britain has it; other foreign nations have it; and they have come to it as the result of experience, much longer experience than ours. This piecemeal investment of half a million dollars here and half a million dollars there is going to result in nothing but the waste of that much money.

For that reason I am opposed to this provision, and I therefore offered yesterday the amendment which is before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

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

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. With the consent of the Senator, I desire to ask the Senator from Indiana a question. Would the Senator be willing to do away with all of the airplane service, all appropriations of all kinds for the maintenance of such airplane service as we have, until he gets his department of aeronautics?

Mr. NEW. Will the Senator state that question again?

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator be willing just to stop all airplane service and experimentation until he gets his department of aeronautics? The Senator does not really expect to have that enacted into law at this session, does he?

Mr. NEW. Well, yes, Mr. President; I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not understand that to be so. That answers my question.

Mr. NEW. Yes; I do. I am decidedly hopeful that it may be enacted into law at this session. I do not think we have any well-established airplane service in the Post Office Department, if that is what the Senator refers to; and this appropriation certainly has no application whatever to anything that is being done in aeronautics by the War Department or the Navy Department. This applies to what is being done in the Post Office Department; and in proposing this amendment I am certainly not cutting down the amount to be expended by other departments. I am not doing anything that interferes in the slightest degree with what is being done by some of the other departments. I am glad to state, however, that I would be very glad to cut down their appropriations, too, if asked for in the same way, because I do not believe that they are going to get anywhere with them.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has answered my question. I did not know that the Senator expected to get his department of aeronautics bill through at this session. However, if the Senator does not get it through at this session, manifestly this appropriation ought to be made.

Mr. NEW. I suggested in the remarks I made on this subject that at another time and at a more fitting place I would offer a means for the adoption of that plan. So I shall.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is in error in stating that the Post Office Department have utilized but six planes. As I read the testimony—and I have perused it very recently—it originally acquired 10 and subsequently obtained 4 from the War Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, in answer to that and another statement that was made by the Senator on yesterday, I have a memorandum here which I should be delighted to read as this time:

Depreciation on aeroplanes in the mail service is arbitrarily reckoned at 33⅓ per cent. This is based on the experience with planes in the possession of exhibition fliers that after three years are still in serviceable condition and on the long life under conditions of field storage and transportation and care of certain Army planes used during Pershing's campaign in Mexico.

There is no justification for the statement that the life of an aeroplane will average only 140 hours in commercial work. In the aerial mail service six planes have been in operation between 100 and 190 hours in the air. One of these six planes is being now taken down in all its parts for a thorough overhauling. Others of this lot are still operating as effectively as the day they came out of the shops. This relates especially to the type known as Curtis JN4H. The mileage made by these machines will run from 8,000 to better than 13,000 miles. As far as anyone can see, with the care that these planes receive daily, it is just as fair to assume that they will be in service at the end of four years as at the end of three.

The Post Office Department has information from the assistant flight officer of the Department of Military Aeronautics that the life of an aeroplane is 500 hours, having 50 per cent or under repairs and from 250 to 500 hours for machines having over 50 per cent repairs.

A detailed statement for record will be furnished if necessary.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not profess to be an expert on airplanes, but from the many inquiries that I have made my information is that the life of a plane used upon the front during the progress of the war has been approximately 140 hours, and in order to render service for that length of time it was constantly overhauled and repaired. Indeed, whenever a flight was made, no matter of what duration, a number of competent and skillful mechanicians overhauled the plane before it was permitted to go into the air again. That was deemed necessary, in order to preserve the life of those who were engaged in a work regarded as hazardous and dangerous.

The Senator has read a statement. I have no doubt that it was prepared by the Second Assistant Postmaster General, or somebody who is desirous of securing this appropriation. Proponents of a measure usually find arguments, whether founded upon facts or in fiction, in support of their efforts to take money from the Treasury of the United States. I do not believe that the history of the war warrants the statement which has just been read by my distinguished friend. And when Mr. Praeger attempted to convey the idea that there had been only a $15,000 loss in the experiments conducted, the statement was misleading. There has been expended approximately $120,000 for machines; and I submit that the majority of those machines are now valueless, or comparatively so; and there has been expended in addition, for mere operation, $75,000.

I do not know what part of the $60,000 which it is alleged was received from receipts came from mail matter that would have been carried by train between the points mentioned, and what part came by reason of this appropriation for aerial service. Hastily glancing over the testimony, I reached the conclusion that they carried a part of their mail as ballast, and they took mail that would have been carried and was intended to be carried by train by the sender and put that into the airplanes, in order to make some sort of a showing that the public were availing themselves of the airplanes for mail service. Not knowing what part of the $60,000 alleged to have been received from mail carried by airplanes came from the unusual postal charge and what portion came from mail matter that should have been carried by trains, we are utterly at sea in determining the amount that actually would have been received and is properly chargeable as a credit to this service.

Mr. President, the experiment conducted by the Post Office Department has shown, at least under its operations up to the present time, the futility of aerial mail service until we get some better guide and some more experienced and more competent men for the operation of the planes. The plan suggested by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] is a sensible and rational one. That is one mistake which we make in the Government—the mistake of duplication; one department or bureau reaches out and covers the field in which another department or bureau is operating. There are parallel lines and a duplication of effort in many of the branches of the Government. If we want a proper aerial service, there should be a coordination of the agencies that are engaged in the utilization of airplanes. I suggested the War Department a moment ago as having had great experience, and suggested that the experts in that department and those who have been engaged for years in studying this problem could evolve a plan and suggest it to Congress that would make the use of airplanes practicable for mail service and, perhaps, other governmental functions.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the amendment of the Senator from Indiana ought to be adopted; but we ought to go further and strike out the entire appropriation now. During the next year those who have been studying this question will have opportunities to compare notes and determine the virtues and successes of the airplane, its weaknesses and its imperfec-

tions. Then, when the next appropriation bill is before us, we will be enabled to determine the wisest course to pursue.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I recognize, of course, the force of the argument made against expending money for any new purpose at this time, but I have become impressed with the fact that the airplane is to be made a great instrument of modern use, and, like all new improvements, it will have to come through experiments. The proposition now is to use the airplane for carrying the mails, not that it is hoped that during the life of this appropriation the result financially will warrant the expenditure, but this is a proposition which looks to the future for its fulfillment, and we would be very unwise, indeed, if we failed to take advantage of the situation as it presents itself to us now.

The fact is that Congress last year made an appropriation to conduct an experiment. That experiment has not been entirely satisfactory, and yet I am inclined to believe it has been worth the investment. It has taught us something that could be learned only through experience. The department has great faith in this project and wants a larger amount of money than the committee saw fit to give. We felt the experiment had not been given a fair trial under conditions which would demonstrate whether it could be used as a practical thing in commerce and in governmental operations hereafter. The experiment has been conducted between the city of Washington and the city of New York. It was started in the midst of the war, when nearly all of the activities of the Government were directed toward war, and now it is proposed to establish an experimental line between sections of the country which will demonstrate the possibilities of this facility in the business interests of the country.

The propositions before the country were to establish three lines that were particularly marked out, one from Albany through the various intervening cities to Detroit, another from New York to Omaha through Chicago, and another from Boston down to Norfolk or possibly to Atlanta. Your committee thought it best to provide for one experimental line at this time. Under no circumstances can it be a total financial loss, and the probabilities are that the insufficient test which was given it during the last year will make those in charge of it better able to operate it successfully in the future than they would be had it not been for the experience of the last year.

Furthermore, it is proposed to use the machines already owned by the Government and also to take advantage of the various experts who have been trained in this war emergency in aeronautics. There is no thought that any other course will be followed. These machines are now in the possession of the Government, and many of them can not be put to any present use nor is there a prospective use for them. It is thought that some of these machines can be altered so as to meet the needs of the mail service with not too great expense, and thus fit them for that service.

I repeat that the aeronauts already in the employ of the Government connected with the War Department will undoubtedly be assigned to operate these machines.

Another thing, Mr. President, that has been clearly demonstrated is that a machine well fitted for fighting purposes in the war is not the best machine possible to use in this mail-carrying service, which is typical of the general civil use to which airplanes may be put in the future. These machines can be altered, it has been stated, at an expense of possibly $5,000 to $10,000 per machine, so as to meet the conditions which have been demonstrated as necessary in the flying mail service. I am no more in favor of going into wild experiments at this time than is any other Senator, but where benefits have been clearly shown, where it is evident to every thoughtful man that these airplanes must be developed for use in civil life, and where the only present means for that development is this mail service, it would be unwise for Congress to neglect the opportunity. We have a practical organization for that purpose now. Some of the landing grounds are already obtained, aeronauts and mechanicians are at the Government's command, and it is thought that $850,000 will establish one complete line and make a demonstration which will satisfy the Government, or the Congress, at the next session, possibly, or within the year, as to the feasibility of continuing the experiment. Whether the airplane shall be used for carrying the mail or whether this experiment shall demonstrate the undeveloped yet altogether probable uses of the airplane in the future I do not care. I simply say we can not drop airplane development now. The airplane service or the development of the airplane for business purposes is one of the greatly possible things which we must recognize, and I repeat that the only present experiment that is possible or that presents itself is in connection with the Postal Service, where already it is in use.

Therefore, Mr. President, I was satisfied to vote for this limited appropriation—unwilling to vote for the larger one to establish three or four long lines, because of the uncertainty of it—and I think it is the least thing that Congress can do in reference to this great facility. The United States must not trail in this development; it must take the lead, and now is the time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to indorse all that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] has so well said. It is a plain common-sense proposition. Last year when this item of appropriation was under consideration it will be recalled that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] took then the same position about the appropriation that he takes now. Since that time, it seems to me, the experiment we have already had is sufficient to show the error of the position of the Senator from Utah. It is no longer an experimentation. A line then was established from Washington to New York, not so much because the business between Washington and New York was great enough to make it a paying proposition—that could not have been, because Washington is not a commercial city—but the idea was to give greater publicity to it, so that legislators could see what was being done with it.

The Post Office Department took that appropriation. I think the service has only been in operation about six months; and they come back with figures showing that in that time the expenses of the plan or operating arrangements of the line have been $75,000 and that the receipts from stamps on the mail carried amount to $60,000. So there has been an actual loss of about $15,000. I say that means not an experiment; or if an experiment, a successful experiment; and that there is no longer any doubt but that rapid airplane service will be the thing of the future. It will in a measure take the place of the telegraph and telephone doing the same thing. I believe if a line was established between New York and Chicago it would pay and pay well. When a line is extended to Boston, or a great commercial city of that kind, it is going to pay, and I make the prediction right now that in one year when we discuss this again and when my good friend from Utah makes a speech against it again he will find that it has been a good business proposition.

Who in this country wants to stop the use of airplanes in mail service? Is there a Senator here who will want to stop it? Practically no one in this country would want to stop it. It is a progressive thing; we know it is coming in the future; we know it is going to be utilized more and more all the time. We are proud of the line that goes from here to New York. We are proud of its success. It has done splendidly. It shows that it is no longer an experiment, and we ought not to stop it, but we ought to increase it sufficiently to make it pay. It is purely a business proposition. All we have to do is to add to the line other commercial cities, and the result will be that it will be a paying proposition and bring the Government in just as much as the Government has to pay out.

There is another thing connected with this matter. The Government has a large number of airplanes on hand. If they are not used for some purpose they will decay and be lost entirely. They are already built. They can not all be used in the Navy or in the Army. What are you going to do with them? Are you just going to let them lie up and decay without doing any good to anyone?

The amendment provides that the appropriation here shall be used in buying those machines and using them on these mail routes. Is not that the sensible thing to do? Is it not the business thing to do? Why should there be a doubt in the mind of anyone about it? The money will be turned over to the department that now owns them. In other words, the Government will be dealing with itself in buying these planes.

Another statement is made to the effect that we have invested a good deal of money in these machines already. So we have; and I was delighted to see the report of Mr. Praeger, which I read a few moments ago, in which he says that practically all the machines that we started out with are still on hand and that only one of them will have to be renovated. I think it is just about to be renovated now.

I say the Post Office Department has made a splendid showing, and we ought to increase this service and defeat the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, which would curtail it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if I were to speak an hour I could add nothing to the statement of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I simply want to remind the Senate that only 27 legislative days remain of this session, and up to the present time not a single appropriation bill has been passed, and a number of other very pressing measures are before the Senate. We have consumed practically two days in the discussion of this item. I wish to express the hope that the

Senate will permit us to vote on the pending amendment that has been under discussion.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I think that the appropriation should be left at $300,000, as was provided by the House. Under the conditions existing in this country now it behooves Congress to find out whether there be a necessity for a thing in the first instance, it seems to me, before provision is made for it or a continuation or expansion of it.

What is the necessity for sending letters or mail by aeroplane? We have the fast trains of the country that carry mail at a speed of 60 miles an hour. You can send a letter all over the country in a day or two days. If you are in a bigger hurry than that, you can telegraph and get an answer to your telegram in an hour from anywhere; and if you get in so great a hurry that you can not put up with that and there is a necessity for faster communication, you can call a man on the telephone clear across the United States and talk to him immediately.

Why should we waste $500,000 additional in experimentation? Three hundred thousand dollars, it seems to me, would be ample. Of course, half a million dollars is nothing as compared with the expenditures of the Government heretofore, but we have got to come sometime to a point where we shall have some regard for business principles in the Government's administration of affairs. We had just as well commence here and now. The mail service on trains is fast; the dissemination of intelligence by telegraph is faster; and you can talk straight over the telephone. All three of these methods are in use and are perfected and effective. It seems to me that certainly this appropriation ought not to go higher than $300,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] to the amendment of the committee.

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

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

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

Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moses	Spencer
Calder	Kellogg	Nelson	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kenyon	New	Sutherland
Colt	King	Overman	Swanson
Curtis	Kirby	Page	Thomas
Gay	Knox	Pittman	Thompson
Hale	La Follette	Reed	Townsend
Hardwick	Lenroot	Shafroth	Trammell
Henderson	Lewis	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hitchcock	McKellar	Sherman	Wadsworth
Hollis	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Johnson, Cal.	Martin, Ky.	Smith, S. C.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. SAULSBURY answered to his name when called.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. ASHURST entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] to the amendment of the committee.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 28, after line 10, the committee reports to strike out lines 11 to 17, in the following words:

For experimental motor-vehicle truck service in such localities of the United States as the Postmaster General may select, the establishment and extension of such service, the purchase, manufacture, exchange, and repair of equipment, supervision and maintenance, and expenses incidental to conveyance and marketing of produce and commodities, $1,000,000.

And to insert:

That to promote the conservation of food products and to facilitate the collection and delivery thereof from producer to consumer and the delivery to producers of articles necessary in the production of such food products, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes, to be selected by him. The Postmaster General is further authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of country motor express routes, which shall be primarily operated as a means of expediting the transportation of fourth-class mail between producing and consuming localities and shall not displace or supplant any existing methods of mail transportation or delivery. These two classes of experiments shall be conducted under such rules and regulations, including modifications in rates of postage and in packing and wrapping requirements, as the Postmaster General may prescribe, and to defray the cost thereof the sum of $300,000 is hereby appropriated:

Provided, That mail other than that of the fourth class shall not be dispatched on experimental motor-vehicle truck routes or on experimental country motor express routes unless the same can be expedited thereby in delivery at destination:

Provided further, That separate accounts shall be kept of the amount of all the mail of all classes carried on such routes. The Postmaster General shall report to Congress the result of such experiments at the beginning of the next regular session.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Nelson	Sutherland
Curtis	Kenyon	New	Swanson
Gay	King	Overman	Thomas
Hale	Knox	Page	Thompson
Hardwick	La Follette	Pollock	Underwood
Henderson	Lenroot	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hollis	Lewis	Sherman	Wadsworth
Johnson, Cal.	McKellar	Smith, S. C.	Walsh
Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary	Smoot	Weeks
Jones, N. Mex.	Martin, Ky.	Spencer	

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

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. TRAMMELL answered to his name when called.

Mr. CALDER and Mr. PITTMAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators so that we may have a quorum.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. KIRBY, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment which was under discussion a while ago has been adopted. I desire to propose an amendment to that amendment, to which I know the chairman of the committee has no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The amendment to which the Senator from Washington desires to offer an amendment was adopted.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the vote whereby the amendment was adopted be reconsidered, in order that I may offer an amendment to it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It was agreed on the floor that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington should be inserted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote whereby the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered, without objection, and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] offers an amendment to the amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 18, line 14, after the word "points," it is proposed to insert "including service to and between points in Alaska."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask the Senate now to vote on the amendment which has been discussed all the afternoon. I think every Senator has had an opportunity to express himself, and has done so. I hope we may now vote.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it is only to-day that I have had an opportunity to examine into the question raised by the pending amendment, and, of necessity, my examination has been all too brief and cursory.

I have here a document entitled "Motor Vehicle Truck Route Service," which includes a letter of the Postmaster General and various statements of Post Office Department officials. In a very hasty glance at some of its contents I find it is one of the most interesting pieces of governmental literature my eye has ever rested upon. It apparently contains statements and reports and comments on this motor-truck service so far as that service has been extended and so far as it has been conducted.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has referred to the committee of the Post Office Department experts—10, I believe, in number—who made an investigation of the service and reported thereon. It may be of interest to the Senate to know that these 10 experts do not seem to think very much of the service. They certainly do not give the impression in their report that it has large prospect for success. They rather give the impression

that it is all very well to try it a little longer, but they have not much hope for it. On page 9 I find they say:

We are not in this report accepting this motor-truck service as a necessary adjunct of the postal establishment nor wholly opposing it as an experimental innovation not worthy of a trial; we are seeking to correct the deceptive appearance of enormous earnings, revenues, and profits, that the subject may be approached carefully and considered in its true light.

In prior sessions of Congress I have taken the opportunity to comment upon some of the methods of the Post Office Department in conducting investigations and in proving a case to which they had already been committed before the investigation was ordered. I have reference to the famous pneumatic-tube cases, in which investigations were carried out in some of our great cities to show that a motor truck traveling through crowded city streets could carry mail faster and with greater reliability than could a pneumatic tube underground. It appeared in evidence upon those occasions that in order to prove the case they ran motor trucks on Sundays in midsummer when there was no traffic on the streets.

I find that this report shows that the reports of the earnings of these motor trucks have been grossly exaggerated. In some publication, which must have some semiofficial standing, this statement is made in order to encourage the public to believe that this system has a wonderful future. This is a quotation from that publication known as the Postmasters' Advocate, which appeared in September, 1918:

Upon the basis of a monthly net income of $4,000 per route, 1,000 out of a possible 5,000 cars operating on the principal improved highways east of the Mississippi should earn $48,000,000 yearly; 10,000 such routes on the basis thus presented would produce $480,000,000 per annum, or more than the total annual postal revenues at this time.

Apparently that is the suggestion which is offered by means of suitable publicity for the digestion of the American people. But these inspectors found that those estimates were grossly exaggerated, and that the reports sent in from the different routes were absolutely false from top to bottom so far as earnings were concerned.

Let me see if I can find some of these examples. For instance, there is an example on page 10 of the report of these inspectors to which I call attention to illustrate how some bureaucrats—and bureaucrats are multiplying in number faster in proportion than the population of the United States itself—attempt to prove their case in order to get their arms into the Federal Treasury at least to the elbow. They say:

Record of first-class mail carried outward from Baltimore on the truck operating between Baltimore and Gettysburg furnishes further evidence of the same character—

That is as to the padding of the returns—

it shows no first-class mail handled from Baltimore on trips of November 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, and 30; on five days of the month, when entries appear to have been made by the dispatching clerk at Baltimore, recorded weights vary from 14 pounds to 29 pounds. On other days, when record appears to have been made by the driver, it shows 45 pounds first-class matter on the 7th and 15th, 50 pounds on the 13th and 28th, 80 pounds on the 8th, 85 pounds on the 6th, 9th, 11th, 14th, 18th, 20th, 25th, and 29th, respectively.

On dates of inspection—

That is the inspection made by this committee or its agents—

December 13, record made by dispatcher was 20 pounds, which corresponds very well with the amount carried.

An actual count of the postage on first-class matter dispatched, with weights of same, by this route from Baltimore was made on the 9th, 10th, and 11th instant, with the following result:

	Actual weight.	Recorded by driver.
	Lbs. ozs.	*Pounds.*
Jan. 9	10 4	90
Jan. 10	15 11	85
Jan. 11	9 14	90
Total	35 13	265

The figures reported by the driver must have been placed upon the records, of course; and they show that in some instances some one multiplied nine times the weight actually carried. Mr. President, you could prove anything by such a method.

I understand that the highest post-office officials admit that these reports are totally unreliable and that they have attempted by some artificial method to arrive at the truth. I am informed that they have done so by first slashing off 30 per cent of the estimated returns, and then, making up their minds that that was not quite enough, slashing off another 20 or 30 per cent. In the end Congress has no information worthy of being considered reliable. We only know that by some lucky chance some inspector who had the true interests of the country and of the public at heart happened to discover this gross padding of these weights, and the matter comes to the attention of the Congress. This is the character of the experimenting that is being done in the Post Office Department and for which $300,000 more is now asked.

Perhaps it would interest the Senate to hear something about the "mushroom special," which is described on pages 12 and 13 of this report, and which apparently, if I read the report correctly, was rather advertised as a good example of the successful operation of the motor-truck service, particularly in transporting vegetables. The report says:

The very large production of mushrooms at West Chester and Kennett Square, Pa., and shipment of the same to New York City by motor truck, representing new postal business, has been much cited as probably the best example of created revenue. Service between West Chester and New York by ordinary truck is in operation, but to advance the mushroom business a large 5-ton truck is operated as an auxiliary between those points, duplicating travel of the other truck for the entire distance, running both ways at night, doing practically no local business, returning empty from New York to West Chester, and carrying an assistant driver both ways between Doylestown and New York.

An investigation of this "mushroom special" line—

Whose deficits, Mr. President, seem to grow about as fast as the mushrooms—

on December 13, note was made of the business done on 14 trips from November 24 to December 12, during which time 58,297 pounds of fourth-class mail was carried bearing postage amounting to $732.92, or what would amount to $52.35 per day or $1,361.10 a month—26 trips. The cost of operation of this heavy truck is about 0.2726 cents a traveled mile, $75.18 per round trip, $1,052.52 for the above stated 14 days, $1,954.68 for a month of 26 trips—

Showing a deficit of $600—

Deductions are obvious, and it is not apparent wherein the Postal Service or the ultimate consumer of mushrooms reaps any benefit, except that the latter may appreciate improvement in quality and possibly quantity.

Yet that particular service apparently received a good deal of commendation by those who desire to see this system, according to the suggestion of Mr. Blakslee—I understand that to be his name—who said "we do not need and can not use $300,000; give us $8,000,000," spread all over the country.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Senator does not claim that the $300,000 would not cover the expenses of the "mushroom special," does he?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, $300,000 would take care of the "mushroom special," I calculate, roughly estimating it, for 900 days, and then it would have to be abandoned and further experimental operations conducted.

Mr. President, this report is of exceeding interest. I have not had time to look at more than four or five pages of it, and what I have found has been, of course, by accident mostly; but if Senators will look at the latter portion of this volume they will find an appendix, in which these inspectors give more detailed reports on some of these motor-truck lines, and the various postmasters, through whose towns the trucks go rejoicing on their way, report what the patrons think of the service. I have not read them all, but thus far I have not been able to find any postmaster who says "right out loud" that anybody is enthusiastic about them, and most of them say that the patrons of the post office do not pay much attention to them; that they do not care much about them; and that they have not resulted in any increased business.

There is a line that has been running from Portland, Me., apparently to Amesbury, Mass., or perhaps that is one section of the line which, I understand, runs from Portland, Me., to New York City. The postmaster at Saco, Me., says:

This motor service is not being used by the patrons of this office to any extent.

The postmaster at York Village, Me., says:

The patrons of this office say that they think the Government is wasting money to operate motor service over this route.

Not all are as harsh as that, but none are enthusiastic, and many are as harsh as that. I do not know how many evidences of that kind are contained in this volume, but probably a good many.

I sympathize with a great deal that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has said about this proposal. If it were of economic value to the country, it would long since have been attempted by private enterprise. I have never believed that the Government should supply any facility of commerce at a loss. It is a fallacy to believe that you are helping the people of the country when you supply governmental service to them at a loss to the Government. Somebody must pay the deficit; the payment must come out of the Federal Treasury; the money is not going to come from the sky; it is going to come from the pockets of the people who obtain the service.

Mr. HARDWICK rose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to ask me a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wonder if the Senator from New York would undertake to apply that very sound theory generally to all the different branches of the Postal Service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator evidently has reference to the rates on second-class mail?

Mr. HARDWICK. No; I mean all the branches of the service. The rural routes do not pay their way and second-class mail matter does not pay its way; in fact, there is only one branch of the entire Postal Service that does pay its way, and that is the first-class mail.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not suppose that it can be expected that every single detail of operation of a great business such as the Post Office Department shall make money; but certainly the Post Office Department, taken as a whole, should be a little better than self-sustaining, and if some of the rates for the handling of mail matter of the different classes are so low as to prevent the Post Office Department as a whole doing a little better than being self-sustaining I am in favor of raising those rates. It is a fallacy to believe you are serving the people of the United States in an operation of that kind when you run it at a deficit.

It ought to make a little profit, and then, with a self-sustaining service and a little profit to be applied for interest on the investment, we will say, or for depreciation of property, we know that we are doing something approaching a sound piece of business. The trouble is that hardly any Government business is ever run on sound business lines, and from the prospects of this motor-truck service, as displayed thus far, on routes which I assume were selected because they were the more favorably situated, it does not seem to me that there is any chance for the Government ever to conduct that service except at a tremendous loss.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to say that the committee had this report before it and examined it very carefully. They were very much impressed with some of the suggestions. They even had before the committee the inspectors who made this report, and examined them very carefully. We then called Mr. Blakeslee, in order that he might have an opportunity to consider this report and make any reply to it that he cared to make.

The House appropriated $1,000,000 for this purpose, and after a very careful examination by the committee we considered that perhaps it would be wiser if we reduced that appropriation to $300,000, exactly what we gave last year, for this experiment—and it is yet an experiment. In making that appropriation of $300,000 we undertook—and I think we did—to prescribe in the bill exactly how it should be expended and how the account should be kept, and that an itemized statement of the whole transaction should be made.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we ought to carry on this experiment to the extent of this appropriation. I never have believed in the accuracy of the statements made by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General as to the great amount of revenue to be derived from it. I think it has been an exaggeration, though perhaps not an intentional one. I do not think it is possible to reach the result suggested by him; but I do think this appropriation ought to be expended under the provisions of the bill, in order that we may know by the time the next Congress meets exactly what is being done and what success is being met by it.

I should like to have the Secretary read the provisions of the amendment to show the restrictions we have put on it. I think that will throw some light upon the subject and will show the Senate how careful the committee was in guarding against any future conduct of this experiment that is not exactly right and proper.

I hope the Senate will listen to the reading of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

That to promote the conservation of food products and to facilitate the collection and delivery thereof from producer to consumer and the delivery to producers of articles necessary in the production of such food products, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of motor vehicle truck routes, to be selected by him. The Postmaster General is further authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of country motor express routes, which shall be primarily operated as a means of expediting the transportation of fourth-class mail between producing and consuming localities and shall not displace or supplant any existing methods of mail transportation or delivery. These two classes of experiments shall be conducted under such rules and regulations, including modifications in rates of postage and in packing and wrapping requirements, as the Postmaster General may prescribe, and to defray the cost thereof the sum of $300,000 is hereby appropriated:

Provided, That mail other than that of the fourth class shall not be dispatched on experimental motor vehicle truck routes or on experimental country motor express routes unless the same can be expedited thereby in delivery at destination:

Provided further, That separate accounts shall be kept of the amount of all the mail of all classes carried on such routes. The Postmaster General shall report to Congress the result of such experiments at the beginning of the next regular session.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am willing to concede that the committee has done its best to get a true report from the Post Office Department as to the expenditure of this money.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask for what purpose?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I wish to make a report from a committee and to ask that it may be printed so as to be ready for consideration on Monday morning.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield for that purpose.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 15140) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes. This is what is known as the second deficiency appropriation bill. I give notice that on Monday I hope the condition of business will be such as to justify me in asking the Senate to proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire from the chairman of the committee when this bill was considered by the committee?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It was considered several times yesterday and to-day.

Mr. KENYON. By the full committee?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. By the full committee to-day.

Mr. KENYON. Was any notice sent to the members of the committee?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I sent up to the floor of the Senate. I tried to notify every member.

Mr. KENYON. I had notice, as a member of that committee, saying that my presence was needed down there for a quorum. That was the first notice that I had had of this bill at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If the Senator has any objection, I will let it be recommitted.

Mr. KENYON. Oh, I know what it will be. It is the same old process of bringing in these appropriation bills and having to rush them through at the last minute. I do not think it is fair. Yesterday there was a meeting of the committee to consider another bill while the Senate was in session.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It is useless for the Senator to debate the matter. If he desires the bill recommitted, so that he can have time to consider it further, I will move to recommit it. I have not the slightest desire to rush it through, except that it returns to the Treasury about $15,000,000,000; and I confess to some anxiety to have that brought about.

Mr. KENYON. I am surprised, then, that there should be any rush about it. I should like to ask the Senator if there was a quorum of the committee present when the bill was considered this afternoon?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There was. I will say now that if the Senator desires the bill recommitted, so that he can be present, I will move its recommitment.

Mr. KENYON. No; I simply say that these great appropriation bills are entitled to some consideration by all the members of the committee at a time when the members can be present and not when the Senate is in session.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I do not see the forcefulness of the suggestion. I told the Senator I would move to recommit the bill, and he can have all the time he desires to discuss every feature of the bill if he desires to do it.

Mr. KENYON. I will take that time when the bill comes up here on the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senator simply desired to make a complaint, then, and did not desire any redress?

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he believes that these great appropriation bills should be permitted to be considered by the Appropriations Committee at a time when other bills are here on the floor that demand the attention of Senators? That is the complaint I make. It is not fair.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. If any injustice has been done anybody, it is easy enough to correct it. I have told the Senator that if he felt that any injustice had been done him I would move the recommittal of the bill. We can not do more than give

him all the opportunity he desires to investigate and be heard. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Iowa has brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, I think I ought to say to the chairman of the committee that I have not been off the floor of the Senate or out of the Capitol, or out of this Chamber practically, since half-past 9 or 10 o'clock this morning, and I had no notice of a committee meeting this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am sorry that it so happened. I will say the same thing to the Senator from Massachusetts. I am perfectly willing to move the recommitment of the bill.

Mr. WEEKS. I do think that members of the committee ought to be notified.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I tried to notify members. I sent my clerk up to the Senate Chamber and asked him to see every member of the committee. If he failed to see the Senator from Massachusetts, I regret it very much. The only redress I can make is to recommit the bill, which I will cheerfully do if he desires it.

Mr. KENYON. If it is a bill to save money, let us not recommit it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Let us not recommit this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That was the only reason I had for hurrying it up. It turns back into the Treasury over $15,000,000,000.

Mr. HARDWICK. Billions?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Billions; yes.

Mr. KENYON. How much does the bill appropriate?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. About $290,000,000, to supply deficiencies.

Mr. KENYON. A trivial amount.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. A very trivial amount as compared with the $15,000,000,000 turned back into the Treasury. Since the Senators have given expression to their complaints and criticism and desire no redress, I will let my request stand.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask one more question of the Senator, if I may. How many Senators were actually present?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I do not know about that.

Mr. KENYON. Were there over four Senators present?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Yes; there were more than four, but I did not keep a list of the Senators who were present. All I can do is to guarantee the Senator that he will have an opportunity to be present by sending the bill back to the committee if he desires. That is all I can do.

Mr. KENYON. It does not do much good to have an opportunity to be present when we have to be here on the floor. I should think the committee could meet at such times that Senators could attend without taking them from their duties here. That is my protest.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am exceedingly anxious to dispatch as rapidly as possible the business of the Senate, but I am not willing to deprive any Senator of a full opportunity of hearing, and being heard, and giving consideration; and if any Senator feels that he desires to meet those conditions the bill will be recommitted. That is all I can say to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks in just a moment.

I find on page 4 of this same document, in a letter addressed by the Postmaster General to the chairman of the committee, this concluding paragraph. It may be that this is now out of date and that the Postmaster General, or some of his lieutenants, have changed their minds. If so, the Senator from Alabama, of course, can correct me or bring my knowledge up to date.

In referring to the committee of post-office experts whom the Postmaster General apparently had appointed to investigate this service, he says:

> They have just completed their labors and have submitted to me a report in writing. I have carefully read same and feel constrained to concur in the findings they have made and the conclusions they have reached. In view of this fact, I respectfully ask that the original estimate made for the continuance of this experiment of $300,000 be reduced to $70,000. I feel that it is desirable to continue the experiment on certain selected routes in the hope that a beneficial result may be secured which will enable me in my next report to indicate just what features of this service may be retained as a permanent part of the Postal Service.

I will conclude my remarks by addressing this question to the chairman of the committee or to any member of the committee: In view of that paragraph, how did it occur that the Post Office Committee decided to appropriate $300,000 instead of the $70,000 which the Postmaster General recommended?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there is but one answer to that, and that is that the committee did not agree with the conclusions of the Postmaster General.

The committee, as I have stated, gave this matter very thorough and exhaustive investigation. We examined that report. We called in the inspectors who made it. We called in Mr. Blakeslee, against whom the report is directed. After hearing both sides of the question, we felt that perhaps it was wisest and best to continue this experiment under the conditions which are prescribed in the amendment. That is all there is to it.

If the Senate want to discontinue this experiment, now is the opportunity to do it. If they are willing to go on and expend this amount of money, $300,000, which was the amount expended last year, under the conditions which we impose in our amendment, then they can do that. I think the appropriation ought to be made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am simply seeking light. I have examined this matter as far as I can. I find that the Postmaster General has no enthusiasm for it; I find that these 10 experts who investigated the whole thing have no enthusiasm whatsoever for it; and I find that the underlings who conducted it have padded the returns. That is all I can find in regard to the whole matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. KING and Mr. WADSWORTH called for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I am sure the Senate did not understand the amendment. We offered an amendment appropriating $300,000 in lieu of $1,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is being considered now as in Committee of the Whole. The amendment can be offered again, if desired, in the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, I understand, Mr. President, that this amendment goes to conference?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the amendment is rejected as in Committee of the Whole. It can be reoffered in the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Was the appropriation rejected or the entire section?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The whole amendment, of course.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 36, section 5.

RECESS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I had no idea that we could complete the bill this afternoon, and I am now satisfied that we can not. I am going to ask the Senate to take a recess now until to-morrow, Sunday, at 11 o'clock, because there are eulogies to be delivered at that time. I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Sunday, February 2, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *February 1, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty Father, in whom there is no shadow of turning, make us constant in all our righteous undertakings and firm in all our duties, that we may render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto Thee the things that are Thine; that we may dignify ourselves and reflect Thy glory in all that is worthy. In the spirit of the Master. 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 without amendment the bill (H. R. 13143) extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La., or for the construction of a tunnel or tunnels under said river in lieu of said bridge.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5316. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Wenatchee-Beebe Orchard Co. to construct a bridge across the

Columbia River at or within 4 miles northerly from the town of Chelan Falls, in the State of Washington.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H.R. 13004. An act extending the time for construction of a bridge and for the maintenance of a pontoon and pile bridge by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. across the Missouri River at or near Chamberlain, S. Dak., and providing additional requirements for the bridge to be constructed.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 5316. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Wenatchee-Beebe Orchard Co. to construct a bridge across the Columbia River at or within 4 miles northerly from the town of Chelan Falls, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13004. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge and for the maintenance of a pontoon and pile bridge by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. across the Missouri River at or near Chamberlain, S. Dak., and providing additional requirements for the bridge to be constructed; and

H. R. 13143. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near and above the city of New Orleans, La., or for the construction of a tunnel or tunnels under said river in lieu of said bridge.

GUARANTEED PRICE OF WHEAT FOR 1919.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a privileged resolution of inquiry to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. How does it become privileged?

Mr. STEENERSON. I move to discharge the committee and report the resolution.

The SPEAKER. What committee?

Mr. STEENERSON. The Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 515.

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish to the House of Representatives any and all information in his possession or in the possession of the United States Food Administration relative to what action has been taken or begun or planned toward carrying out and putting into effect the guaranteed price of wheat for the crop of 1919, contained and promulgated in the proclamation of the President of the United States dated September 2, 1918.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that resolution is not privileged, and I make it on the ground that the resolution calls for information from the Secretary of Agriculture and from the Food Administration. The Secretary of Agriculture has absolutely no jurisdiction over the Food Administration. The Food Administration is under the direct command of the President of the United States.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard.

Mr. MANN. It does not refer to the Secretary.

Mr. LEVER. I thought it called on the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. LEVER. I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. It is too late. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves to lay the resolution on the table.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. MANN. This is to get the information; that is all.

Mr. STEENERSON. It is very urgent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know what information they could have. It is a matter of legislation to carry it out, of course. If the Government is going to carry out its contract——

Mr. MANN. It is the information that calls for legislation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand the committee has had hearings on that proposition.

Mr. LEVER. The objection to it is this——

The SPEAKER. These things are not debatable.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I will not insist on the motion to table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee withdraws his motion to table. The question is on the motion to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] may have five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I will give the gentleman from Minnesota five minutes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Minnesota has an hour.

The SPEAKER. It is not debatable.

Mr. MANN. No; he has not an hour. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] have five minutes and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota have five minutes and the gentleman from South Carolina have five minutes, and then that the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, judging from the letters that I have received and a petition and other communications from my district, the people are getting very nervous and anxious about what is going to become of the presidential guarantee of the price of wheat for the crop of 1919. It seems that nothing has been done so far. Here is the Agricultural appropriation bill, but there is nothing in that. And we have not been favored with any information as to whether any steps are to be taken or what is to be done. There were some newspaper reports, but we have no authentic information from the Food Administration or from the President of the United States, under whom the Food Administration is operating, as to whether or not they have taken any measures or steps or what measures or steps they have planned should be taken to carry out in good faith this guarantee.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. For a question.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman want to fix prices?

Mr. STEENERSON. I want the information called for in this resolution from the President and the Food Administration which he controls to enable Congress to take such legislative action as necessary to make that guarantee effectual. We have not been favored with any official information whatever. It may be in possession of the committee, but Congress ought to know, and it ought to be officially communicated to Congress. Here is a proposition that the newspapers say will involve very large sums, but whatever it involves we must face and carry the burden.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman how much is involved in this?

Mr. STEENERSON. Properly managed, I do not think this guarantee would involve any expense at all; but if it is bungled, if the administration neglects to take steps now, if the Food Administration neglects to provide for it, we will be in the clutches of the speculators and wheat gamblers, and we can not tell how much they will bleed the Government. But if we take proper steps by legislation in connection with the powers that the Food Administration now has, and which will be continued, I believe this guarantee will be carried out without any loss to the Treasury.

Here is an open covenant, openly arrived at, which apparently from neglect or design is to be made a scrap of paper. That there are powerful interests back of this effort at repudiation is indicated by the market letter of Henry Clews & Co., of 35 Wall Street, New York, dated January 25, 1919, an extract from which reads as follows:

Now, that the war is over Congress should repeal the law which guaranteed the farmers $2.26 per bushel for their wheat; at least on the spring wheat crop not yet sown.

No class of people have been so loud and persistent in their denunciations of repudiation of contracts and treaties, whether between individuals or nations, as the financial press, but here is a leading financial authority that openly and avowedly advocates the repudiation of the guaranty of the price of wheat to the farmers, especially the farmers of the Northwest in the spring wheat regions, who have plowed and prepared their ground and their seed for a crop of wheat pursuant to the express guarantee of the President and the urgings of the Department of Agriculture, the Food Administration, and other governmental agencies.

It seems to me unthinkable that such a proposition could have any following whatever in either branch of Congress or among any of the leading lights of either party, and yet we find that this matter of most vital importance is being neglected and delayed for some reason that is not apparent upon the surface. The majority party in Congress seems to have been left without active direction and leadership, and is now floundering away, not knowing what measure to press or what course to pursue. Look at the situation with regard to legislation for reconstruction, for instance. There are almost as many plans as there are Cabinet officers. The Secretary of the Interior demands unlimited discretion and authority over $100,000,000 to spend for this purpose as he may hereafter determine to be wise. The Department of Labor has fathered a law which would do credit to the Bolsheviki of Russia. There are to be communities and colonies. The Government is to reclaim and improve the land and supply buildings and machinery. There is to be an eight-hour day on the farm, and if the crops raised are not sufficient to pay the customary wages for labor, then the Government will pay the deficiency. It is to be Government-owned and Government-operated farms, and the welfare of the farmers is to be looked after in every detail—a more paternalistic plan than has ever been proposed to take care of the aborigines on their reservations. The Treasury Department, through the Farm Loan Board, has given out an entirely different plan, which bankers claim will greatly impair, if not entirely destroy, all chances of selling Government bonds, and so on, through the whole list. Evidently the dominant party needs unity of direction, but their leader is absent. In the meantime the country is facing most serious difficulties.

I warn you that unless expeditious action is taken on the wheat guarantee that it will have more far-reaching effect than is generally supposed. Not only will it undermine the financial and credit systems of the country, but will breed discontent and distrust in the Government itself. We have only a few weeks left of this Congress, and I most earnestly urge speedy action.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. STEENERSON. Here is an obligation that is as sacred as anything can be, and yet repudiation is threatened.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the gentleman think the President ought to guarantee the price of the spring wheat crop that is not yet planted?

Mr. STEENERSON. The President has already guaranteed it. Of course, it must be carried out. I believe Congress will carry it out, but we have got to take early action. We have got to have all the information that exists and study the matter carefully. We can not do it within 24 hours—properly, at least—and therefore I am appealing to you to pass this resolution in order that we, the Members of the House, may have the information that exists.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], if he had made some little inquiry and had been as diligent about this matter off the floor as he has been on the floor, he would have found that already the Secretary of Agriculture, some two or three weeks ago, had sent up to the Committee on Agriculture a pamphlet of 63 pages going into very great detail as to the wheat situation, and that by the direction of the Committee on Agriculture I had that printed as a committee print, and I did the Members of the House the courtesy of having my clerks mail each a copy of it, marking the envelope "Personal."

Mr. STEENERSON. I received that copy, I will say to the gentleman, and read it most carefully; but we want additional information, and the gentleman should have asked for it.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman wants an opportunity to abuse the President, because he is over in France trying to save a bad situation. Now, let me say further, so that there will be no misapprehension about this wheat guaranty proposition, that the Committee on Agriculture has been called to meet on Monday to hear the various interests about suggested plans and to hear Mr. Barnes, the head of the Grain Corporation, and we hope by the latter part of next week to be able to present to the Congress such legislation as is necessary to carry out in good faith the Government's guaranty to the wheat farmers of the United States.

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

Mr. LEVER. And instead of this resolution being of any interest to the House, instead of this resolution being of any service to the country, it simply means that the officials that we ought to have before the Committee on Agriculture giving information will be sitting in their offices digging out information which, after it is presented to Congress, nobody but the gentleman from Minnesota will ever read.

I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. MAPES. In my correspondence I find that the fear on the part of producers and farmers is that the Government is going to go back on its guaranty.

Mr. LEVER. You can give them the absolute assurance that so far as the Committee on Agriculture is concerned, I think there is a unanimous feeling that the guaranty shall be kept. I do not believe that there will be a dissenting voice in the House of Representatives against that proposition.

Mr. MAPES. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that the Committee on Agriculture will be unanimous on that subject. I have answered my correspondents saying that it was inconceivable to me that the Government would go back on its obligation.

Mr. LEVER. It is inconceivable.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Can the gentleman say how much it will cost the Treasury?

Mr. LEVER. There is no one on earth that can answer that question.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Can you give a guess?

Mr. LEVER. No; I could not give a guess.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman assures his constituents that the Committee on Agriculture will keep this guaranty, it is a question whether the Congress will do it. The President has made the guaranty, and there is only one body that can be guilty of bad faith, and that is the Congress itself.

Mr. LEVER. I hope, inasmuch as this resolution can not bring any benefit to the House, that we will not hamper the officials that the committee will have before it next week by passing it and calling upon them for the information. I hope this resolution will be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from the further consideration of this resolution.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

THE FOURTEENTH AND SUBSEQUENT DECENNIAL CENSUSES.

Mr. HOUSTON, by direction of the Committee on the Census, submitted for printing under the rule the conference report and accompanying statement on the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1023).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 24, 27, and 28.

That the House House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate, insert the following:

"That a census of the population, agriculture, manufactures, forestry and forest products, and mines and quarries of the United States shall be taken by the Director of the Census in the year 1920 and every 10 years thereafter. The census herein provided for shall include each State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. A census of Guam and Samoa shall be taken in the same year by the respective governors of said islands and a census of the Panama Canal Zone by the governor of the Canal Zone in accordance with plans prescribed or approved by the Director of the Census."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate, insert the following: "$5,000; the chief clerk and three chief statisticians for the divisions of population, manufactures, and agriculture, respectively, $4,000 each; three"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed

to be stricken out, insert the following: "for the divisions of vital statistics and statistics of cities, and the chief statistician provided for in section 3 of this act, $3,600 each"; also on page 4, line 9, of the engrossed bill, strike out the word "and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate, insert the following: "$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate, insert the following: "subject to the approval of the United States Civil Service Commission, these"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate, insert the following: "applicants claim to have"; also, on page 6, line 16, of the engrossed bill, strike out the word "or," where it occurs the first time, and insert the word "of"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"*And provided further*, That in the selection of the additional clerks and employees provided for by section 6 the Director of the Census is authorized to use, so far as practicable, the reemployment registers established by Executive order of November 29, 1918, so far as the same applies to permanent appointments by competition."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"SEC. 8. That the Fourteenth Census shall be restricted to inquiries relating to population, to agriculture, to manufactures, to forestry and forest products, and to mines and quarries. The schedules relating to population shall include for each inhabitant the name, place of abode, relationship to head of family, color, sex, age, conjugal condition, place of birth, place of birth of parents, nationality or mother tongue of all persons born in foreign countries, nationality or mother tongue of parents of foreign birth, number of years in the United States, citizenship, occupation, whether or not employer or employee, whether or not engaged in agriculture, school attendance, literacy, tenure of home and the encumbrance thereon, and the name and address of each blind or deaf and dumb person.

"The schedules relating to agriculture shall include name, color, sex, and country of birth of occupant of each farm, tenure, acreage of farm, acreage of woodland, value of farm and improvements, and the encumbrance thereon, value of farm implements, number of live stock on farms, ranges, and elsewhere, and the acreage of crops and the quantities of crops and other farm products for the year ending December 31 next preceding the enumeration. Inquiries shall be made as to the quantity of land reclaimed by irrigation and drainage and the crops produced; also as to the location and character of irrigation and drainage enterprises, and the capital invested in such enterprises.

"The schedules of inquiries relating to manufactures, to forestry and forest products, and to mines and quarries shall include the name and location of each establishment; character of organization, whether individual, corporate, or other form; character of business or kind of goods manufactured; amount of capital actually invested; number of proprietors, firm members, copartners and officers, and the amount of their salaries; number of employees and the amount of their wages; quantity and cost of materials used in manufactures; principal miscellaneous expenses; quantity and value of products; time in operation during the year; character and quantity of power used; and character and number of machines employed.

"The census of manufactures, of forestry and forest products, and of mines and quarries shall relate to the year ending December 31 next preceding the enumeration of population, and shall be confined to manufacturing establishments and mines and quarries which were in active operation during all or a portion of that year. The census of manufactures shall furthermore be confined to manufacturing establishments conducted under what is known as the factory system, exclusive of the so-called neighborhood, household, and hand industries.

"Whenever he shall deem it expedient, the Director of the Census may charge the collection of these statistics upon special agents or upon detailed employees, to be employed without respect to locality.

"The number, form, and subdivision of inquiries provided for in section 8 shall be determined by the Director of the Census."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. C. HOUSTON,
J. B. ASWELL,
CHAS. A. NICHOLS,
Managers on the part of the House.

MORRIS SHEPPARD,
HENRY F. ASHURST,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

On amendment No. 1: This amendment strikes out all of section 1 as passed by the House and proposes to insert a provision providing for a very much enlarged census covering the additional subjects of education, health, and insurance, to be taken every five years, which would result in more than doubling the cost of the census. Your conferees restored the House provision and added thereto after the word "manufactures," in the first line of this section, the words "forestry and forest products," so as to conform to section 8 of the bill as passed by the House, which directs an inquiry upon this subject.

On amendment No. 2: This amendment related to the quinquennial census directed by Senate amendment No. 1. The Senate recedes and restores the House provision without change.

On amendment No. 3: The House conferees accepted this amendment for the reason that it reduced the number of statistical experts from 15 to 10, thus decreasing the appropriation for this grade of experts $10,000 annually, or $30,000 for the three-year period.

On amendment No. 4: Your conferees recede from this amendment for the reason that the necessity for this legislation has passed in view of the fact that hostilities have ceased and the draft process is no longer in operation.

On amendments Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9: These amendments all relate to the salaries of the executive and administrative officials of the Census Office. The bill passed by the Senate provided for four chief statisticians at $4,000 each and three other chief statisticians at $3,000 each. The compromise reduced the number of chief statisticians by one, and provides for three at $4,000 and three at $3,600. As amendment No. 3 reduced the number of statistical experts from 15 to 10, there is only a net increase of $1,300 in this section over the bill as passed by the House, and there is a decrease of $2,200 over the bill as passed by the Senate. Your conferees therefore accepted the compromise and receded.

On amendment No. 10: This amendment provides for a graduated scale of salaries beginning at $900 and terminating at $1,800, with a difference of $60 between classes from $900 to $1,440, and $120 between classes from $1,440 to $1,800, so as to provide more frequent promotions. It will also make possible a more equitable adjustment of salary to the varying degrees of merit and efficiency of employees.

The section as passed by the House failed to provide for the employment of clerks at $1,000 and $900 or for an engineer and two photostat operators, which was undoubtedly an oversight.

During the decennial census period, the bureau will undoubtedly occupy one or more buildings outside the Commerce Building, where the permanent force is now housed, so that it will be necessary to have an engineer to look after the heating, lighting, and other equipment of the bureau.

On account of the tremendous increase in the volume of work they will also require the services of two photostat operators. The bureau states that these operators will have their salaries over and over again in making photostat copies of tables, letters, etc., which would otherwise have to be typewritten or copied by hand. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 11: This amendment prohibits the Director of the Census from employing more than 150 clerks at the rate of $1,440 or more per annum, and is made so as to conform to amendment No. 10; hence your conferees recede.

On amendment No. 12: On this amendment the conferees on the part of the Senate will move that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same, which will adopt the provision submitted by Mr. Van Dyke and passed by the House, which is as follows:

"That hereafter in making appointments to clerical and other positions in the executive departments and in independent gov-

ernmental establishments preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, and widows of such, if they are qualified to hold such positions."

On amendment No. 13: This amendment provides that the examinations for clerical positions prescribed by the Director of the Census shall be subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 14: This amendment simply provides that the clerical force employed in the Census Office shall be selected by the Director of the Census in the order of rating; hence the House recedes.

On amendment No. 15: This amendment strikes out "Census Office" and inserts "Government service," which change is in conformity with existing law. The House recedes.

On Amendment No. 16: This amendment simply strikes out the word "may" and inserts the word "shall." The House recedes.

On amendment No. 17: This amendment is simply a change of phraseology. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 18: This amendment corrects a grammatical error. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 19: This amendment is simply the insertion of a comma. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 20, 21, 22, and 23: These amendments propose to correct grammatical errors by changing the phraseology from singular to plural. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 24: This amendment proposed to strike out a provision of the House that not more than one person shall be appointed to a clerical position from the same family. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 25: This amendment provides that, so far as practicable, the director shall use the reemployment registers established by the Civil Service Commission as a result of the Executive order of November 29, 1918. The House recedes with an amendment that the words "of the Census" be added after the word "Director" in line 20 of the bill.

On amendment No. 26: This amendment proposed to strike out all of section 8 as passed by the House and to insert certain provisions that would have been required in case Senate amendment No. 1 had been adopted by your conferees. In conference the House text of section 8 was restored and the words "forestry and forest products" added in the second line of the third and fourth paragraphs of said section in order to conform with the language used in the first paragraph of the bill as passed by the House. In addition thereto the phraseology of the last paragraph relative to the number, form, and subdivision of inquiries, as passed by the House, was changed so as to make it clearer.

On amendment No. 27: Section 9 as passed by the House provided for the appointment of supervisors by the Secretary of Commerce upon the recommendation of the Director of the Census and the Senate amendment proposed that they shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This amendment also contained certain legislation relating to amendment No. 1, which was not agreed to. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 28: This amendment is not necessary, as Senate amendment No. 1 was not adopted by your conferees; hence the Senate receded from this amendment and restored the House text.

On amendments Nos. 29, 30, and 31: These three amendments simply correct typographical errors that were made in the printing of the bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 32: This amendment simply changes the phraseology, so the House recedes.

On amendment No. 33: The House bill directed that an enumerator should be an actual resident of the subdivision within which his duties are to be performed, but made an exception in the cases of persons residing in the same city. The amendment simply makes the same rule applicable to persons living in townships and other civil divisions. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 34: This amendment proposes to expedite the enumeration in cities which had a population of 2,500 or more inhabitants at the last census. This means that the work must be completed in two weeks instead of one month. A large number of cities which had more than 2,500 inhabitants and less than 5,000 inhabitants in 1910 now have over 5,000 inhabitants. The House recedes.

On amendments Nos. 35 and 36: These two amendments simply correct grammatical errors. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 37: This amendment conforms to a similar provision in the Thirteenth Census act. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 38: This amendment provides that the Director of the Census is authorized to furnish transcripts of tables and other records upon the payment of the actual cost of such work, with the understanding that in no case shall the information furnished be used to the detriment of the person to whom such information relates. The House recedes.

W. C. HOUSTON.
J. B. ASWELL.
CHAS. A. NICHOLS.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand I made last evening for the reading of the engrossed copy of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws his demand for the reading of the engrossed copy of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of Theodore Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of Theodore Roosevelt. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a change of reference of the bill H. R. 8426, a bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL], with reference to salaries of clerks of courts, the bill having been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary through error instead of to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is right about it. Without objection, the change will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Also, Mr. Speaker, I make the same request with respect to these other bills, where the circumstances are the same.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the titles of all of them.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1734) to increase the salaries of the United States district attorney and United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia, and for other purposes.

A bill (H. R. 2419) for the relief of Lieut. Commander Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired.

A bill (H. R. 4618) to increase the salaries of the United States district attorney and United States marshal for the southern district of New York, and for other purposes.

A bill (H. R. 7347) providing for an increase in salary of the United States marshal for the western district of Louisiana.

A bill (H. R. 7691) to increase the salary of the clerk of the district attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas.

A bill (H. R. 8426) fixing the salary of the clerks of the United States district courts; prescribing how and when they shall account for the fees collected; providing for the office expenses of such clerks, including salaries of deputy clerks and clerical assistants; and for the travel and subsistence expense of such clerks and their deputies when necessarily absent from their official residences.

A bill (H. R. 11186) providing for an increase of salary of the United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana.

A bill (H. R. 12446) providing for an increase in the salary of the United States marshal for the district of Connecticut.

A bill (S. 2116) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Rhode Island.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, what is the gentleman's request?

The SPEAKER. The request is to take these bills away from the Committee on the Judiciary and send them to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, many of these matters have been already determined by subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, and if not reported are ready to be reported, and therefore I object.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withhold his objection for a moment, the rule, paragraph 36 of Rule XI, set forth in section 712 of the Manual, giving the jurisdiction of the committees on expenditures, says:

* * * The examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several departments of the Government and the manner of keeping the same * * * the reduction or increase of the pay of officers shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the nine standing committees on the public expenditures in the several departments.

And I have simply endeavored to bring the matter before the House in this way. I hope the gentleman will not insist on his objection.

Mr. GARD. I think the gentleman is entirely wrong in what he imagines to be the construction of that particular section, because I know that these bills and similar bills have been before

the Committee on the Judiciary for many, many years, and in order that they may be seriously and properly considered I object.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will withhold his objection further——

Mr. GARD. I thought the gentleman had completed his statement.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am so confident as to the construction of the section and feel so certain that this minor committee ought to have an opportunity to do enough work to deserve its clerk——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman frm Ohio [Mr. GARD] has objected, and that is the end of it. It is not debatable.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am so confident of the construction of the rule that it will take more than consideration on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar to pass one of these measures.

NATIONAL SOLDIERS' HOME.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have laid before the House the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, with Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. MANN. Let the amendments be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to order that. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: Line 3, strike out "M. T. Dwyer" and insert "George S. Wood."

Amendment numbered 2: Line 4, strike out "Henry Hase" and insert "Menander Dennett," and, in line 5, strike out "Wisconsin" and insert "Maine."

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, these amendments restore the bill to the same condition that it was in when reported by the Military Committee to the House. The House struck out the name of the member from Maine, Mr. Dennett, and substituted the name of Mr. Hase, from Wisconsin. The Senate has reinstated the name of the member from Maine and has stricken out the name of the man from Wisconsin. The substitution of the name of Mr. Wood for that of Mr. Dwyer is to restore the name of the man who is at present a member of the Board of Managers. The reason that the name of Mr. Dwyer was offered at the time the resolution was in the House was that Col. Wood had gone into the service of the country, but since the signing of the armistice he has again gone back to his position upon the board, so that the only question at issue is the substitution of the member from Maine for the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I will say that the reason the Military Affairs Committee of the House have unanimously instructed me to move that the House concur in this amendment is that if the member from Maine is dropped out, New England will have no representative whatever upon this board. The Central West, from which Mr. Hase comes, has members from Indiana, Illinois, and Kansas as members of the Board of Managers. It is the opinion of the members of the committee that the State of Maine is entitled to this representative. Now, I want to move the previous question on this motion, but probably the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] would like to present his side, and I will yield to him such time as he desires, say five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, when this resolution was presented originally before the recess, the House after listening to the arguments as to the respective claims of these two parts of the country, on the question whether the State of Maine or the State of Wisconsin should have a representative on the board, had a division vote, and by a considerable majority inserted the name of Mr. Henry J. Hase of my home city. Mr. Hase is a Civil War veteran, has one son who is a colonel in the Regular Army, and has another son who fills a position of responsibility in the public service. The basis for the claim that Wisconsin should have its place reestablished was that some years back this board of managers consisted of a larger number. It happened that the term of the Wisconsin representative on the board at that time expired just when they were reducing the membership. Now, the argument is made that New England should have some representative on this board. The two homes in New England are so small and inconsequential as compared to the Wisconsin branch at Milwaukee that the House decided that it was far better to have a representative on the board to look after the Wisconsin home and leave the representative in the East, Mr. Wadsworth, of New York, to look after the interest of the New England home. Since Wisconsin has not had a local representative on the board officials have been imposed upon the Wisconsin home who have been guilty of embezzlement. We have one of the largest homes in the country, which will be filled up by soldiers returning from abroad, and it was because of that condition that the House, after listening to the merits of the two propositions, decided that Wisconsin should have the representative rather than Maine.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How many inmates are there in the Wisconsin home?

Mr. STAFFORD. Over 2,000.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. On the strength of the argument just proposed, that because you did not have a representative on the board there was embezzlement at the home, would it follow that there should be a manager resident in each State in which there is a soldiers' home?

Mr. STAFFORD. That was the policy until some years back when it was decided to reduce the membership of the board. It has not resulted very advantageously in the management of these homes, so far as the Wisconsin branch located in Milwaukee is concerned.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then the gentleman thinks we do not need any watching in Maine, that we would not have any embezzlement, anyway. Very well.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, Maine has not suffered the way Wisconsin has suffered, because Maj. Wadsworth has been able to look after the Maine branch. Those delegated to look after the western homes have not been so solicitous of conditions out there. That is what I am contending for. There is no question about the ability of Mr. Hase, a Civil War veteran, whom the House before voted should have this place. I ask the House to reject the Senate amendments and send the bill to conference.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. When we adjourned last night the passage of the Agriculture bill was held up by a demand for the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] withdraws his demand for the reading of the engrossed copy. The Clerk will read the bill the third time.

The bill was read a third time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I send up a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Michigan opposed to the bill?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am not.

The SPEAKER. If any gentleman in the House is opposed to the bill and desires to make a motion to recommit the Speaker will recognize him, otherwise he will recognize the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, with instructions to report the same forthwith with the following amendment: Page 91, line 4, at the end of line 4 add the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated by this act shall be used to pay the salary or compensation of any official or employee of the Department of Agriculture in excess of the salary or compensation he is now receiving in the office or position in which he is now engaged or for the work he is now doing if he shall be entitled to an increase of salary or compensation or additional allowance of pay under or by virtue of any other act of Congress: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to persons employed outside the District of Columbia."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 157, nays 146, answering present 2, not voting 124, as follows:

YEAS—157.

Anderson	Esch	Kraus	Rogers
Anthony	Essen	La Follette	Rose
Ashbrook	Fairchild, B. L.	Lampert	Rowe
Austin	Fairfield	Langley	Sanders, Ind.
Baer	Fess	Little	Sanders, N. Y.
Birch	Focht	Longworth	Sanford
Bland, Ind.	Fordney	Lundeen	Scott, Iowa
Bowers	Foss	McArthur	Scott, Mich.
Browning	Frear	McCormick	Siegel
Buchanan	Freeman	McFadden	Slayden
Burroughs	French	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Butler	Fuller, Ill.	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Byrnes, S. C.	Fuller, Mass.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snell
Byrns, Tenn.	Gillett	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snyder
Campbell, Kans.	Glynn	Madden	Stafford
Cannon	Good	Magee	Steenerson
Cary	Graham, Ill.	Mann	Stiness
Clark, Pa.	Green, Iowa	Mapes	Strong
Classon	Greene, Mass.	Mason	Sweet
Claypool	Greene, Vt.	Merritt	Temple
Cooper, Ohio	Hadley	Miller, Minn.	Tilson
Cooper, Wis.	Hamilton, Mich.	Miller, Wash.	Timberlake
Crago	Haskell	Mondell	Treadway
Cramton	Haugen	Moore, Pa.	Vestal
Currie, Mich.	Hawley	Moores, Ind.	Voigt
Curry, Cal.	Hayes	Morgan	Volstead
Dale	Hersey	Mott	Ward
Dallinger	Hicks	Nelson, A. P.	Wason
Darrow	Hollingsworth	Nelson, J. M.	Watson, Pa.
Davis	Huddleston	Nichols, Mich.	Wheeler
Dempsey	Hull, Iowa.	Osborne	White, Me.
Denison	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Williams
Dillon	Juul	Parker, N. J.	Wilson, Ill.
Dowell	Kahn	Parker, N. Y.	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Platt	Woods, Iowa
Dyer	Kennedy, Iowa.	Powers	Woodyard
Eagle	Kennedy, R. I.	Purnell	Young, N. Dak.
Edmonds	King	Ramseyer	
Elliott	Kinkaid	Reed	
Ellsworth	Knutson	Rodenberg	

NAYS—146.

Alexander	Fisher	Lesher	Sabath
Almon	Foster	Lever	Sanders, La.
Aswell	Gallagher	Linthicum	Sherley
Ayres	Gandy	Lobeck	Sherwood
Bankhead	Gard	London	Shouse
Barkley	Garner	Lonergan	Sims
Beakes	Garrett, Tenn.	McKeown	Sisson
Bell	Garrett, Tex.	McLemore	Small
Beshlin	Goodwin, Ark.	Mansfield	Smith, C. B.
Black	Gordon	Martin	Smith, T. F.
Blackmon	Gray, Ala.	Mays	Snook
Bland, Va.	Gregg	Montague	Steagall
Blanton	Griffin	Moon	Stedman
Brand	Hamlin	Neely	Stephens, Miss.
Burnett	Hardy	Nolan	Stephens, Nebr.
Campbell, Pa.	Hastings	Oldfield	Sterling
Candler, Miss.	Hayden	Oliver, Ala.	Sumners
Cantrill	Heflin	Oliver, N. Y.	Taylor, Colo.
Carlin	Hensley	O'Shaunessy	Thompson
Carter, Okla.	Hilliard	Overmyer	Tillman
Church	Holland	Overstreet	Venable.
Collier	Hood	Padgett	Vinson
Connally, Tex.	Howard	Phelan	Walton
Connelly, Kans.	Hull, Tenn.	Polk	Watkins
Crisp	Humphreys	Pou	Watson, Va.
Decker	Igoe	Quin	Weaver
Dent	Jacoway	Ragsdale	Webb
Denton	Jones	Rainey, H. T.	Welling
Dickinson	Keating	Rainey, J. W.	Whaley
Dies	Kehoe	Raker	Wilson, La.
Dill	Kettner	Randall	Wilson, Tex.
Dixon	Kincheloe	Rayburn	Wingo
Dominick	Kitchin	Robinson	Wise
Doolittle	Larsen	Romjue	Wright
Evans	Lazaro	Rouse	Young, Tex.
Ferris	Lea, Cal.	Rubey	
Fields	Lee, Ga.	Rucker	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Gallivan	Littlepage

NOT VOTING—124.

Bacharach	Clark, Fla.	Drane	Gould
Barnhart	Cleary	Drukker	Graham, Pa.
Benson	Coady	Dupré	Gray, N. J.
Booher	Cooper, W. Va.	Eagan	Griest
Borland	Copley	Elston	Hamill
Britten	Costello	Emerson	Hamilton, N. Y.
Brodbeck	Cox	Estopinal	Harrison, Miss.
Browne	Crosser	Fairchild, G. W.	Harrison, Va.
Brumbaugh	Davey	Farr	Heaton
Caldwell	Delaney	Flood	Heintz
Caraway	Dewalt	Flynn	Helm
Carew	Donovan	Francis	Helvering
Carter, Mass.	Dooling	Garland	Houston
Chandler, N. Y.	Doremus	Godwin, N. C.	Husted
Chandler, Okla.	Doughton	Goodall	Hutchinson
Ireland	Maher	Rowland	Switzer
James	Morin	Russell	Tague
Johnson, Ky.	Mudd	Saunders, Va.	Taylor, Ark.
Johnson, S. Dak.	Nicholls, S. C.	Schall	Templeton
Kearns	Norton	Scully	Thomas
Kelly, Pa.	Olney	Sears	Tinkham
Key, Ohio	Park	Sells	Towner
Kiess, Pa.	Peters	Shackleford	Van Dyke
Kreider	Porter	Shallenberger	Vare
LaGuardia	Pratt	Sinnott	Waldow
Lehlbach	Price	Slemp	Walker
Lufkin	Ramsey	Sloan	Walsh
Lunn	Rankin	Steele	Welty
McAndrews	Reavis	Stevenson	White, Ohio
McClintic	Riordan	Sullivan	Winslow
McCulloch	Roberts	Swift	Zihlman

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. TINKHAM (for) with Mr. GALLIVAN (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BACHARACH.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. DAVEY with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. DEWALT with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. GOULD.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. SEARS with Mr. RAMSEY.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. SWIFT.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia (commencing Jan. 29, 1919, ending Feb. 3, 1919).

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. WALSH (except road appropriation).

Mr. DRANE with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. LAGUARDIA.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. WOODYARD.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. GARLAND.

Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. LEHLBACH.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. BROWNE.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. REAVIS.

Mr. BENSON with Mr. ELSTON.

Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. HELM with Mr. LUFKIN.

Mr. LUNN with Mr. MCCULLOCH.

Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. VARE.

Mr. OLNEY with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. PARK with Mr. ZIHLMAN.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. STEELE with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on this roll I voted "no." I find that I am paired with my colleague Mr. TINKHAM, who, if present, would have voted "aye." I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. GALLIVAN was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present, the Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture, I report back the Agricultural appropriation bill, with the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina reports back the Agricultural bill with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, at the end of line 4 add the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated by this act shall be used to pay the salary or compensation of any official or employee of the Department of Agriculture in excess of the salary or compensation he is now receiving in the office or position in which he is now engaged or for the work he is now doing if he shall be entitled to an increase of salary or compensation or additional allowance of pay under or by virtue of any other act of Congress: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to persons employed outside the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEVER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PENSIONS.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15219, the annual pension appropriation bill, and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to an hour and a half, one half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15219, and pending that he asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to an hour and a half, half of that time to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire from the majority side of the House whether, after the conclusion of the pension appropriation bill now before the House, it is the intention to call up any other important measure to-day?

The SPEAKER. It is the intention to call up the Military Academy bill as soon as we get through with this one. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15219, the pension appropriation bill, with Mr. HENSLEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15219, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15219) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. By unanimous consent debate has been limited to an hour and a half, one half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] and the other half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes with the unanimous indorsement of the Committee on Appropriations, and is based on the annual estimates of the Pension Bureau, aggregating $220,050,000. We recommend for the ensuing fiscal year the sum of $215,030,000, a reduction in both the estimates and the current law of $5,020,000.

The amount disbursed for the first six months of this fiscal year, ended December 31, 1918, is $109,000,000. At this rate of disbursement, if it continued for the next six months, there would be a surplus in the current appropriation of $2,000,000. However, the disbursements during the latter half of each fiscal year are somewhat heavier than during the first half, owing to the settlement of a greater number of claims as the year draws to a close and the passage by Congress of a great many private pension bills during the closing hours of the session. For these reasons it is the belief of the committee that the surplus in the current appropriation, if any, will be very small.

The sum carried in the bill now under consideration, $215,030,000, is believed by the committee and the Commissioner of Pensions to be adequate to pay all pensions under existing law. The number of deaths of those receiving pensions will probably be about the same as in recent years, and for that reason the sum of $5,000,000 has been lopped off the estimates. Pensioners die at about the same rate each month. For the last three or four years the number of deaths has been in the neighborhood of 30,000 yearly. For 1914, 1915, and 1916 it was over that amount, but last year it was a little less, because the body of soldiers from which are computed the deaths is constantly growing less, although the percentage is increasing, so that we can pretty fairly judge how much the loss to the roll will be by reason of deaths, and the number of widows is decreasing also.

The principal factor of uncertainty in determining accurately what sum will be needed to pay pensions during the coming years is the net loss of pensioners from the rolls. The number upon the rolls on June 30, 1918, was 646,895, which is a net decrease during the period from July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918, of 26,216. The loss by deaths during this period was 50,860 persons, of whom 30,466 were Civil War soldiers, 18,412 were widows and other Civil War pensioners, and 1,982 were pensioners of other wars. Losses to the roll by remarriages, minors attaining the age of 16, and other causes aggregated 1,847, so that the gross loss during this period was 52,707. This loss was offset by the addition of 26,491 persons through original allowances and restorations and renewals, so that the net loss to the roll was 26,126.

Mr. Chairman, our report contains several statistical tables which are reproduced from the annual report of the Commissioner of Pensions, and which it is believed will be of value to the membership of the House in connection with the consideration of the acompanying bill:

Amount paid to pensioners, 1790 to 1918, inclusive.

War of the Revolution	$70,000,000.00
War of 1812	46,031,563.82
Indian wars	15,144,212.92
War with Mexico	52,148,138.86
Civil War	5,087,647,618.63
War with Spain and Philippine insurrection	61,333,476.58
Regular Establishment	46,540,408.16
War of 1917	7,243.31
Unclassified	16,508,447.41
Total	5,395,361,109.69

The bill is but 12 pages long. I have made as complete a statement as the committee felt was necessary in opening, and unless some member of the committee desires to ask some question I would now ask that my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] use some part of his time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. And I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion or consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill there was more or less said concerning the plant quarantine issued by the Federal Horticultural Board forbidding the importation of most plants after June 1 next. There was inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Marlatt, chairman of the board, addressed to Mr. LEVER, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; also a letter from Mr. Marlatt to myself; and I ask leave to have inserted in the RECORD another letter from Mr. Marlatt addressed to me upon the subject, in order that people who are interested in the matter may have a chance to dig out of the RECORD the information contained in those letters.

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

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FEDERAL HORTICULTURAL BOARD,
Washington, D. C. January 31, 1919.

DEAR MR. MANN: Referring to our discussion this morning, and after reading the discussion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, it seems perhaps desirable to emphasize the fact that the suggestion of the possibility of amendment of quarantine 37, made in the last paragraph of the memorandum reprinted in the RECORD, was included in this memorandum in answer to the charge which had been made in letters received that the department would not consider any representations of modification or amendment of the quarantine. The object was simply to point out that any quarantine is subject to amendment either to increase or decrease its scope, and not to indicate that the department had any uncertainty as to the wisdom of its action or would change the quarantine on mere pressure without convincing showing of need.

The memorandum points out that the department has taken this action after a very long and thoroughgoing investigation, in which it called to its aid all the plant authorities of the United States and consulted at hearings and individually with the leading plant propagators of this country. After giving practical trial to the possible alternatives of inspection and disinfection the department has been forced to the conclusion that the only possible solution of this problem is in the exclusion of all stock not absolutely essential to the forestry, horticultural, and floricultural needs of the United States; in other words, this quarantine represents the mature judgment of the department and its advisers and is in no sense experimental or tentative. As stated in the memorandum, the main lines of this quarantine are undoubtedly justified, and no minor modification will be made except on showing that is absolutely convincing as to the need and as to the safety thereof.

Yours, very truly, C. L. MARLATT,
Chairman of Board.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, some time ago I had read, by the consent of the House, a letter from the Secretary of War concerning payment of allotments to soldiers, with a reply which I made to the Secretary. I have a letter from Secretary Baker, replying to my letter, which I ask to have the Clerk read in my time, in order to do full justice to the Secretary.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 26, 1919.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANN: Under date of January 9 you replied to my letter of January 6.

You believe me to be in error with regard to two statements contained in my letter of January 6; first, to the effect that allotments payable by the War Department are being promptly paid, and, second, that allotments payable by the War Department are not ordinarily for the benefit of families.

A careful inquiry into the facts shows that allotments payable by the War Department are being paid promptly and are not in any way in arrears. The following table shows the date due and the date of completion of payments from the month of March, 1918, to and including December, 1918:

Month.	Due on.	Payments completed.
March, 1918	Mar. 31, 1918	Apr. 11, 1918
April, 1918	Apr. 30, 1918	May 8, 1918
May, 1918	May 31, 1918	June 7, 1918
June, 1918	June 30, 1918	July 3, 1918
July, 1918	July 31, 1918	Aug. 5, 1918
August, 1918	Aug. 31, 1918	Sept. 9, 1918
September, 1918	Sept. 30, 1918	Oct. 15, 1918
October, 1918	Oct. 31, 1918	Nov. 18, 1918
November, 1918	Nov. 30, 1918	Dec. 19, 1918
December, 1918	Dec. 31, 1918	Jan. 15, 1919

As the dates of payments given above are the dates of completion of payments, it is obvious that the bulk of the allotment checks were in the mails before the dates given.

As to the second of my statements, I call your attention to the fact that a family allowance can be claimed in all cases by a wife or child, and can be claimed by a mother or father, brother or sister, when dependency exists. In all such cases the allotment checks are sent out by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and not by the War Department. The Army allotment system is, therefore, not usually called upon to send allotment checks in any of the foregoing classes of dependency, since the soldier having such dependents ordinarily elects to pay it through the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and have the additional allotment provided by the Government also paid for the benefit of the dependent.

In your letter you call my attention to the fact that you are receiving many complaints from soldiers that they are not receiving their pay. Undoubtedly such letters as reach you in practically all cases deal with soldiers returning to this country sick or wounded and having due them one or more months' pay by reason of the fact that their separation from their service records has made complete payment on the other side difficult. The orders of the War Department are that the first disbursing officer in this country who is brought into contact with such sick and wounded persons is instructed to pay them in full, accepting the affidavit of the soldier as to the date when he was last paid. These instructions have been sent to every port of arrival and similar instructions have been sent to the commandants of the different hospitals. These instructions and action under them have doubtless relieved the major part of the difficulty, which was due to the fact that when the armistice was signed the opportunity was presented suddenly of returning sick and wounded men to the United States in available transportation, and it was deemed better to return them without waiting for the complete auditing of their pay accounts, thus creating a situation of men returning without money, but not in want of any of the necessaries of life or the comforts which their sick and wounded condition require. I myself discovered this situation on my return trip from Europe and took immediate steps to correct it. From that time the matter has had the prompt and urgent attention of the department.

As an illustration of the character of complaints reaching you you inclose a letter, which I herewith return, from Sergt. John J. McAvoy, as to whom you will be glad to know that he arrived in the United States on November 30, 1918, having been paid in full to include August 31, 1918. In November, while still in a hospital in Savenoy, France, he received a partial payment amounting to $7.50, and on January 13, 1919, an affidavit was taken from the soldier as to his previous payments, and he was paid in full to include December 31, 1918. This action was taken without knowledge on the part of the officer involved of Sergt. McAvoy's letter to you or yours to me.

You call my attention to two other complaints (1) that the War Department is maintaining an expensive system of officers under the Department of Labor to secure employment for discharged soldiers, but that the soldiers who have employment waiting for them find it difficult or impossible to secure discharges, and (2) the refusal of the War Department to obtain information concerning soldiers who are reported wounded and referring them to the Red Cross.

As a matter of fact, the War Department has demobilized to this date something over 850,000 men. From such information as I have been able to secure this is many more than have up to this time been demobilized by either Great Britain or France. We have not, in fact, demobilized men preferentially who had employment waiting for them, and this for the reason that to have done so would have been to detain in the service men equally anxious to be released in order that they might compete for such places of employment as were open. I did not feel and do not feel that it would have been just to release some and detain others who when they are released would find greater difficulty in securing employment by reason of the preferences exercised against them in favor of their associates. This policy of the War Department has been frankly stated and has my unqualified approval, and I believe it to be both just and necessary. It has, however, been modified by authority granted to commanding officers to release preferentially men whose family circumstances contain such elements of distress as to justify exceptions.

As to your last complaint, the War Department has from the beginning persistently and earnestly sought to secure all possible information for the benefit of friends and relatives as to sick and wounded soldiers. The Congress itself has provided a relationship of alliance and cooperation between the American Red Cross and the Army. The Red Cross, by reason of its peculiar activities, has maintained in Europe a very large body of helpful and considerate workers. Their relation to the Army has been such that they have had additional means of securing information and transmitting it to the relatives and friends of soldiers. The War Department has, therefore, urged all inquiring relatives and friends to supplement such information as the War Department could secure for them by utilizing the casualties information section of the Red Cross, and I am happy to be able to say that the American Red Cross has been of great service both to the Army and to the friends and relatives of soldiers in this humane work. There has been no lack of effort on the part of the War Department, however, to use its own facilities to the limit. There have been times when the congestion of urgent public business made only a limited use of the cables possible for personal and individual inquiries. In such cases courier letters have been resorted to. Recently more cable time has been available and a vast number of personal inquiries have been sent and answers received and dispatched to relatives and friends of wounded men.

Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have not the time to analyze Secretary Baker's letter, much of which contains information as to the policy of the War Department, whether you agree with it or not. But for the benefit of Secretary Baker I am going to call his attention to a few cases that still exist. I have received the following letter:

Corpl. Frank J. Walsh (my brother), Company I, One hundred and thirty-first Infantry, was gassed on October 14, 1918; since that time he has been convalescent in a hospital located at Vichy, France. We have received several letters from him advising us that he received no mail since he was taken out of the lines and that he has not been paid for some five months. I am inclosing herewith an envelope returned to me from France.

Here is an envelope marked on the outside, an envelope addressed to this Army boy, "Gassed 10/14. C. P. O. Tours Directory Section." It is returned to the writer.

Notwithstanding the Secretary's letter—and I admit this information is correct—notwithstanding the Secretary's letter, he has not been paid for five months. And, notwithstanding the Secretary's letter, here is a telegram from a valued constituent of mine, as follows:

JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

My son, Pvt. Chauncey E. Sanders, Company C, Fifth Field Battalion, Signal Corps, Third Division, Regular Army, gassed in action near Chateau Thierry, July 26, taken to Base Hospital 36, was located December 10 at casual evacuation camp, First Depot Division, Army Post Office 727. Has had only one letter since August 10; no pay since May. Government evidently lost record of him at Base Hospital 36, as 21 letters written him by ourselves and friends have been returned from that point marked "No record." Can you secure any action on part of Government to correct this outrageous bungling?

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I have not the time or I would be glad to do so. And when I sent this to the War Department they referred me to the Red Cross. They do this, however, in addition to anything they have done heretofore. Heretofore it has only been a reference to the Red Cross, and the Red Cross say they can not get the information for weeks, and maybe for months to come, but in this last communication they say:

Your letter has been referred to the commander abroad for report to us the present whereabouts and condition—

That is, of the soldier—

and you will be advised immediately upon receipt of his reply.

I suppose that my request for information has been transmitted by mail. The boy has not had any mail from home for many months. Twenty-one letters which were addressed to him have been returned. He has had no pay since last May. They hear from him, but the Government can not find out where he is.

Now, Secretary Baker is a fine gentleman, complacent in his style and manner; and when somebody under him tells him that everything is lovely and that the goose hangs high, he believes it, I assume. At least he tells us it is so.

I have any number of communications, both from soldiers themselves and from their relatives, stating they have not been paid and that they can not get their mail. I have no desire to criticize the War Department. I appreciate the great work which the Army has done. But I hope that the Secretary will lose his complacency for a few moments, wake up the men under him, and try to attend to these complaints.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I am sorry I have not more time, but I can not take it.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I shall take just a moment for a short statement in reference to a matter that is closely connected with what my colleague [Mr. MANN] has just been stating. The letter from Secretary Baker brought the matter very forcibly to my mind. There was a fine young man from my town by the name of Earl Pillow, who was severely wounded

in action on the 12th of October—I think it was—and who was sent to the same hospital as the young man mentioned by my colleague [Mr. MANN]. Afterwards his parents received word from the War Department that he had died from wounds received in action on November 11. Yet they had letters from him written on November 20 and on November 24, or written by his nurse for him, in which he told them of his condition, although the War Department had notified his father that he had died from wounds on November 11.

At the request of his father I took the matter up several times with the Casualty Bureau of the War Department and could get no information at all further than that mentioned, and I took it up finally with the Red Cross, and asked them to send a special cable. They agreed to do so. They sent the cable and said that they would get a reply just as quick as it was possible under the present conditions of the cable service. It was more than a month after they sent the cable to find out whether this young man was dead or alive before they got a reply. They finally received a reply that he had died on November 26 from wounds received in action.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. In just a moment. Now, then, in the last letter the young man wrote to his parents, by the assistance of the nurse in the hospital at Vichy, France, he told them he had sent them all the money he had saved and had taken over with him. He took considerable money along with him when he went abroad. He had sent it to his parents by mail after he received his wounds and when he may have been uncertain of recovering, but they have never heard from it. That was way back in October.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. Is the case the gentleman is talking about a transaction which occurred since the armistice was signed or before?

Mr. DENISON. It was just recently.

Mr. DYER. Let me suggest to the gentleman that instead of going to the Red Cross he himself cable direct to Gen. Pershing, and he will get the information he desires.

Mr. DENISON. I asked the War Department about that, and they said I could not do so and get a reply under a month or six weeks.

Mr. DYER. I will say that in extreme cases I cable to Gen. Pershing personally and get a reply promptly.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. HOWARD. I would like to state to the gentleman that I have had the War Department refer me to the Red Cross for further information half a dozen times in the last three weeks.

Mr. DENISON. The Red Cross have invariably treated me with the very highest consideration in my appeals to them. In the case of the young man I am discussing they acted promptly and did the very best they could. The trouble has been that the cable service has been so completely absorbed with the reports of the proceedings of our representatives at the peace conference that there was not left available sufficient service to report the casualties to our soldiers and the condition of our sick and wounded boys.

Mr. HOWARD. I want to say further that I hope the gentleman is not reciting that case as representing an unusual situation, is he?

Mr. DENISON. No. I was just citing it as a case that was in point with the remarks made by my colleague [Mr. MANN].

Mr. HOWARD. It is a common occurrence.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman from Georgia is right. Now, let me say further that this soldier, Earl Pillow, wrote his father he had not received his pay for five months, and he did not get it up to the time he died on November 26.

Now, his father has never received the money that his son sent him, and he says he does not expect to receive it. The young man did not receive his wages for five months before he died; at least that was the information that his father got, and the War Department gave his parents misinformation as to the time of his death.

Mr. HOWARD. I have a telegram this morning from a gentleman named Wallace, of Atlanta, Ga., who was informed yesterday by the War Department that his son was killed in action on August 31, 1918, and this is the first information that this man has been able to get about his son until yesterday.

Mr. DENISON. It seems to me there has been the grossest mismanagement on the part of somebody when we see that casualties received by our soldiers before the fighting stopped on November 11 are only now being reported, and when the parents of those reported wounded or missing have been absolutely unable to get any further information about them. I hope the whole subject may be investigated and that those responsible for these unfortunate conditions may be ascertained.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill making appropriations for those now on the pension lists. I believe the last two speeches have a very proper place in this discussion. The bill takes care of the soldiers of the Civil War, of those who come within the provisions of the general pension acts and who are survivors of the Spanish War and of the Indian wars, and of certain classes of widows and invalids and minor children. Just now this country is concerned over the returning soldier, and the returning soldier is concerned over what this country is going to do for the boys who have gone "over there" fighting for humanity.

This bill is the largest pension appropriation bill which has ever passed Congress, with a single exception, that being the bill of last year, and we are glad, I hope, to do what was done last year—pass the bill unanimously—the first time in the history of Congress. But we must not forget the men who are coming back, and both the gentlemen from Illinois remind me of something in connection with what I said on the floor of the House the other day, when I paid my respects to certain members of the high command in France. I have an Illinois case which I dare say my friends are not acquainted with, and just now I want to read a letter which came to me from a good woman in Boston, who read something of what I had to say in the newspapers. Under date of January 16 she writes:

BOSTON, MASS., *January 16, 1919.*

Representative JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GALLIVAN: Thank you for your spirited and enlightening speech of January 14 defending the Nationals and Gen. Edwards's manly and brave attitude toward them.

I had a nephew who went in as brigadier general with the Nationals from Illinois. He was deposed and a Regular given his honors just before he lost his life in the Argonne Forest leading his men to a machine-gun nest. When his body was found, he was pierced with seven bullets, any one of which would have been fatal. He was brave and beloved.

Thank you for your defense of such as these.

Very sincerely, ——— ———.

I will not mention the lady's name, but I have her letter, as I have 400 other letters, which have come to me from 29 States in the Union, in my office, and I will be glad to show those letters to any Member of this House who is interested in seeing the originals, provided my correspondents' names are not divulged, so that Congress may realize that what I referred to was not local to New England but was general to the country. I am going to read a few more of them. I have a letter here from a Regular Army officer. Of course, I am not going to use his name. But he writes me from the city of New York as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, *January 15, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Being an ex-Regular Army officer, and also having very recently served again a short time as colonel, I see from the inside perhaps better than even you do from the outside, and I want you to know how I sympathize with you in your recent courageous remarks in Congress on the conducting of Army affairs.

But while you were at it, why did you not also bring out the ludicrousness of the Chief of the General Staff's accepting and practically bestowing upon himself, as it were, the badge of distinguished service? Can you beat it? He in a swivel chair in Washington, blunderingly mismanaging affairs and knowing nothing about a modern battle, cheapening this badge by decorating himself with it?

Here are two other letters:

BOSTON, *January 15, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have been very much interested in reading your speech in Congress yesterday regarding the treatment of the Twenty-sixth Division.

I have this minute received a letter from my daughter, who, since last June, has been a Young Woman's Christian Association secretary near the front and who is now within a few miles of the place where the Twenty-sixth Division is stationed. She writes, "December 17," that she has just received a call from two of the boys of the One hundred and third Field Artillery, and, quoting her words, she says:

"The boys were awfully sore over the way the Twenty-sixth was left out of mention in dispatch by Gen. Pershing. It seems the marines advanced into Belleau Woods but could not hold it—not their fault; they were outnumbered—and then the Twenty-sixth relieved them, captured the woods, and held it. They have never been given any credit for it. Another thing that made the boys sore was that Pershing said his only veteran divisions with which to start the drive were the First, Second, and Third, when the Twenty-sixth had been in the front lines continuously since February. I am sorry for some one when these boys get home and into civilian clothes, when they can talk. I do not know even now but what I have said more than I ought, because there are just two things that can not be in letters now—criticism and statement of casualties."

Very truly, yours, ——— ———.

ANNAPOLIS, MD., *January 25, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN, M. C.

DEAR SIR: I write to thank you for your brave and just defense of the National Guards. They were the only purely unselfish, patriotic, and unpaid military organization in the country before the war; yet the Regular Army officers of high rank and the militarists of this country, taking advantage of the exigencies of the time and the loyalty of the American people in great crises, destroyed the guards to further and promote their own personal interests.

Could the true story of the wickedness of the original scheme and the intrigues by which it was carried to its ultimate consequences—the unjust dismissal of many of the officers of the guard of high rank—it would cover numbers of the guilty with the indignation of our fellow citizens, and possibly retrieve some of injuries deliberately and well-nigh criminally done to many of the competent officers of the volunteer service.

Please send me your full speech and keep up your noble vindication of the guard until returning reason restores the militia of the United States to its right place under the Constitution of the country.

I am a Democrat and no Republican complainant.

Very respectfully, yours,

——— ———.

Now, about every one of these letters mentions the word "courage" or "courageous" in connection with what I had to say, but I can not believe for the shadow of a minute that it needs courage for a man to tell the truth, even in Congress.

I have some other letters, and here, Mr. Chairman, is one from 40 wounded Army officers now in a base hospital in America, and I want your attention while I read this letter hurriedly.

JANUARY 15, 1919.

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We read with joy and thankfulness your speech in the House, in which you discussed the American Expeditionary Forces high command, and are writing this to give you a few hints, that, if you will follow them up, will reveal a state of affairs that no one has dreamed of.

It has been impossible for anyone to criticize. If you did it here, you were pro-German; if you said anything "over there," you were sent home in disgrace. The Czar of Russia in his palmiest days never enjoyed the autocratic power that the staff enjoyed here and abroad.

It can be proven on investigation that medical officers were peremptorily ordered (and dared not disobey) to find unfit officers that it was not desirable, from the staff viewpoint, to send overseas.

Brest was unspeakable as a place to keep soldiers. Prison officials here would have been sent to prison for a term of years that would have dared to keep prisoners in such a hole. Yet we dumped our soldiers there, out of sanitary camps where they were well housed and well fed. Thousands fell ill of diarrhea and dysentery, and hundreds from pneumonia, because of it.

At no time was this remedied, yet at all times we had labor battalions there and Engineers to do the work, but were too busy building France a port of entry that is excelled by none to properly house and care for our soldiers. Pages could be written and then half would not be told you. Some of us were sent home that way and found conditions no better than last May and June. Yet the Secretary of War says it was ideal when he saw it a few months ago. We only wish he had to spend the time there under the conditions we did.

When Gen. Wood visited our front he was treated more like a German spy than an officer of the United States. We have the word of several colonels that knew him well for this. He was hurried through his visit and ordered back home without allowing him to visit the Italian front or returning through England, as he was invited to do by Lloyd George. Gen. Wood was the idol of the Army, officers and men alike, was one of our most efficient officers, yet he was kept in a corner here at home. Who did it?

You are absolutely right as to the high commands. God bless you for it; it is all we can say. The S. O. S. was full of Regulars and the front lines were manned by reserve officers, as far as the fighting units went, and by the National Guard. This also applies to the Regular Medical Corps, Engineers, Infantry—in fact, to any branch of the service.

This became so plain, and the guard and reserves were doing so well, making such a good name for themselves, and the casualty list was showing up so much at home against them that what did they do? They did this: At the first of the war they (the Regulars) were very jealous of the insignia "U. S." and the title "U. S. officer" in distinguishing them from Reserve officers or National Guard officers. But when they saw that all the honor of the war was going to be with the Reserves and Guard they had an order passed making all of us U. S. Do you see it? We did, we assure you. And, as you said, when it was all over but the shouting our officers were replaced by G. H. Q. pets from the Regular service.

We would like to have a count of deaths and wounds. How many men were wounded above the rank of captain? The number is negligible. Above those ranks none of us were allowed to soar, no matter how efficient we were, except in a few instances. It is all very well for them to say that an officer commanding an advance should not be exposed to fire, etc. We will say to you and will prove that hundreds of men were wounded and killed needlessly because the officers ordering the advance or change of position were ignorant of the ground to be traversed or did not know the position of the enemy.

We can also prove to you that scores of men were sacrificed because the officers in command were ambitious for promotion and ordered needless advances, or those that would show up spectacularly in their favor, which were of no material advantage to the general advance and would not have been ordered if they had had to risk their own lives, as they should, with their men and lower officers.

We know of one National Guard colonel relieved of his command after a very successful advance and sent back to the S. O. S. because of jealousy.

We know that in the Medical Reserve Corps in France very few promotions were made among these devoted men, even after a general order was issued to promote them all. It was the general impression among these officers that this order was never intended to be obeyed, but issued to satisfy the pressure back home from these officers' friends. At least no attention was given to the names after they were sent in, except in a few isolated instances.

So these men now are returning to their homes after a year or more service in the Army, wounded more deeply in their pride than those actually wounded in war. This same rule applied to the line officers of the guard and reserve. In all instances a reserve officer is promoted at the will and pleasure of his superior officer. Consequently he is at his mercy, and must please this officer, no matter how efficient he may be, before he can be promoted. The Regulars have us there, too. Their promotion comes to them automatically, for years of service or because they are Regulars. Many good, efficient, hard-working reserve and guard officers were outranked by some young West Point dude, who has been trained for four years to look on the man in the ranks as his "oyster" for no other reason except that he was a Regular and the other man a reserve or National Guard. Those two things above all should be changed in our laws.

In the Regular Army an officer is not judged for his efficiency as an officer, but for his social qualities. We could name several promotions for that alone, and several efficiency ratings based on that item alone.

Our part in the great war was a success, not because of the skill of our high command, but in spite of it. The American doughboy is the best soldier in the world to-day, and in our humble opinion has the poorest general officers.

We have known this all along, but what could we do? We were muzzled as to what we could write home, and it was understood that to report even the grossest inefficiency of a superior officer meant "back home in disgrace for yours." So we have waited, hoping for just such a champion as yourself, that maybe would take the muzzle off and give us a chance to tell what has been done without the chance of a dishonorable discharge staring us in the face. If a full, free, without fear or favor investigation be made, the American people will get off of their knees here worshipping, and maybe make some changes in the Army regulations and laws that will prevent a repetition of this scandal, now so well hidden.

It is true that the "S. O. S." was full of highly paid Regular officers, while in the lines there was great need of them. Medical officers especially were needed, yet in some places great numbers were kept idle, or worse than idle, and could not be assigned to work, or were not, even when asking every day for assignment.

We could tell you many, many other things, but what would be the use? We have burdened you thus far in order to let you know that you have not broken the crust of this thing even, and that the returning Army, reserves and guard, and the enlisted men are with you to a man. We only pray that your arm be made strong, and that you will not be awed by rank.

In our so-called democratic Army there is less freedom of speech or of the individual than in either the British or the French. We did not get our mail, thousands of packages sent us from home of needed articles actually ordered by special permission were stolen from us. Yet we could not say anything. It did no good to complain to general headquarters. No attention was ever paid to anything of that nature. Thousands of us have lost all we had in France—our trunks, our uniforms, bed rolls, etc. And we see no way to be reimbursed for them. To begin with, there was no reason why these things should be lost. And so on, almost without end.

In spite of all the inefficiency and hidebound regular militarism, thank God we had a splendid bunch of men, mostly National Guard and Reserve officers, that cut red tape where they could, disobeyed orders, ignored precedents, etc., sufficiently to get the great job done for which the Regular Army is trying to get all the credit. It is nothing but human that we should object to that.

We are sorry more than we can express that we can not sign our names to this, but being still in the Army we know the penalty of writing to a Member of Congress. We beg that you do not disregard this letter for that reason, but take our suggestions, all of which are true, as a basis from which to work, and do what you can to see that justice be done the guard and the reserves.

To show we are without prejudice we will say that 15 of us are Democrats, 2 Socialists, and 8 Republicans. Eight of us are National Army officers, 4 National Guard, and the rest Reserves.

Again thanking you, and wishing you Godspeed, we are,

FORTY WOUNDED AMERICAN OFFICERS.

That is what Congress must consider, gentlemen. These men are coming back disgruntled. Oh, yes! When they come into New York or Boston or the other ports of debarkation they are glorying in the victory won. They have defeated German autocracy. But I have talked with dozens of them, and they have told me in many, many instances that when they were fighting the Huns in front of them they had to watch for a few Huns behind them; and that is gospel truth, gentlemen of the House.

Mr. POU. What does the gentleman mean by that statement? The statement that they were watching for Huns in the rear of them? I think that the gentleman might well explain that.

Mr. GALLIVAN. If the gentleman insists on an explanation, I think the House grasped what I meant. The very militarism which they have gone abroad to batter down they found in their own ranks behind them, if the gentleman from North Carolina wants an answer. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, that is an answer in a way, but is it an answer that satisfies the gentleman's own mind?

Mr. GALLIVAN. It does. I am perfectly clear as to what I have in my own mind and I am perfectly clear as to what the boys who have returned from abroad have said to me and what they meant, and right here I want to warn the members of my party who are constantly criticizing us when we endeavor to bring to the attention of the country the needs of these boys who are coming back—I say to them that they are making the mistake of their political lives in rushing to an imaginary defense of the men who have been guilty of cruel wrongs to our soldier boys. [Applause.] It is no party question, and the party that attempts to protect these guilty men will go down to ignominious defeat. I am doing my party a service when I challenge the action of men abroad, and I want to say that the men of New England for whom I spoke the other day and who are coming back only in dribs and drabs are a unit in the criticisms to which I have referred; and once more I beg the men on this side of the House, unless they can answer these attacks, to keep quiet for the present or else go and get an answer, and do not put the Democratic Party in a hole. [Applause.]

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield? I am not interested in putting anybody in a hole, neither am I interested in protecting anybody. If any outrages have been committed, I will join with the gentleman in seeing that the guilty parties are convicted and punished; but when a man writing to the gentleman states that there were a few Huns in the rear of the American Army, that statement conveys a very horrid idea to me. I wish to know what is meant by it. We know who were the Huns in front, and what they stood for. Does the gentleman's correspondent mean to say that in the American Army behind the front there were men, officials, or otherwise, who so far as our boys in France were concerned, stood with reference to them, just as the German enemies in front stood? I want to know specifically what a statement of that sort means. If there is anybody who seeks to be protected, I am not in favor of protecting him, and if there is anyone who ought to be punished, I will join with the gentleman in seeing that he is punished. But at least we ought to have some definite meaning attached to the charge advanced by the gentleman's correspondent.

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman knows that when I quoted the boys who have said to me that they were fighting the Huns behind them, the soldier lads clearly referred to the Hun autocracy which they were there to destroy, but which they saw exemplified in our own ranks in the actions of some of their own officers.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. They meant to say that that Hun autocracy was exemplified by some officer or officers in the American Army?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Exactly.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Very well. I will join with you in trying to weed that out, if it exists. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. There is no occasion even to question the statement. It is clear what the boys meant, and any man in this House who will take the time to investigate will be satisfied if he believes that these men, who up until November 11 were "our heroes," are telling the truth. I think they are telling the truth. I said the other day that I had talked with many men, and not one of them was satisfied, not one of them was proud of most of the officers of the high command in France, and I repeat it now. I have hundreds of letters from 29 States in this Union. I have a colonel from the gentleman's own State and a major and a captain from Virginia who wrote me asking me to take up their cases and see what can be done for them.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question, purely for information?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Sure.

Mr. FERRIS. We hear these criticisms. I get some of them in my mail. Some of them I am impressed with and some of them I am not, but as I am able to understand them and fathom them they all reach back to the rivalry and the contest for promotion between the several officers. Do the letters of the gentleman point to that?

Mr. GALLIVAN. The letters which have impressed me do not point to that in any way, shape, or form. I have thrown such letters as the gentleman refers to into the waste basket. I am reading real letters. The letters to which my good friend from Oklahoma alludes did not impress me; and where a man said that he was in line for this commission or that commission and did not get it I have not bothered with his letter. I am reading other letters which do not refer to individual promotions.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman think that there was absolute venality among the officers, or does he think it is the crime of the system, of too much discipline, too much arrogance, too much authority, or what? I am asking now in perfect good humor and perfect good faith. I hear some of the same troubles that the gentleman does, perhaps not to such an extent, because I live farther from the coast. I would like to ask the gentleman what is the real trouble?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I will try to answer the gentleman, because his question is an honest one. I would prefer to find somebody on the other side of the aisle asking these questions, but my good friends over there are afraid to touch it. There is no glory in what the Republicans of the House have done up to date on this question. I repeat they have not had the courage to tackle the situation.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. BUTLER. You tell us how we can touch it, and we will show you whether we are afraid or not.

Mr. GALLIVAN. My friend from Pennsylvania has been here 22 years, and he is asking me to tell him how.

Mr. BUTLER. Because you know better how than I do.

Mr. FREAR. I want to say that we are with you in many cases.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have a colonel from the gentleman's State who asks me to take up his case.

Mr. BUTLER. From Pennsylvania?

Mr. GALLIVAN. From Wisconsin.

Mr. BUTLER. I will give you the names of several men from our State.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have the names of several men, generals and colonels, from the gentleman's State.

Mr. BUTLER. I can give the gentleman the names of several men from Pennsylvania who were demoted after they had made successful fights against the Hun.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes; I have got 26 general officers above the rank of captain who saw service abroad and were demoted, and in most instances the men who were given their places had not seen combat before.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What reasons were assigned, if any?

Mr. BUTLER. None.

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman is wrong. Does the gentleman mean what reasons are assigned for relieving the man of his command?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In demoting the man. I was following the gentleman's statement.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I will refer to a distinguished brigadier general from my city, who had fought longer than any brigadier general in the Infantry line. Listen to this: He was on the front line until November 6, and a division commander, who was appointed to succeed the gallant Gen. Edwards, removed him on the 6th of November. Remember, on the 6th of November. And although he had fought with his brigade from away last February until November the reason assigned was that he was not aggressive enough in attack. He had been attacking and had gained a further advance in the enemy's line than any other brigade commander in Infantry. And in his brigade is the one regiment of the entire American Expeditionary Force which was cited as a regiment and the colors decorated.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Then that man was the victim of a lie.

Mr. GALLIVAN. He was; but I want to say in fairness that he asked for a court of inquiry, and the news only came to us yesterday that after his court was held and the papers went clear up the line at last, when they got to the commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces, Gen. Pershing ordered the man back to his brigade and said he never should have been removed. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Did the gentleman undertake to get from the War Department the record of the demoted man?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have not of late. I was in Boston before the session met in December, and had some correspondence with the Secretary of War about a colonel from my own city who was relieved, and was informed that they had referred it to over the seas. I did learn from a Senator-elect from my State, who comes into the United States Senate on the 4th of March next, the first Democrat elected to the United States Senate since the Civil War from Massachusetts, that he had thrown himself into the action here in the War Department, and that the Secretary of War had assured him that the record of the colonel for whom I was asking fair play was absolutely one of efficiency, so far as they knew in the War Department; that there was not a black mark against it. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that the colonel who had fought from February until the 1st of November, with only seven days' rest in all that time, was relieved for "inertia." [Laughter.] "Inertia," that is all. This man, who also asked for a court of inquiry, was removed by a division commander who was in command of the division but 24 hours and had never laid eyes on him and never saw him in his life.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Where does this policy start, and who is responsible for it?

Mr. GALLIVAN. That is what I am going to find out if I get help.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does not the gentleman think it had its start at West Point?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Not altogether; and while some people got the impression the other day that I was attacking West Point, I was not. There are many good things about West Point, although I heard a distinguished brigadier general in an address at the Harvard Club at Washington the other night advise a change in the curriculum at West Point. He went on to say that it must not, for the shadow of a moment, be believed that the officers or that military science had won this war. He told us what we all want to believe, that it was the spirit of the men—the spirit of the men—and he advised his fellow officers

in the regular line to cultivate the men whom they have met in the commissioned personnel of the National Army in the last year or 15 months. Gen. Ansell, of the Judge Advocate General's office, one of the most brainy men in the whole Army, made that suggestion.

Now, I have a great many letters here——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman referred to some cases that came from my State, captains, colonels, and others, in respect to which he said they asked him to take up their cases. Does that relate to injustice or demotion and other wrongs they claim were done to them?

Mr. GALLIVAN. It did.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Those cases present questions of fact which are to be arrived at by a military inquiry.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I am not reading their letters.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What does the gentleman propose to do with these cases?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Well, I talked about that the other day—I do not want the gentleman to use all my time, for I have something interesting to say. [Laughter.]

Mr. DECKER. Does the gentleman think the man to blame for this is Gen. Pershing?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I do not.

Mr. DECKER. He is in command?

Mr. GALLIVAN. He is.

Mr. DECKER. Then the gentleman must think he is to blame.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I want to say parenthetically, and in answer to the gentleman from Missouri, that I was asked to what I attributed it, whether it was to West Point jealousy, and I say no; and also, when my friend from Missouri brings up the name of Gen. Pershing, I say no. I am assured on the highest authority that these unjust and unfair actions are credited to the so-called "Leavenworth clique," and there are men from West Point who are not in the "Leavenworth clique."

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. How does the "Leavenworth clique" exert its influence on the War Department? Tell us that—and who is the "Leavenworth clique"?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I suppose my friend, who has been in Congress longer than I, knows that we have certain Army schools at Leavenworth, a sort of post-graduate schools, and these men who come out of Leavenworth have become closely banded together. Whether Gen. Pershing is the head, front, and center of the "Leavenworth clique" I can not say to my friend from Missouri [Mr. DECKER], but it is well known that the controlling influence in his staff were members of the "Leavenworth clique," and I can assure my friend that unless I am being led astray men, even in the regular line, if given proper protection, will, when Congress investigates this entire situation, take the stand and under oath testify to the power and the influence and the unfairness of the "Leavenworth clique."

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. The gentleman has spoken of a great many unmerited demotions. Are those demotions due to any one man over and above any other man, or many men?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have just answered the gentleman's question. I have discussed for four minutes the "Leavenworth clique." I am advised from excellent sources that they were due to the influence and power of the "Leavenworth clique." In fact, may I say to my friend from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] that I was advised, when I sought information, to be most careful to separate the West Point system from the Leavenworth system, and once more I repeat that I did not in any words of mine intend to lay up against West Point the injustices that have been perpetrated on American young men who gave up everything to go across the ocean.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The influence and power of the "Leavenworh clique" with whom?

Mr. GALLIVAN. With the high command.

Mr. MASON. Does the gentleman mean the general stawf? [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. With the General Staff in Washington, as well, my good friend; yes.

Mr. MASON. I want to ask the gentleman a question. The question has been asked here on both sides of the Chamber—What can we do? This is one branch of the Congress of the United States. I have had the honor and pleasure of introducing a resolution which would allow the Congress of the United States to send for papers and persons and to sit during the recess. Does the gentleman not think it would be a wise thing for both parties to pass that resolution, so that we can get the facts before the people and before Congress, and then we will know how much is truth and how much is error in all of these letters and charges?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I do; and I have already suggested that. I might say to my friend from Illinois, both parties better get a jump on; both parties.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. In that connection I asked the gentleman a moment ago if any requests had been made of the War Department for the records of men which have been refused. I asked that because I had understood—I had been informed—that a Senator of the United States had asked of the War Department the records of certain demoted men, and that all records had been refused, and I wanted to know if the gentleman had any information in respect to it.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have not had any information along that line; but I think I know the officer to whom my good friend refers. If it is Col. Hume, of the One hundred and third Infantry——

Mr. WHITE of Maine. That is one of the officers.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I have his record here, the official record of Col. Hume, where the man was cited more than once; where, like Col. Logan, of Boston, he had fought almost until the last stroke of the gong, and he was relieved on the 4th of November. He was in the brigade of the general to whom I referred a moment ago, who was recently restored to his command by Gen. Pershing. Do you wonder that we from New England rise in this Chamber and call the attention of Congress to these conditions? Remember that our boys have been over there longer than anyone else, excepting the first small unit that went with Pershing himself, and remember that the Twenty-sixth Division, the Yankee Division, fought until 11 o'clock on November 11. Do you wonder that it would take the heart out of any man in Congress if he was compelled to keep quiet when he knows the truth of these stories? For one I propose to have my say here in Congress.

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

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can give any information as to the probable time of the return of these troops from New England, who have served, as the gentleman says, longer than any others?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Only from the newspapers, to which I was referred by the distinguished Chief of Staff; and the newspapers in Boston say that the division is coming home. I hope that no words of mine spoken on this floor may change the order, but I am watching; I am not afraid.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I not ask if the newspapers in our sections have not carried the stories that the men themselves are writing home that they expect to reach debarkation points in the very near future, but that no confirmation of that fact can be secured from the War Department or the Chief of Staff here?

Mr. GALLIVAN. I was advised by the Secretary of War the day before yesterday that he knows nothing about the departure of the Twenty-sixth Division. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. GALLIVAN. I thank the committee for its very great interest and attention in these matters. [Prolonged applause.]

I ask unanimous consent to extend, revise, and correct my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I now under the privilege extended to me desire to print some more of the letters to which I have referred in my remarks this afternoon, and I ask the Members to read them carefully. They all tell a story similar to each other, and in every instance they came to me with the signatures of the writers attached. I will not print the names of my correspondents, but will gladly show the originals to the Speaker of the House or to the leader of the minority [Mr. MANN], if they should desire to read them.

ILLINOIS, *January 23, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one of the many "jobbed" National Guard officers, permit me to express my thanks to you for your recent severe and manly condemnation of the system employed by the Regular Army clique to discredit and remove from service officers of the National Guard and Reserves.

A congressional investigation such as you have urged will reveal conditions almost unbelievable and compared to which the "embalmed-beef" scandal of 1898 would be insignificant.

Should you desire it, shall be glad to submit some facts for your perusal, and can furnish names and addresses of upward of 100 National Guard officers from many States to substantiate my statements.

I sincerely hope you will persist in demanding a congressional investigation pertaining to dismissal of National Guard officers, the conduct of the brigade and field officers' school at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., and the school for noncommissioned officers of the National Guard at Leon Springs, Tex.

The arrogant, brutal methods employed at these schools alone would shock the Nation.

I am writing my Congressman ———, asking him to support you in your efforts to get justice for many brave officers who have been cruelly wronged.

Sincerely, yours,

—

BOSTON, *January 20, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
Congressman from Massachusetts, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to thank you for your very able and forceful effort on the floor of the House to convey to official Washington and the country some of the things that the War Department is either doing or countenancing that are not right as we see it.

My work as ——— keeps me in fairly close touch with conditions abroad, and I have been amazed at the shortcomings of the War Department.

To illustrate, my own son went without his pay for something over 10 months, and I have just succeeded in getting the War Department to settle with him. Many of our boys have not received their pay for months and months; are being landed in this country without a penny in their pockets; have been discharged without any pay since the day they left Framingham; parents have been cut off from allowances and allotments; National Guard officers, we believe, have been discriminated against unfairly; and now, on top of it all, the War Department issues a ruling that no soldier, unless he is with his unit, is entitled to the special YD and other insignia, which is an atrocious ruling, the bad effects of which will be far-reaching.

So I repeat that I was glad to see your bold stand of constructive criticism. I want to be fair, but constructive criticism is fair, and those of us at home who have been active know some of the shortcomings of the War Department.

I can substantiate with facts any of my criticisms.

Very truly, yours,

—

NEW YORK CITY, *January 17, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES GALLIVAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your speech to the House quoted in the Times of the 15th was a step in the right direction. While you are on the subject of the Army, might I be permitted to state the following facts:

If an officer of the National Army or National Guard while in the Federal service is unfit for further duty through physical disability he is discharged and that ends it. This disability, of course, occurred in the line of duty. But—

If the officer disabled is of the Regular Army or the old establishment, he is not discharged, but retired at one advance in grade and allowed a percentage of his new grade's pay. Please note the difference; one is discharged and the other is retired.

Last September I placed these facts and some data before Chairman DENT of the House Military Committee, but up to the present time have heard nothing. I am one of the above discharged National Guard officers.

Yours, truly,

—

BOSTON, MASS., *January 16, 1919.*

The Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In one of the morning papers I read of your appeal to Congress for our boys of the Twenty-sixth Division. I believe I am voicing the sentiments of every soldier's mother when I say that it is obligatory on the part of our Government that this affair be thoroughly investigated immediately. The delay of the return of this division and the treatment of some of its officers is being discussed everywhere. If there is a question that fair play has not been given these men, it should be settled at once to the satisfaction of all concerned.

If our Army officials are keeping this division in France for mercenary reasons or through personal feelings of spite, authority to do so should be wrested from them. Such proceedings are a violation of Uncle Sam's principles and the very cause for which these brave boys volunteered their services.

The boys of the Twenty-sixth Division should have returned on the first homeward-bound transport from France. These boys volunteered in answer to Uncle Sam's first call to the colors. The majority of them gave up fine positions, with splendid futures ahead of them, to fight for our protection. Not only did they leave their homes for a strange land, but they purchased liberty bonds paid for out of their Army salaries, which they sometimes waited months for.

Ours is a Government by the people, of the people, and for the people. If there is any suspicion of unjust discrimination in sending our troops home, the people should protest and demand an explanation, not only that our boys may receive justice but that those at whom the accusations are directed should be vindicated.

It has been rumored that this division is to be held at a rest camp until their condition is physically improved, when they will be ordered to Germany as part of the army of occupation. Everyone knows what they have done in this war fighting from February until after the signing of the armistice, without one period of rest, untiringly. I could go on endlessly relating the sacrifices they made and their heroism, but we all know the story.

Haven't they done more than enough? Send them home! It is a trivial reward after what they have endured for us.

If they are ordered to Germany, what shall they say to us when they return, broken in health and spirits, to find every available position in the country filled, forgotten by everyone excepting their dear ones?

I hope that Congress as a body will give this matter immediate attention, that the proverbial "red tape" will be swept aside, and that they will not tolerate undue delay in answer to their investigation.

I feel safe in saying you have the esteem of all New England for your efforts thus far. Let us hope, sir, you will see this thing through until success is attained. If the personal signature of mothers and relatives of the boys of this division will facilitate matters, I am willing to do my utmost to place such a list in your hands. I submit this in lieu of having heard the plan suggested.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

—

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 15, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The writer has just received his Washington Evening Star of the 15th instant, and has noted with real interest the account of your criticism of Army pets as set out in that paper.

Inasmuch as the Government had to call upon the people, the State guard, and reserve officers in order to win the war, and inasmuch as the civilian had in many cases to make up for the shortcomings of the Regular Army, and the said Regular Army being a closed corporation, I would suggest that the War Department be the subject of an investigation by Congress, with real investigators, sitting and acting as a court of inquiry, presided over by a civil judge, that the proper examination and cross-examination might take place.

It is a known fact that an Army or War Department investigation is a one-sided affair, the whole intent of the inquiry being to protect the Army view of the situation, and any member of the Army forces who dares to criticize the acts or methods of the combine is at once asked to resign, no matter whether his claims are just or not.

Further, in order to break up the combination of the Regular Army officers and the lead-pipe cinch held by them, and in view of the fact that the National Guard and reserve officers had to come to the front, I suggest that the Army control be divided, one-third going to the National Guard and one-third to the civilian reserve officers, and that proposition be continued and maintained.

An Army officered by such a combination will be a live factor for justice; no packed court-martial can then be pulled off, and I see no better way for the people of this great Nation to show its appreciation to our men who went to the front than to give them some voice in the real management of affairs, and I predict that there will be a business administration therefrom and ever after.

Very truly, yours,

——— ———.

—

———, GA., *January 24, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.:

You are to be congratulated on your speech before the House on January 14. It takes a man of a peculiar class of courage to make the statements you did, although every statement was as true as gospel. Gen. Edwards was not the only officer that was "got" by inferior nincompoops over there. There were hundreds of them, generals and colonels, who were removed without apparent cause, after long and efficient service, solely to give excuse for the appointment of Cavalry officers or those from the Leavenworth clique. Check up any of those relieved and you will not miss a case of rank injustice very far.

Another way of "getting" officers was to order them to a hospital, and the doctors would take care of them after that.

Again, scores of officers who served from three to six months in the front sectors—lines, if you like—with all the hardships and dangers that that service implied, were sent to the rear temporarily worn out—did not have the opportunity to sleep in warm beds or eat three good meals a day—and then railroaded to the States, with the resultant denial of promotion justly won. Men who have seen their juniors jumped over them purely through personal favoritism—selection—and a large number of those thus discriminated against by virtue of this favoritism bear the scars of wounds received in battle. Yet that counts for naught unless you had a "stand-in" with the powers that be—Duncan K. Majors and his like—in other words, were of the "elect"; and if you did your work in an efficient, hustling, painstaking manner and did not make the welkin ring with outbursts of self-laudation of your greatness and importance, you were lost.

The powers that be have the officers of the Army by the throat, and if those who suffer gross injustice at the hands of the favored—those who are bedecked with medals for their gallantry, but who ruled in Chaumont and the States—utter a whimper in protest they are immediately squelched via the court-martial route. There is no possible chance for an officer who has been unjustly treated to secure justice.

You can see every day scores of brigadier generals, colonels, etc., who have never heard a hostile shot. Justice?

A large number of officers—a very large number—hope you will push your request for an investigation, and also put a stop to any future similar acts of favoritism by squelching the clique recommendation for promotion by selection in the proposed Army reorganization bill. It has been very definitely shown by the promotions by selection in the past few months that the personal factor is the greatest element to successful advancement in the Army, and the man who is out doing straight soldiering gets no consideration.

The Army and Navy Journal is filled with a lot of editorial slush with reference to your remarks and the source of your information, but its eyes would be opened could Army officers and men tell the truth without fear of having their means of livelihood summarily stopped.

Discipline is necessary, but gag rule is a curse to any nation.

Sincerely,

—

BOSTON, *January 16, 1919.*

Representative JAMES A. GALLIVAN.

DEAR SIR: Let me introduce myself as the wife of one of those slighted and shamefully treated officers of the Massachusetts National Guard, who you so gallantly defended in your truly wonderful speech of the 14th in Washington.

You have no idea what a wonderful comfort it was to me to read it, and realize you have made it possible for the public to know the real truth in regard to these things. My husband, an officer in the —— Massachusetts—I will call no names—has given 20 years of the best part of his life and time to the work of the National Guard. After many years of hard work he has built up a paying business. When "his country called" he gladly gave up all family ties, business, everything, to go to war; with what result? After fighting, suffering, and great sacrifice, to be turned down from his rightly earned reward and have to see a young West Pointer, a rich man's son, who has never done anything to merit reward, put into his place! It is a disgrace to this administration the way real men have been abused, and it surely will have to pay for it later. As you say, "Wait till the boys get home; they will tell a few things."

Your wonderful speech "blazed the way" to the truth, indeed. It was just splendid and you certainly have the blessings of the wives and mothers of those men you so gallantly defended. The shameful conditions of the mail service in regard to soldiers' letters is so true. I have a relative wounded in a French hospital who has not had a letter from home for three months, and we have written 10 to him. May God give you courage to continue your good work and bring to justice those "powers that be" who persistently refuse to listen to the cries of those in distress who have given "their all" and who also absolutely refuse to "right the wrong."

Thanking you for what you have done in putting the facts before the people and for your splendid speech, I remain,

Most sincerely,

—

NEW YORK CITY, *January 15, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Every volunteer officer, especially those in the combat units in France and their relatives, will be glad to read of the issue raised by you yesterday in respect to certain Regular Army officers, their safety-first conduct, and their treatment of said volunteer officers who, educated at private expense, volunteered their services and risked their lives for their country in all posts of danger to which they were assigned and told that they would have to earn promotion under fire.

Beginning with applications for admission to officers' training schools and in such training schools in charge of West Pointers, the volunteers were hectored, bullied, and abused in a way remarkable for its smallness and pettiness and told that they were unwelcome and that they did not propose to have them, the volunteers, get commissions that it had taken them four years at West Point to obtain. The fact that such volunteers had had educations, college and other, and business experience which more than equaled the purely academic training of four years at West Point of the West Pointers during their adolescence, was entirely disregarded and considered as of no value by said West Pointers, who assumed that the course at West Point per se (obtained at public expense, for which they evince no gratitude), had given them a profound, superior, and complete knowledge of the past, present, and future tense of everything, and in addition had made them, properly from all walks of life, social superiors of said volunteers, whom they continually flouted and refused to meet on equal terms or accord equal privileges on all occasions.

When France was reached the volunteer officers were assigned to all branches of the service in the combat divisions considered of extrahazardous nature, such as manning scouting machines, aeroplanes, and balloons for observations of artillery fire, commanding machine gun and field-artillery units, even of the regular divisions, trench-mortar batteries. The latter was considered extrahazardous (not borne out) by the English and French Armies; in fact was termed the "Suicide Club," and there was not a West Pointer in command of a single trench mortar battery, even of the Regular divisions of the Army.

The truth of these conclusions is verified by the small list of casualties to West Pointers. The writer hopes that you will obtain and publish a complete statement, showing the number in the service, the number in combat divisions, the nature of their assignments, and number and proportion of casualties sustained. The writer hopes that the matter will be ventilated fully, as well as the method by which the grossly unfair promotions and commissions have been given, and that our public-school aristocracy of West Point will have much-needed and corrective measures applied to it or abolished for the good of the country.

——— ———.

—

———, VA., *January 25, 1919.*

Hon. JAS. A. GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with much interest and appreciation your remarks in Congress a few days ago about "Regular Army pets," etc., and I take this means of thanking you for same, as every National Guardsman knows that you have spoken nothing but the truth.

"Get those National Guardsmen" seemed to have been a general order right down the line; whether the means be fair or foul, it was get them.

In the Twenty-ninth Division (the Blue and Gray), to which I went with my command after the border service with much pleasure and pride, not only were the words "persecution" and "discipline" confounded in the conduct of that division, but it was the custom of our distinguished commander—having orders from "higher up," no doubt—to merge three National Guard regiments into one—I cite the Fifth Maryland Infantry as an instance—then to chop, chop, chop away at the commissioned personnel until it was trimmed to suit. On the other hand, as you doubtless know, it was the custom to expand the very inferior Regular outfits into three. The object in merging was to get rid of the officer who had for years been giving his time and efforts free in the hopes that some day he would be of some service to his country. The object in expansion being to give promotion to Regular officers, most of whom had been educated and trained out of funds coming from the taxpayers, among whom are numbered the National Guard officers and men.

As a member of the National Guard who has more than 20 years to his credit, who three times of his own accord left home and loved ones to defend the flag, I again wish to thank you for your efforts and to express my pleasure to find at last a Member of your honorable body who has enough red blood in his veins and courage in his heart to defend the National Guard.

Again thanking you, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

——— ———.

—

———, MO., *January 15, 1919.*

Hon. Mr. GALLIVAN.

DEAR SIR: Just noticed your report on ousting of National Guard officers in this morning's paper. I am one of those unlucky ones and want to congratulate you and thank you for having backbone enough for your supporters. I was a major in Missouri and had served 17 years in the National Guard, and was relieved for doing what I call my duty. It is too bad our representatives can not take the same stand you have taken. I could tell you more but am out now and it would do no good, but I just could not help thanking you for your speech.

Hoping for your success and pledging you my support if I ever get a chance, I am,

Respectfully,

——— ———.

———, VT., *January 15, 1919.*

Representative JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have just been reading an account of your attack on the War Department and the high Army command in this country and in France for their treatment of the Twenty-sixth Division, and I thank God that there is one man that is not afraid to speak his mind, and now that the ice is broken I hope that there will be something done and that the Twenty-sixth Division (what there is left of it) will be on its way home soon.

We have a son over there in the One hundred and first Ammunition Train and he has been through it all. That you may know what one soldier boy thinks of Gen. Edwards, I will quote a part of his last letter to me dated December 11, 1918:

"If I were you I would not build my hopes too high on our being home for New Years, or three from then, for that matter. The Twenty-sixth Division, for some unknown reason, does not fit any too well with those higher up and never has for that matter. If Gen. Edwards could have his way we would be home in a hurry, and I am sure that he will do everything in his power to get us there as soon as possible. Mother, Gen. Edwards is the best man that ever wore stars and there is not a man in the Twenty-sixth Division who would not fight for him. I sure would like to hear him talk in Boston. If it were not for this fact, that we are not allowed to criticize anything or anybody in our letters, I might write several interesting pages on this subject."

Very truly, yours,

——— ———.

—

MELROSE, MASS., *January 15, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to add my feeble words of commendation to those I feel must be pouring in to you from all over the land for your fearless denunciation of the injustice done the officers and men of the Twenty-sixth Division. You have surely earned the thanks of all who believe in justice and fair play, and for one I thank you. Myself an old member of Company A, Ninth Massachusetts Infantry, I have watched with a great deal of pride the splendid record made by our New England boys, especially the One hundred and first Regiment. All the more so as I had a son in Company L of that command, who now lies under the sod of France, having been killed July 20 at Vaux, in the second Battle of the Marne. As yet I have been unable to obtain any definite information in regard to his death and so far have received none of his personal effects, though I have tried in every way to do so. I surely agree with you that there is something wrong and wish you every success in your efforts to have things righted.

I have received from France an official citation for bravery issued to my son upon recommendation by his regimental and brigade commanders and signed by Gen. Edwards. While I shall always cherish that, it does not and never can take the place of my dear boy, who I feel, like many others, was needlessly sacrificed.

With highest regard, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

——— ———.

—

———, N. Y., *January 15, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES GALLIVAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read in the New York Times the report of your speech. If there is basis for your charges I hope that you will persist in having these allegations investigated, and, if proven, the guilty ones punished.

I was not aware of the treatment accorded Gen. Edwards; wider publicity should be given it. But I and many like me have been aware of what is, as far as the Army is concerned, the gravest scandal of the whole war. I refer to the treatment accorded Gen. Wood.

Gen. Wood is not known to me personally. I speak as a disinterested person. But I have watched his career and had learned to hold him in the greatest respect, as to character, ability, and certain statesmanlike qualities rarely found in a soldier. The greatest offense of which he has been guilty has been his desire to acquaint the American people with what he considered their almost helpless condition should war suddenly come upon us. I never have heard him accused of any laxness or misconduct as far as his Army career was concerned. He has been humiliated, one might almost say persecuted, by those in authority in Washington for no other reason, that I can learn, than that he chose to fearlessly speak out on an issue that others chose to "pussyfoot" on. The criticism might have hurt the tender sensibilities of some of the most high in Washington, but it was constructive criticism of the best kind. As far as preparatory work goes, I believe that Gen. Wood's outspoken criticism which led finally to the establishment of the numerous officers' training camps all over the country before we were finally engaged in the war was the finest piece of work done by any Army officer.

I hope, sir, that you will do all that you can to open the doors wide, to the end that men of the type of Gen. Edwards and Gen. Wood may receive full justice, and to let the fullest publicity obtain so that the man in the street may read for himself and learn.

Cordially, yours,

——— ———.

—

BRIDGTON, ME., *January 15, 1919.*

Mr. GALLIVAN.

DEAR SIR: I have been reading in the Post your talk about the Twenty-sixth Division, and I am glad to see one man that will show these men up in their true light and find out why they have been crowding these boys of the Twenty-sixth the way they have done.

I have a boy in the Twenty-sixth and would like to know why they should be kept over there any longer. They have done their duty, and they should have been sent home long ago.

I certainly hope you will keep up the good work and make it interesting for them until they do do something about it.

Yours, truly,

——— ———.

—

BOSTON, MASS., *January 15, 1919.*

MY DEAR MR. GALLIVAN: I know such words as mine can not express such pride and honor which we people of this congressional district owe to such a man as you.

I have read your speech made in Congress to-day, and as I have a brother in the One hundred and first Regiment, I find it nothing but my most important duty to congratulate you on your wonderful under-

taking. My brother was reported killed, wounded twice, and missing. You can imagine for a moment the feeling and sorrow which came to our home during this memorable period. However, he is now safe and sound in France—or at least he so states—and it is my only desire now to see him get a square deal and receive his due justice.

There shall be volumes of books written upon this very subject, but when I finish my college career and am about to write my view of this subject, I shall only write it with contempt and "soreness" for the men to whom you refer in connection with the treatment of the Twenty-sixth Division and the transfer of its officers.

I only hope that you shall continue your fight to a finish, and our prayers shall abide with you to the end.

Yours, forever,

——— ———.

WINFIELD, KANS., *January 20, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES GALLIVAN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for your recent criticism of the treatment of the National Guard, both before and since going abroad and most heartily say amen to every word in your address.

I have the honor to have a boy in the Thirty-fifth Division, and I do not believe there is a father or mother of a National Guardsman who *does not* believe that they have had the worst of it ever since they have been called into the service. Not a breath of complaint has ever come from the boys abroad, but when we hear such reports as Gov. H. J. Allen and others as reliable it causes just a little misinterpretation. We gave our boys freely, and every one of them has been an honor to us who gave them and to their country, and we have a right to expect that both officers and men be accorded the honorable treatment they deserve.

Go on in your fight, and not a father or mother of a National Guardsman in the country but will rise up and call you blessed.

I know not wherein lies the blame, but it should be found out and wrongs be righted before it is too late.

I am, most sincerely,

——— ———.

HAVERHILL, MASS., *January 15, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN.

DEAR SIR: Thank God you are a man and that you have backbone enough to say what you did in Congress yesterday.

New England guardsmen were needlessly slaughtered.

Find the man responsible for it and give him a "congressional medal" without whitewash.

Allow me to congratulate you.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

LYNN, MASS., *January 14, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN.

DEAR SIR: It is a pleasure, indeed, to see a man who has the insight and "guts" to go after one of the most dangerous evils prevalent in our Army. You're right from A to Z. Go get 'em.

I know. I went through it.

——— ———.

STAMFORD, CONN.

Hon. JAMES GALLIVAN,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have read with interest in the New York Times of your efforts to obtain the speedy return home of the Twenty-sixth (New England) Division.

As the mother of a lieutenant in the One hundred and second Infantry, who went to France in September, 1917, has been in the fiercest fighting, and has been twice in the hospital, I want to thank you for your efforts to secure promotions for those brave, unselfish men of the Twenty-sixth Division who have offered their lives for us all.

Surely the brave fighters of the National Guard, many of whom have borne the brunt of many battles, ought to be as readily honored and promoted as the men of the Regular Army.

Thanking you for your efforts on behalf of our own brave division, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

——— ———.

MARSHFIELD, VT., *January 16, 1919.*

Representative GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pardon me for taking up a little of your valuable time. I saw your speech to Congress in regard to the Twenty-sixth Division in yesterday's Boston Post.

I am a farmer in the good old State that has given a good many of her sons to that noble division. I have a son who is a corporal in Company F of the One hundred and first Ammunition Train.

Gen. Edwards reviewed the Vermont troops at Fort Ethan Allen before they were put into the National Army. The boys went wild over the speech he made them. It seems very strange that the Twenty-sixth is being held over there after what they have been through.

There certainly is a "nigger in the woodpile" somewhere, and I am glad there is one man in Washington that has got sand enough to start something.

You have the respect and best wishes of one proud dad in this matter.

All honor to Gen. Edwards and the noble Twenty-sixth Division.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

DORCHESTER, MASS.

Congressman JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to thank you for your eloquent address in the House of Congress. We who gave our sons to go in the One hundred and first Regiment appreciate your speech. It was so fine and so thoroughly true. Here in Dorchester and South Boston you made us all happy—we felt that we were about at the breaking point—when you made that notable speech.

We hope that the Congressmen will act accordingly and, besides bringing the gallant Twenty-sixth home, we hope that they will punish the men who mistreated our National Guard.

Congressman GALLIVAN, we gave our boys to defend the country, not to be mistreated by some of the Regular Army.

I want to thank you for your kindness to fathers and mothers, sisters, wives of the boys of the gallant Twenty-sixth Division by your eloquent speech.

From a father of a boy in the One hundred and first Regiment.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *January 15, 1919.*

Representative JAMES GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with interest in to-day's New York Times of your speech in the House about Army politics.

My son received his commission as captain November 28, 1916. He was called into service May 8, 1917; served at Fort Snelling, Minn., until December, 1917, when he was ordered to France, where he still is.

Numbers of captains whose commissions date later than his have been promoted to majors, while he is serving the country in France in the rank that was given him over two years ago.

Very truly, yours,

——— ———.

MORRISTOWN, N. J., *January 18, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES GALLIVAN.

DEAR SIR: Having read the speech in the New York Times you made in the House of Representatives, in reference to the treatment given Maj. Gen. Edwards, of the Twenty-sixth Division, United States Army, must say I never read anything that appealed to me so.

I wish to tell you that my only son is a member of the Twenty-sixth Division, a private in Company B, One hundred and third Machine Gun Company. He has been in France since July last and has seen hard service to this day. With all the letters we have sent to him, he has not up to December 16 received any; and at this date he was in Base Hospital No. 50. We have letters returned marked "sick" and giving date taken to hospital. But he can receive none. I think it is an outrage that he can not even know if his father or mother is dead in all this time.

I hope all the people whom you represent will appreciate your remarks as I have. I believe all who have anyone in that division and think about justice will appreciate them.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

FITCHBURG, MASS., *January 16, 1919.*

DEAR MR. GALLIVAN: I will not take up too much of your time. I simply want to say "thank you" from the bottom of my heart for what you have said regarding the Twenty-sixth Division. I would only like to shake your hand.

My brother is in the One hundred and second Infantry, and thank God, from what we last heard, he is alive and well. We are all waiting anxiously for some word in regard to their departure for home.

Trusting what you have said may in some way hasten their home-coming, I am,

Gratefully yours,

——— ———.

God bless you.

NEWTON, MO., *January 16, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES A. GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Saw your declamation in Congress as to action of Regular officers toward the National Guard and State troops. No doubt it is correct. The same thing happened during the Civil War, but the volunteers soon told them where to head in, and they stopped it. Where would we have been without them (volunteers), and where without the National Guards and Reserves? They did the fighting in both instances.

There is and always has been too much "ego" in the Regular Army. The present war has demonstrated that we don't need over half a million men in the Regular Army at the most, but do want a National or State Guard of from one to ten regiments, owing to population, to keep up the spirit of rivalry between the States and for emergencies that may arise. We don't want to Germanize the United States with too much militarism. Stand up for the National Guard.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 15, 1919.*

Hon. JAS. A. GALLIVAN,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I take the liberty of congratulating you in your efforts in behalf of the Twenty-sixth Division.

My son is a master signal electrician in the One hundred and first Field Battalion, Signal Corps, Twenty-sixth Division. Thinking that the following statistics may be of service to you, I send them to you. They were compiled by Lieut. Byene, of the One hundred and second Field Artillery, a Salem boy, and I am sure are accurate:

The Twenty-sixth Division was the first complete American division on the line.

In the lines the longest of any division.

Out of lines (road marches, movements from one front to another, and rest) just 35 days.

Has never failed to make an objective.

Has never been in a retreat.

Fought and won the first American battle (Seicheprey).

Has been under 17 French generals.

Has never been in a corps or an army without being cited or commended at least once.

In French general headquarters among four divisions ranked as crack (First, Second, Twenty-sixth, and Forty-second) the Twenty-sixth ranks first.

Asked for by name by high command to take hardest sector at Chateau-Thierry and Verdun.

Has taken more territory than any other division.

The One hundred and fourth Infantry of the Twenty-sixth is the only regiment in the American Expeditionary Forces who has the honor of wearing the Croix de Guerre Fongeie.

Hoping that the foregoing facts may be of some service to you, being in concrete form, I am, sir,

Very respectfully, yours,

——— ———.

FLORIDA, *January 25, 1919.*

Hon. JAMES GALLIVAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: All honor and glory and success to you in your courageous fight for the National Guard, who, although abused, misused, smashed by the "system," went across and made good. Their magnificent work on the other side must have been quite a disappointment to those who have for years tried hard to discredit them, tried in every conceivable way to fill up the public with the idea that they were untrained, inefficient, a nondependable force, and who tried by unjust discrimination to break up a morale that was unbreakable. I use the term "unjust discrimination" justifiably. There are many proofs of it. One of the early War Department bulletins of 1917 proves this. I have not a copy here with me now and can not quote exactly, but among other things it provided that all officers before being sent across would be required to pass an examination as to their physical fitness, National Guard officers found unfit would be discharged, while Regular Army and National Army officers would be retained in the service. If this is not discrimination against the National Guard officer, I don't know the meaning of the word.

I am one of the victims—discharged for physical unfitness, which consisted of a slight tremor in the right hand; in every other way sound as a bullet. The "disability" had not in the slightest manner affected my work. I have been in the field nearly a year with my regiment and had not had a sick day. The vacancy caused by my discharge was filled by an outside man—some one not connected with the regiment. The rank I held was that of regimental commander, which I had gained after 34 years of continuous service. I enlisted at the age of 20 and was not quite 54 at the time of my discharge. Served as a captain of Infantry during the Spanish-American War; but all that did not count. Was it because of a slight tremor in one hand, or was it because I was a National Guard officer?

I feel as though my life has been blasted, and I know that I must spend the rest of it in trying to explain how it is that my country had no use for me after 34 years of military training, 25 of which as a commissioned officer, and there is no redress, no matter what punishment might be meted out for the crimes and mistakes that have been committed. Nothing, I feel, can possibly right the wrong that has been done me and others. It is too late.

I wish we had more men like yourself, with the courage to tell truths; and I shall pray the Almighty that you may be successful in exposing and fixing the blame for the horrible wrongs and injustices that have been committed.

Sincerely and gratefully, yours,

——— ———.

Mr. Chairman, I have had something to say about the character of the fighting of the Twenty-sixth Division, and I will here insert in the RECORD a story of its wonderful performances which was issued from the statehouse in Boston recently by the governor of my State. I quote from the Boston Post of January 23:

[From the Boston Post, Jan. 23, 1919.]

WHAT THE TWENTY-SIXTH DID—WAR HISTORY OF NEW ENGLAND'S OWN DIVISION ISSUED BY GOV. COOLIDGE TAKEN FROM WAR DEPARTMENT DATA.

Gov. Coolidge yesterday issued a history of the famous Yankee Twenty-sixth Division told in statistical form, which, diverted of all sentimental and patriotic words, constituted a story which will convince the present and future generations that this division of New England heroes, led by Maj. Gen. Clarence R. Edwards, "went through" in a way to make the entire Nation proud of it.

The governor's statement, taken from data supplied Adjt. Gen. Stevens by the War Department, gives in detail those facts which no power on earth could have gotten by the censor prior to November 11, the date the armistice was signed. It shows that the division arrived at Neufchateau in the Vosges department of France on October 11, 1917, and gives the dates of its movements to other departments.

The division struck the front lines at Chemin-des-Dames February 6, and after several months of comparative "quiet" saw active service at Chateau-Thierry, beginning July 25, which continued up to the date of the signing of the armistice.

TOOK 3,148 PRISONERS.

That the division did its "bit" at St. Mihiel is demonstrated by the fact that it captured 48 officers and 2,520 men, or a total of 2,568 enemy. The total number captured by the division in all sectors was 3,148 officers and men.

The capture of 3 heavy artillery guns, 13 light artillery guns, 15 trench mortars, 132 machine guns, and 42 rifles was also included in the division's achievements.

Out of approximately 30,000 men attached to the division, 11,955 were listed among the casualties, including 1,730 killed, 3,624 wounded severely, 2,819 wounded slightly, 3,363 gassed, 283 missing, and 136 prisoners.

From the time the division became "active" on July 18 until the armistice stopped it from improving upon its record it had gained 37 kilometers of ground against the Hun and was going fast at the finish.

The principal battles in which the division participated were: Bois Brule or Apremont, Seicheprey, Flivrey, Xivray-Marvoisin, Chateau-Thierry, St. Mihiel, and north of Verdun.

The data relative to the division were secured by the adjutant general at the request of the governor. The governor's announcement is as follows:

DIVISION'S MOVEMENTS.

Gov. Coolidge has obtained through his adjutant general's office the following information, which is of general interest, concerning the Twenty-sixth Division:

(a) Date of arrival of division headquarters, Twenty-sixth Division, in zone and successive locations:

Location:	Date of arrival.
Neufchateau	Oct. 31, 1917
Couvrelles	Feb. 8, 1918
Bar-sur-Aube	Mar. 18, 1918
Joinville	Mar. 25, 1918
Neynel	Mar. 27, 1918
Boucq	Mar. 31, 1918
Trondes	June 20, 1918
Toul	June 8, 1918

Location—Continued.	Date of arrival.
Ranteuil-les-Beaux	June 29, 1918
Chemigny	July 9, 1918
Genevrois Farm	July 10, 1918
Mery-sur-Marne	July 15, 1918
Genevrois Farm	July 20, 1918
Lucy-le-Bocage	July 21, 1918
Grand Ru Farm	July 21, 1918
Mery-sur-Marne	July 30, 1918
Russy-sur-Seine	Aug. 16, 1918
Bar-le-Duc	Aug. 29, 1918
Sommedieue	Aug. 30, 1918
Rupt-en-Woevre	Sept. 6, 1918
Trayon-sur-Meuse	Sept. 16, 1918
Verdun	Oct. 8, 1918
Bras	Oct. 18, 1918
Pierrefitte	Nov. 14, 1918
Benoite-Vaux	Nov. 15, 1918
Frobecourt	Nov. 19, 1918
Montigny-le-Roi	Nov. 23, 1918

IN THE FRONT LINES.

(b) Successive periods in front lines of Twenty-sixth Division:

The date of entry, place and sector, active or quiet, and date of withdrawal follows:

February 6, 1918, north of Soissons (brigaded with French). Chemin des Dames, quiet, March 21, 1918.

April 3, 1918, north of Toul, La Reine, and Boucq, quiet, June 28, 1918.

July 10, 1918, northwest of Chateau-Thierry, Pas Fini, active, July 25, 1918.

September 8, 1918, north of St. Mihiel, Rupt, and Tryon, active, October 8, 1918.

October 18, 1918, north of Verdun, Neptune, active, November 14, 1918.

(c) Fifty-first Field Artillery Brigade operated with Twenty-sixth Division during all activities.

(d) Prisoners captured by Twenty-sixth Division:

Location.	Officers.	Men.	Total.
North of Toul	6	43	49
Northwest of Chateau-Thierry	2	244	246
North of St. Mihiel	48	2,520	2,568
North of Verdun	5	280	285
Aggregate	61	3,087	3,148

(e) Material captured by the Twenty-sixth Division:

	July 18-25 (Chateau-Thierry).	Sept. 12-13 (St. Mihiel).	Total.
Heavy Artillery	1	2	3
Light Artillery	3	10	13
Trench mortars	7	8	15
Machine guns	23	109	132
Rifles	.....	42	42

NUMBER OF CASUALTIES.

(f) Total casualties of Twenty-sixth Division since arrival in France:

	Officers.	Men.	Total.
Killed	78	1,652	1,730
Wounded severely	100	3,524	3,624
Wounded slightly	111	2,706	2,819
Gassed	113	3,250	3,363
Missing	10	273	283
Prisoners	9	127	136
Total	421	11,534	11,955

(g) Total depth of advance, in kilometers, in principal offensives:

Chateau-Thierry, July 18–25	17.5
St. Mihiel salient, Sept. 12–13	14.0
Verdun area, Oct. 18–Nov. 11	5.5
Total	37.0

They occupied the following sectors:

Sector.	1918.
Chemin-des-Dames	Feb. 6–Mar. 21.
La Beine and Boucq	Apr. 3–June 28.
Pas Fini	July 10–25.
Rupt and Troyon	Sept. 2–Oct. 8.
Neptune	Oct. 10–Nov. 14.

The principal battles in which the division was engaged are:

Sector.	1918.
Bois Brule, or Apremont	April 10–13.
Seicheprey	April 20–21.
Flirey	May 20.
Xivray-Marvoisin	June 15.
Chateau-Thierry (second Battle of Marne)	July 10–25.
St. Mihiel	Sept. 12–13.
North of Verdun	Oct. 10–Nov. 14.

I am in possession of the citations and honorable mentions which this famous fighting division received from March 15, 1918, up to November 18, 1918, and I will ask my colleagues to read the wonderful record of the stout-hearted lads from

New England as it is glorified in these general orders and commendations:

[11th Army Corps, Staff, 1st Bureau, No. 9114 B/1, S. C. No. 4817.]

H. Q., *March 15, 1918.*

[General Order No. 7.]

We regret that our comrades of the 26th Division should leave us in order to fulfill their task elsewhere.

We have been able to appreciate their bravery, their sense of duty and discipline; also their frank comradeship; they carry away our unanimous regrets.

General Edwards has been pleased to consider the 11th Corps as godfather to the 26th Division; the 11th Corps feels proud of the awarded honor, being sure that, wherever he may be sent, the godson shall do credit to the godfather.

Le General DE MAUD'HUY,
Commandant le IIme Corps d'Armee.

—

[32d Army Corps, Staff, G-1.]

H. Q., *April 26, 1918.*

[General Order No. 737/A.]

General Passaga, in command of the 32d Army Corps, mentions in the Army corps dispatches.

104th Infantry Regiment, U. S. A., under command of Colonel G. H. Shelton:

"For greatest fighting spirit and self-sacrifice during action of April 10th, 12th, and 13th, 1918. Suffering from very heavy bombardments and attacked by very strong German forces, succeeded in preventing their dangerous advance and with greatest energy reconquered at the point of the bayonet the few ruined trenches which had to be abandoned at the first onset, at the same time making prisoners."

General PASSAGA,
C. O. 32d Army Corps.

—

[VIIIth Army, Staff, 3d Bureau, No. 5310.]

ARMY H. Q., *June 8, 1918.*

Service memorandum.

The commanding general of the VIIIth Army is happy to pronounce the success of the raid on the Camp du Moulin, carried out during the night of May 30-31, 1918, by the 101st Regiment of American Infantry.

He requests the commanding general of the 32d Army Corps to forward his congratulations for this operation, as well planned as it was energetically conducted, to the commanding general of the 26th American Division.

(Signed) General GERARD.

—

[32d Army Corps, Staff, 3d Bureau, No. 2918 B/3.]

True copy sent to: The commanding general of the 26th American Division.

The commanding general of the 32d Army Corps is happy to forward the congratulations of the commanding general of the VIIIth Army to the commanding general of the 26th American Division.

H. Q., June 9, 1918.

By order of the Chief of Staff.

(Signed) E. MANGIN.

—

[VIIIth Army, Staff, 3d Bureau, No. 5492.]

Secret-service memorandum.

ARMY H. Q., *June 17, 1918.*

In the course of a powerful raid carried out on June 16, about 3 o'clock, against the sector of the 26th American Division, the Germans penetrated the village of Xivray which was evacuated by our combat group; everywhere else they were thrown back by the determined defense of the occupants, who stuck to their positions.

Shortly afterwards a counterattack, vigorously carried out by elements from two American battalions, drove the Germans out of Xivray, leaving in our hands several prisoners, including an officer.

The commanding general of the VIIIth Army is happy to acknowledge the fine conduct of the American units in the course of this action; the spirit of initiative and general grasp of the situation shown by the decisions of the commanders; the stubbornness in defending and sharpness in attacking shown by the participants.

The commanding general of the 32d Army Corps will be so good as to forward the compliments of the commanding general of the Army to the commanding general of the 26th American Division, requesting the latter to congratulate, in the name of the commanding general of the Army, the officers and men who took part in the action for the fine soldierly qualities of which they have given proof.

General GERARD.

—

[32d Army Corps Staff—3d Bureau. No. 3103/3.]

True copy sent to the commanding general of the 26th American Division.

In forwarding the above service memorandum from the commanding general of the VIIIth Army, the commanding general of the 32d Army Corps is happy to add his personal congratulations, which, moreover, are the subject of General Order No. 131, forwarded to all the troops under his command

H. Q. June 18, 1918.

By order of the Chief of Staff.

(Signed) E. MANGIN.

—

[VIIIth Army. 32d Army Corps Staff—3d Bureau. No. 3,094 A 1. I.]

H. Q., *June 18, 1918.*

[General Order No. 131.]

On June 16 a strong detachment of 600 Germans, previously selected, reinforced by units from an assault battalion, attacked at daylight the front line of the 26th American Division at Xivray and Seicheprey. The enemy was everywhere thrown back by immediate counterattacks, leaving numerous dead on the terrain and 10 prisoners, including 1 officer.

This brilliant action does the greatest honor to the 26th Division, and particularly to the 103d Regiment, Col. Hume commanding.

This operation shows the unquestionable superiority of the American soldier over the German soldier. It also gives an idea of all that may be expected of these magnificent troops when the entente, in its turn, takes the offensive.

General Passaga, commanding the 32d Army Corps.

(Sgd.) PASSAGA.

Official:
The Chief of Staff:
Agd. MANGIN.

To be read to companies.

—

[14790-A-106 (PF)]

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS A. E. F.,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
June 20, 1918.

From: Commander in Chief.
To: Commanding General, 26th Div.
Subject: 103d Regiment.

1. I am directed by the commander in chief to inform you that he has noted with sincere appreciation the excellent work of the 103d Regiment of your division, which inflicted severe losses in killed, wounded, and prisoners in repelling the strong raid attempted by the enemy on the morning of June 16, 1918, on the Xivray sector.

J. W. MCANDREW, *Chief of Staff.*

—

[VIIIth Army, 32d Army Corps Staff, 3d Office.]

HEADQUARTERS,
June 27, 1918.

[General Order No. 133.]

At the moment when the 26th Division of Infantry of the U. S. is leaving the 32d French Corps, I salute its colors and thank it for the splendid services it has rendered here to the common cause.

Under the distinguished command of their chief, General Edwards, the high-spirited soldiers of the "Yankee Division" have taught the enemy some bitter lessons at Bois Brule, at Seicheprey, at Xivray-Marvoisin; they have taught him to realize the staunch vigor of the sons of the Great Republic fighting for the world's freedom.

My heartiest good wishes will accompany the "Yankee Division" always in its future combats.

General Passaga commanding the 32d Army Corps.

(Signed) PASSAGA.

—

HEADQUARTERS TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION, A. E. F.,
France, July 11, 1918.

[General Order No. 60.]

1. At the moment that the Twenty-sixth Division takes up its position on its third sector in three months it is fitting and proper that the division commander should take this opportunity to thank and congratulate the officers and men of the Yankee Division on the record that they have achieved since the division actively took its place in the fighting lines of the allies for the common cause.

2. You have been taken from a sector where in three battles you have shown that the blood of New England has not attenuated, and that the same spirit and traditions which your forefathers made glorious at Lexington and at Bunker Hill still survive in the generation which at Bois Brule, Seicheprey, Humbert Plantation, and Xivray have met and defeated the picked troops of the enemy. His four years of experience in active warfare and the ferocity of his methods have not daunted you, and on every occasion where you have been called upon to face him you have distinguished yourself with notable valor and brought credit upon your division and upon the people of New England from which you have come to engage in this righteous conflict.

3. A great honor has been conferred upon the whole division in that the French and American high command has at this time picked your division to come into this critical sector. That you have been so hurried to this sector is the evidence to you all of the opinion of the high command of the mettle of which this division is constituted.

4. The past months in battle have brought men and officers into that close union of confidence and affection which have resulted in the growing morale of this division. Looking back on the past four months, with its spotless record and known achievements, which have been recognized by both France and America, it is with unqualified faith in the future and pride of the past that I see the Twenty-sixth Division go into a new sector, certain in my conviction that the men of New England will prove once more that they are capable of every effort and every sacrifice which the future may demand of them.

C. R. EDWARDS,
Major General, Commanding.

—

[Clipping from the Chicago Tribune, July 28, 1918.]

HEADQUARTERS TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION, A. E. F.,
France, July 28, 1918.

Germans in retreat from the Marne. Highest praise is given United States division by Gen. Degoutte. "Could not have done better with my best troops." Hard to restrain them. Were so anxious to fight they wished to go too fast.

The following marginal comment on the communiques has been issued: If one wants to judge the offensive spirit which animates the Americans and their tactical methods, one has only to follow in detail the operations of a division since the beginning of our counterattack between Chateau-Thierry and Soissons.

It was on the 18th, at 4 a. m., that the order to take the first line of German positions was received. The American division whose movements we will relate was at that time northwest of Chateau-Thierry, in the Bois de Belleau, at the pivot of the Degoutte army. This division was made up of New England troops and had taken the place of a division which took part in the operations of Belleau and Bouresches, and it wanted to distinguish itself as well as these elite troops. But the divisions placed at the pivot have to advance slowly, according to the progress made by the wings.

On the very first day it was necessary to moderate the ardor of the Americans, who would willingly have gone farther than the first objectives. Indeed, at the signal of the attack, the American troops went with perfect discipline, in rear of the artillery barrage to the Torcy-Belleau-Givry line and the railroad line up to the Bouresches station. They reached this line in one sweep, almost without meeting any resistance, and, excited by their success, they wanted to go farther.

However, it was necessary before continuing the general advance to take Monthiers and the Petret Wood, still strongly occupied by the Ger-

mans. There was hard fighting on the part of the French troops on the left to annihilate the resistance of the enemy.

In order to relieve them the Americans, on the evening of the 20th, made an enveloping maneuver which was crowned with success. With splendid valiance they went in one sweep as far as Etrepilly height, the Gonetrie farm, and Halmardiere. It was a model surprise attack, and it was a revelation of American audacity. Notwithstanding the machine-gun barrage and the enemy's islands of resistance they advanced for 2 kilometers, capturing three guns, a big minenwerfer, and numerous machine guns. Moreover, 200 prisoners were taken by the Americans.

"I could not have done better in a similar occasion with my best troops," commented General Degoutte upon learning of this first American success.

The Germans then found themselves in such a disfavorable position in Monthieres that they had to begin a retreat.

On the 21st the whole German line was in retreat and the Chateau-Thierry-Soissons highway was reached. The Americans were cleaning the ground and vigorously pursuing the enemy's rear guard.

On the 22d a battalion of Americans occupied Epieds. There was hard fighting in the village and the enemy opened a violent barrage fire.

The fight was in open country, and on that day it was not possible to take the village entirely. Rather than to sustain heavy losses, the commander of the American division preferred to take his troops to the rear. It was necessary, if the difficulty was to be overcome, to start the surrounding movement again, and on the 23d the Americans sought to enter the Trugny Wood south of Epieds. The Germans strongly opposed this attempt and counterattacked with energy, but they learned at their expense what American tenacity is. Stopped once in the maneuver, the Americans occupied the fringe of the wood on the 24th, entered it deliberately, took a whole company of German pioneers, and continued their advance with such fury that about 3 p. m. they were at the fringes of the Fere Woods and on the same evening had reached the road from Fere-en-Tardenois to Jaulgonne.

This American division has, therefore, realized in three days an advance of as much as 17 kilometers at certain points, fighting continuously night and day, and displaying the finest military qualities. All the liaison services worked perfectly, both at the right and at the left wings and between the units of the division. A discipline which caused the Germans to wonder and admire animated the attacking troops. They were marching with their officers at the head of the column and their bodyguards on the flanks, as the French troops.

The German prisoners were astonished. "We do not see often those who command us," they declare to their captors; "you're lucky; like the French, you are led to the fight by your officers." The French and American high commands work during the action in as close a harmony as the troops.

The general commanding the division in question is a leader of men, broad-minded, precise in his orders, of practical mind, who from the first moment dealt with the problems raised by the operations under way with a mastery which cost dear to the enemy.

These days from the 18th to the 25th give a new and emphatic proof of what the alliance of France and the United States can do on a battlefield.

—

[General Orders, No. 67.]

HEADQUARTERS TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION A. E. F.,
France, August 2, 1918.

To the officers and men of the Twenty-sixth Division:

On July 18 you entered, as part of the allied drive against the enemy, upon the offensive, and continued the offensive combat until the major portion of the command was relieved on July 25.

On the assumption of the offensive your position in the line demanded an important and difficult maneuver. Your success in this was immediate and great, and the way in which you executed it elicited high praise from the French Army commander. The eight days from July 18 to 25, marking the first great advance against the enemy, in which American troops bore proportionately a considerable share are sure of historical setting. Your part therein can never be forgotten. In those eight days you carried your line as far as any part of the advance was carried. Torcy, Belleau, Givry, the Bouresches Woods, Rochet Woods, Hill 190 overlooking Chateau Thierry, Etrepilly, Epieds, Trugny, and finally La Fere Woods and the objective, the Jaulgonne-fere-en-Tardenois Road, belong to your arms. You are the recipient of praise, thanks, and congratulations of our Commander in Chief. You went unafraid into the face of the enemy's fire; you forced him to withdraw before you, or to accept the alternative of hand to hand combat, in which you proved yourselves morally and physically his superior; you gave freely and gave much of your strength, and of your blood and your lives, until pushed beyond mere physical endurance, fighting night and day, you still forced yourselves forward, sustained almost by spirit alone.

These things are now part of your own consciousness. Nothing can detract from them. Nothing that I can say can add to them. But I can testify in this way to my pride in commanding such troops, so capable of achieving success in every undertaking; and this testimony I give to each of you gladly and with deep gratitude.

C. R. EDWARDS,
Major General, Commanding.

—

[General Orders, No. 68.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIV., A. E. F.,
France, August 3, 1918.

1. The division commander publishes for the information of all concerned two memoranda and an official letter from the commanding general, VIth Army, which are self-explanatory.

—

[VIth Army Staff—3d Bureau, No. 2283/3.]

P. C., *July 26, 1918.*

Memorandum.

The President of the Republic, during a visit to the VIth Army expressed his satisfaction over the results obtained as well as the proofs of valor and endurance shown by all the units of the Army.

The commanding general of the VIth Army takes pleasure in communicating to the troops of his army the congratulations of the President of the Republic.

GENERAL DEGOUTTE.

[VIth Army Staff—3d Bureau, No. 2284/3.]

P. C., *July 26, 1918.*

Memorandum.

The commanding general of the VIth Army brings to the attention of the troops of the Army the following address received from the mayors of the arrondissement of Meaux, in meeting assembled, on the 20th of July, 1918:

"The mayors of the arrondissement of Meaux, in meeting assembled, on the 20th of July, 1918, are happy to acknowledge the great victory of the VIth Army, which, at the time of the Battle of the Marne, had just saved their commune from the invasion which was threatening them.

"Send to the valiant troops of the VIth Army the most earnest expression of their gratitude and admiration."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS OF MAYORS,
G. HUGEL, *Mayor of Meaux,*
Deputy from the Dept. of Seine and Marne.

The commanding general of the VIth Army takes pleasure in transmitting these congratulations to the troops of his army.

GENERAL DEGOUTTE,
Army, July 29, 1918.

[VIth Army No. 2353/3.]

From: General Degoutte, commanding the VIth Army.
To: General Edwards, commanding the 26th American Division.

The operations carried out by the 26th American Division from July 18 to July 24 demonstrated the fine soldierly qualities of this unit and the worth of its leader, General Edwards.

Cooperating in the attack north of the Marne, the 26th Division fought brilliantly on the line Torcy-Belleau, at Monthiers, Epieds, and Trugy, and in the forest of Fere, advancing more than 15 kilometers in depth in spite of the desperate resistance of the enemy.

I take great pleasure in communicating to General Edwards and his valiant division this expresison of my great esteem together with my heartiest congratulations for the manner in which they have served the common cause.

DEGOUTTE.

By command of Major General Edwards:

W. S. BOWEN,
Lieut. Colonel, G. S., Acting Chief of Staff.

Official:
C. A. STEVENS,
Adj. Gen. Adjutant.

—

[VIth Army.]

P. C., *August 9, 1918.*

General Order.

Before the great offensive of July 18, 1918, the American troops forming a part of the VIth French Army distinguished themselves by taking from the enemy the Bois de la Brigade de Marine and the village of Vaux, stopping his offensive on the Marne and at Fossoy.

Since then they have taken a most glorious part in the second Battle of the Marne, rivaling the French troops in ardor and gallantry. In 20 days of incessant fighting they liberated numerous French villages and made, over difficult terrain, an advance of 40 kilometers, which carried them beyond the Vesle.

Their glorious advance is marked by names which, in the future, will make illustrious the military history of the United States: Torcy, Belleau, Plateau of Etrepilly, Epieds, le Charmel the Ourcq, Seringes-et-Nesles, Sergy, the Vesle, and Fismes.

The new divisions, under fire for the first time, showed themselves worthy of the old fighting traditions of the Regular Army. They had the same ardent desire to whip the Boche and that discipline which always insures the carrying out of orders of their commander, whatever be the difficulties to be overcome or the sacrifice to be made.

The magnificent results obtained are due to the energy and skillfulness of their commanders and to the bravery of the soldiers. I am proud to have commanded such troops.

The commanding general of the VIth Army. DEGOUTTE.

—

[General Orders, No. 143.]

G. H. Q., A. E. F., *France, August 28, 1918.*

It fills me with pride to record in General Orders a tribute to the service and achievements of the First and Third Corps, comprising the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 26th, 32d, and 42d Divisions of the A. E. F.

You came to the battle field at the crucial hour of the allied cause. For almost four years the most formidable army the world had as yet seen had pressed its invasion of France and stood threatening its capital. At no time had that army been more powerful or menacing than when, on July 15th, it struck again to destroy in one great battle the brave men opposed to it and to enforce its brutal will upon the world and civilization.

Three days later, in conjunction with our allies, you counterattacked. The allied armies gained a brilliant victory that marks the turning point of the war. You did more than give your brave allies the support to which as a nation our faith was pledged. You proved that our altruism, our pacific spirit, our sense of justice have not blunted our virility or our courage. You have shown that American initiative and energy are as fit for the test of war as for the pursuits of peace. You have justly won the unstinted praise of our allies and the eternal gratitude of our countrymen.

We have paid for our success in the lives of many of our brave comrades. We shall cherish their memory always, and claim for our history and literature their bravery, achievements, and sacrifice.

This order will be read to all organizations at the first assembly formation after its receipt.

JOHN J. PERSHING,
General, Commander in Chief.

Official:
ROBERT C. DAVIS,
Adjt. Genl.

—

[General Orders, No. 77.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIVISION, A. E. F.,
France, Sept. 15, 1918.

1. The following letter is published for the information of all those concerned:

RUPT-EN-WOEVRE, *September 13, 1918.*

SIR: Your gallant 26th American Division has just set us free. Since Sept. 1914, the barbarians have held the Heights of the Meuse, have

foully murdered three hostages from Mouilly, have shelled Rupt, and on July 23, 1915, forced its inhabitants to scatter to the four corners of France.

I, who remain at my little listening post upon the advice of my bishop, feel certain, sir, that I do but speak for Monseigneur Ginistry, lord bishop of Verdun; my parishioners of Rupt, Mouilly, and Geincourt, and the people of this vicinity in conveying to you and your associates the heartfelt and unforgettable gratitude of all.

Several of your comrades lie at rest in our truly Christian and French soil.

Their ashes shall be cared for as if they were our men. We shall cover their graves with flowers and shall kneel by them as their own families would do, with a prayer to God to reward them with eternal glory, these heroes fallen on the field of honor, and to bless the 26th Division and generous America.

Be pleased, sir, to accept the expression of my profound respect.

A. LECLERC,
Curé of Rupt-en-Woevre.

By command of Major General Edwards:

DUNCAN K. MAJOR, Jr.,
Chief of Staff.

Official:
C. A. STEVENS,
Adjt. Genl.

[General Orders, No. 79.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIVISION, A. E. F.,
Sept. 18, 1918.

1. The following telegrams from the President of the United States, the commander in chief of the allied armies, and the commander in chief of the American Expeditionary Forces are published to the command:

WASHINGTON, *Sept. 14, 1918.*

General JOHN J. PERSHING,
A. E. F., France:

Accept my warmest congratulations on the brilliant achievements of the Army under your command. The boys have done what we expected of them, and done it in the way we most desire. We are deeply proud of them and of their chief. Please convey to all concerned my grateful and affectionate thanks.

(Signed) WOODROW WILSON.

SEPTEMBER 14, 1918.

COMMANDING GENERAL FIRST ARMY.

MY DEAR GENERAL: The First American Army under your command on this day has won a magnificent victory by a maneuvre as skillfully prepared as it was brilliantly executed. I extend to you, as well as to the officers and to the troops under your command, my warmest congratulations.

(Signed) MARSHAL FOCH.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1918.

COMMANDING GENERAL FIFTH CORPS:

Please extend to the officers and men of the Fifth Corps my sincere congratulations for the part they have taken in the first battle of the American Army. Our successes have thrilled our countrymen and evoked the enthusiasm of all allies. Will you convey to the command my cordial appreciation of their work? I am proud of the accomplishment.

(Signed) PERSHING.

By command of Major General Edwards.

[General Orders, No. 82.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIVISION, A. E. F.,
France, September 28, 1918.

To the Twenty-sixth Division:

1. It again becomes my duty and pleasure to congratulate this division on the important part it played in the battle of the St. Mihiel salient September 12 to 14, 1918. Our task was to attack on the historic and hitherto impregnable ground near Les Eparges, where in the past so many thousands of French lives have been sacrificed.

In front of us the fortifications were manned by Germans, with a no man's land on difficult slopes, churned and pitted by four years of shelling and with a mass of wire and other obstacles from trench to trench.

The three Infantry regiments in line—the 101st, the 103, and the 104th, with the brigade machine-gun units—met a determined resistance. The enemy machine-gun fire was intense. The artillery, without daylight registration, did well, during that part of the night allowed for preparation, in cutting breaches through this mass of wire, which were completed by the Infantry before and during the attack.

The determined and effective methods of the Infantry in the attack on the machine-gun nests, the deliberate locating of these nests, and the subsequent infiltration process used in overcoming these nests; the bold dashes wherever opportunity offered, in one case resulting in the 2d Battalion of the 103d Infantry rushing and capturing a hostile battalion of greater strength before the enemy could raise his head; the fine liaison and cooperation of the artillery; the expedition with which follow-up roads were constructed by the engineers; the enterprise of the medical, supply, and other auxiliary units—all combined to prove that its wide service and experience have made this a veteran division.

I was pleased with all elements of the division.

2. By dark on the 12th the principal resistance of the enemy had been overcome. Then came the order to close the gap between our forces on the north and our troops advancing from the south in order to prevent the escape of the enemy from St. Mihiel. Our mission then was to reach Vigneulles before daylight and there establish contact with troops of our Fourth Corps.

The 102d Infantry, in the division reserves, which had followed the advance closely throughout the battle in readiness for any such emergency, was ordered to spare neither energy nor blood to accomplish this mission. The whole division was pushed forward through the night, the rest of the 51st Infantry Brigade following the dash of the 102d Infantry, and the 52d Infantry Brigade moving out on the left rear of the 102d Infantry, with the towns on the plain in the northwest of Hattonchatel, to include St. Maurice, as objectives.

In less than one-half hour after the receipt of this order the 102d Infantry and the 102d Machine Gun Battalion were on the march, led and inspired by the regimental and battalion commanders in person. They marched over 9 kilometers on the only existing road, through a dense forest, in an unknown and hostile country infested with the enemy, losing for the time being liaison both to the right and left. The leading elements, passing through Hattonchatel, reached Vigneulles before 2 o'clock in the morning, took complete possession of these two towns by 3 o'clock, and, pushing out, occupied Creue and Heudicourt and blocked the roads leading from the southwest, while sending patrols farther into the plain to gain contact with the American forces coming from the south.

This advance force captured many prisoners, much ammunition, stores of all kinds, and released many captive civilians from St. Mihiel that the enemy in his hasty retreat was forced by the 102d Infantry to abandon.

With this advance force were the entire 102d Infantry, 3 companies of the 102d Machine Gun Battalion, and part of the 101st Machine Gun Battalion from the division reserve. This last part, abandoning its motors, marched 14 kilometers carrying its guns by hand the entire way.

By the morning the whole command had taken possession of all the towns in the sector of its advance and was impatient to pursue the enemy across the Hindenburg line.

4. The towns of St. Remy, Dommartin, Thillot, St. Maurice, Billy-sous-les-Cotes, Vieville-sous-les-Cotes, Hattonchatel, Hannonville, Vigneulles, Creue, Heudicourt, Deuxnouds, Wadonville, Avillers, and Butgneville, as well as the entire length of the Grande Tranchee de Calone, with a gain of 14 kilometers, belong to your arms.

The division captured about 2,400 prisoners, large stores of supplies and ammunition, horses and motor transportation, and about 50 guns.

I am proud of you. You are a shock division.

C. R. EDWARDS,
Major General, Commanding.

[General Order No. 85.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIVISION, A. E. F.,
France, October 10, 1918.

1. The following letters are published to the command:

[2nd Colonial Corps Staff No. 29.329.]

Hq., *October 3, 1918.*

From: General Blondlat, commanding 2nd Colonial Corps.
To: The Commander in Chief (thru channels, general commanding 2nd army).
Subject: Proposition for citation in army orders in favor of the 1st Battalion, 102nd Regiment of Infantry, U. S.

I have the honor to send you the report which I had the general commanding the 26th U. S. Division to make on the very hard and glorious combat which this division engaged September 26, 1918.

The 2nd Colonial Corps had received orders to carry out extensive raids to attract and fix the attention of the enemy: "General Order No. 20, Sept. 20, 1918, of the general commanding the First U. S. Army. The 2nd Colonial Corps will hold the front of Bois le Chauffour inclusive to Mesnil exclusive.

"The 2nd Colonial Corps will make a demonstration along its front, launching artillery bombardment as well as making extensive raids at H house."

The dimensions and duration of the raid executed by the 26th U. S. Division certainly deceived the enemy as to our intentions; the losses suffered by the troops taking part in this operation were fairly severe, but there is no doubt that those suffered by the Germans were much more severe.

The spirit of sacrifice and magnificent courage displayed by the troops of the 26th U. S. Division on this occasion were certainly not in vain; they seem to me worthy of recompense and praise; therefore, I direct the general commanding this division to address propositions to me on this subject.

I earnestly request that the 1st Battalion of the 102nd Infantry be cited in army orders on the following grounds:

"Picked troops who, trained by Colonel Hiram J. Bearss, who led the attack in the first line, carried out brilliantly and with splendid energy a particularly delicate operation; engaged battle with a superb dash; won a victory after a violent combat over an enemy who was both stubborn and superior in numbers, entrenched in concreted shelters, strongly supported by numerous machine guns and powerful artillery, and who made use of in the course of the action infamous methods of warfare; heriocally carried out their mission in capturing in heavy fighting a village where they maintained themselves all day in spite of four enemy counterattacks and thus furnished the finest example of courage, abnegation, and self-sacrifice."

I request further that the officers and men mentioned in General Edward's report receive each and severally the rewards suggested for them by name.

(Signed) BLONDLAT.

[2nd Colonial Army Corps Staff No. 29431/A.]

H. Q., *October 7, 1918.*

From: General Blondlat, commanding the 2nd Colonial Army Corps.
To: The commanding general, 26th Division (American).

At this time, when the 26th Division is leaving the zone of the 2nd Colonial Army Corps, I wish to forward to General Edwards and to his gallant division the expression of my complete satisfaction, my best wishes for its successes to come, and my hearty thanks for the brilliant services in the attack on the St. Mihiel salient.

Although the 26th Division was only under my orders for a short time, I discovered on the part of all, both officers and men, those qualities of discipline, ardor, and esprit de corps which characterize picked troops.

I thought it buf my duty to call to the attention of the French high command the fine conduct under fire of your men in the glorious battle of September 26; they demonstrated once again their high qualities of energy and spirit of sacrifice. I have requested that citations be bestowed upon the brave men whose conduct has been specially reported to me.

(Signed) BLONDLAT.

By command of Major General Edwards:

DUNCAN K. MAJOR, JR.,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

C. A. STEVENS, *Adjutant General, Adjutant.*

[General Orders, No. 92.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIVISION, A. E. F.,
France, October 23, 1918.

1. The division commander extends to the commanding officer 51st Infantry Brigade and the officers and men of the following organizations his hearty congratulations on their great success in the opera-

tions of this date for the capture of the Heights of the Meuse in the region of Le Houppy Bois and Belleau Bois:

51st Infantry Brigade.
101st Infantry.
102d Infantry.
101st Machine Gun Battalion.
102d Machine Gun Battalion.
Detachment, 101st Field Signal Battalion.
Detachment, 101st Sanitary Train.
281st Aero Squadron (French).
Balloon No. 25 (French).
51st Artillery Brigade.
1st Battalion, 211th Field Artillery (French).

2. The attack, as planned, was difficult of execution and only to be attempted by trained troops. You carried it out like the veterans you are and with a dash and valor worthy of the best traditions of the 26th Division.

(Signed) C. R. EDWARDS,
Major General, Commanding.

—

[General Orders, No. 93.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIV., A. E. F.,
France, October 24, 1918.

Extract.

1. To the artillery of the 26th Division is due my expression of admiration for its efficiency and aggressive fighting qualities and for its indefatigable support of our fine infantry. Artillery can desire no higher tribute than the conscious fact that it has gained the confidence, reliance, and thanks of the Infantry.

2. During more than 8 months of fighting service the spirit of loyalty displayed by every officer and man of the 51st Artillery Brigade toward his duty, toward the Yankee division, and toward the division commander, has been fine.

3. The record of the 51st Artillery Brigade in the 2d Battle of the Marne is glorious. It went with, supported, and protected the Infantry in its advance of 18½ kilometers by Chateau-Thierry, and afterwards in succession two other divisions in the advance from the Marne to the Vesle for a period of 18 days, between July 18 and August 4, with a gain of over 40 kilometers. It is a record of which the entire division and our country justly may be proud.

I congratulate and thank the Art. Brig. of the Yankee Div.

C. R. EDWARDS,
Maj. Gen., Commanding.

—

[General Orders, No. 93.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIVISION, A. E. F.,
France, October 24, 1918.

Extract.

II. The following tribute to the division is published for the information of all concerned:

[17th Army Corps Staff, 1st Bureau.]

HEADQUARTERS, *24 Oct., 1918.*

General Claudel, commanding the 17th Army Corps.
To the Commanding General 26th Division.

GENERAL: The reputation of your division preceded it here far ahead.

To all its titles of glory gained in fierce struggles, and only recently at the signal of Hattonchatel, it has added on the 23d of October a page which perhaps is more modest, but still does it great honor.

In a few hours, as at a maneuver, it has gained all the objectives assigned to it in the difficult sector of the Woods of Houppy, Etrayes, and Belleau.

This operation is evidence, indeed, of superior instruction, mobility, and will.

I do not know how to thank you sufficiently for your assistance, dear General, and it is my great desire to express to you all our grateful admiration for your splendid division which thus has added its name to all of those who have fought to hurl the enemy back from the outskirts of Verdun.

H. CLAUDEL.

C. R. EDWARDS,
Major General, Commanding.

—

[General Orders, No. 93.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIV., A. E. F.,
France, October 24, 1918.

Extract.

III. The following tribute is published for the information of all concerned:

[3d Bureau.]

17 OCTOBER, 1918.

General Andlauer, commanding the 18th Division of Infantry.
To the Commanding General 26th Division.

GENERAL: At the moment that the 18th Division of Infantry is relieved in its sector by the 26th D. I. U. S., I wish to send you my heartiest thanks for the support given to its comrades of the 77th Regiment by the 104th Infantry, which, since its arrival in the sector, attacked with tanks and succeeded, thanks to a stubborn battle, in forcing the evacuation of half of the edge of the Bois d'Haumont by the enemy.

ANDLAUER.

C. R. EDWARDS.

—

[General Orders, No. 83.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIVISION,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
France, October 24, 1918.

Extract.

IV. 1. In compliance with paragraph 48, Special Orders, No. 293, G. H. Q., A. E. F., the undersigned relinquishes command of the 26th Division.

2. He thanks the division for its loyalty to him and for what it has accomplished in the common cause. He bespeaks for its successor in command the same loyalty and devotion, and he leaves the division in full confidence that its same fine work will continue to the end.

C. R. EDWARDS,
Major General, Commanding.

[General Orders, No. 103.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIVISION, A. E. F.,
France, November 17, 1918.

1. The following letter from the commanding general Second Colonial Army Corps (French) is published to the command for the information of all concerned:

[1st American Army, 2d Colonial Army Corps, Staff, No. 1012/c.]

HEADQUARTERS, *November 14, 1918.*

From: General Claudel, commanding general 2nd Colonial Army Corps.
To: General Bamford, commanding general 26th American Division.

MY DEAR GENERAL: At this time, when the 26th American Division is leaving the sector of the 2nd Colonial Army Corps (formerly the 17th French Army Corps), I especially desire to express to you the complete satisfaction it has given me since October 15th last.

The 26th Division has made its entry into line by attacking in the difficult and long since fortified region of the Bois d'Haumont and of the Bois d'Ormont. In each case this division showed the fine qualities of vigor and dash which are characteristic of it.

Later it was engaged in the most severe fighting for the capture of the henceforth famous woods of Etrayes, Belleau, and Ormont, without ever considering its hardships or its losses.

At the same time it made a remarkable and successful effort for the improvement of the road system, so vital for the conduct of the operations.

The conditions under which the fighting took place, the weather, and the communications were most often very poor, while the enemy, determined to hold positions which were to him indispensable, did not spare his shells of all caliber or his gas shells.

The 26th Division finally received the well-deserved reward of throwing the enemy back into the plain at the moment when the final victory was won.

In the name of the 2d Colonial Army Corps and their French comrades, I desire you to extend for me to your fine troops and to the various staffs and services my thanks for the generous and devoted cooperation which they have never ceased to render.

I shall not forget, my deal general, our so very cordial relations, and I ask you to believe in the expression of my sincere and grateful feelings.

(Signed) CLAUDEL.

2. Pursuant to telegraphic instructions from general headquarters dated November 17, 1918, General Orders, No. 100, these headquarters, dated November 14, 1918, directing that candidates be sent to the Army-candidate schools so as to report on November 25, 1918, is revoked.

By command of Brigadier General Bamford:

DUNCAN K. MAJOR, Jr.,
Chief of Staff.

Official:
C. A. STEVENS,
Adjt. Gen. Adjt.

—

[General Orders, No. 104.]

HEADQUARTERS 26TH DIVISION,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
France, November 18, 1918.

I. 1. Officers and enlisted men of the 26th Division, I congratulate you upon your success in the war which has just been brought to a victorious end.

2. From your entry into the battle line on February 7, 1918, at Chemin des Dames as a division of recruits until the cessation of hostilities on November 11, 1918, when you laid down your arms fighting in the front line as a veteran division, you have shown yourselves worthy sons of the country that gave you birth.

3. Bois Brule, Seicheprey, Xivray-Marvoisin, Torcy, Belleau, Givry, Bourseches, Hill 190, Epieds, Trugny, St. Mihiel Salient, Bois d'Haumont, Bois Belleau, Bois d'Ormont, Bois de Ville are indelibly written on your banners.

(Signed) F. E. BAMFORD,
Brigadier General, Commanding.

Mr. Chairman, when I addressed the House a few weeks ago I referred to the fact that the commander of this division, Maj. Gen. Clarence R. Edwards, after participating in combat with his men and assisting them in achieving the wonderful results which are mentioned in the foregoing orders, had been sent back to the States in October, 1918, and that no good reason had been assigned for his being relieved. Recently in a Boston newspaper Gen. Edwards told of his pride in his organization and reviewed the methods he had adopted in bringing the Twenty-sixth Division to the heights it reached in its many campaigns in France. Listen to the splendid story of a brave American soldier. Gen. Edwards says:

In, I hope, the pardonable pride that I took in the organization and the record of the Yankee Division I have never consciously made invidious comparison as to any other division. In my various speeches I always say that the Yankee Division is typical of other American divisions; that I knew personally about the Yankee Division and therefore could speak especially of it.

I do claim that it had an esprit, a capitalization of tradition, which developed into a soul which took the place, and splendidly took the place, of the lack of time in which to give it the training that all Regular officers heretofore have always thought necessary.

It was the first division under the American flag in the new organization entirely organized, and therefore the first completely filled up and organized division to arrive in France.

NEVER FAILED IN THE TEST.

No division was put to a higher test, and it never failed.

It is the only division which sailed as a whole and whose first concentration was in France.

All of its units did not arrive until November, and a few batteries of Artillery much later. It went into line in the first part of February.

There were few work troops in France, and during its training period large drafts from its battalions necessarily had to be detailed for unloading cars, digging sewers, building hospitals, and all the other things that were necessary at the time. It had very little transportation, it underwent unusual conditions and handicaps that could not be foreseen or could not be avoided.

In the short training period of from two to three and one-half months, with all these handicaps, it did not complain. Its fighting record is known throughout France and is commencing to be known in the United States.

NOT NATIONAL GUARD DIVISION.

It is not a National Guard division, so called, and ceased to be a National Guard division before the above excellent order was issued. It was, and now is, a division of the Army of the United States, and its officers are officers of the Army of the United States.

I never allowed the words "National Guard," "Regular," or "National Army" to be used in my division.

Battles and war service in the face of the enemy, the supreme test of war, were what selected, so far as lay in my power, its lieutenants, its captains, its majors, and its colonels. One or two battles picked out these officers, and there was not question as to their selection. The controlling element was leadership, the greatest factor in choice for command, and frequently the factor that is given the least credit in military schools and colleges.

It is wonderful and informing what can be done in six months with 30,000 men if politics, prejudice, and favoritism are eliminated and the only thought is patriotism and service.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to supplement the remarks made by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] in reference to the officers and the men of the Twenty-sixth Division. He has stated the case with great accuracy and expresses the opinion of the people of New England relative to both the officers and the men.

I asked for time to call attention to another matter worthy of the attention of this House which appears to me to be an abuse of the franking privilege on the part of the Comptroller of the Currency, when he sends out to every bank in the United States a circular of notification that he has had some sort of trouble with a newspaper correspondent and in which circular he supports his claim for reappointment and reconfirmation upon the part of the Senate.

This statement reached me this morning from an official of a bank in my district. It had a number on the envelope showing that it was the general mailing list of the Comptroller of the Currency, and I only have time to read one or two very brief sentences showing that the franking privilege is used for the personal support of the gentleman himself. It seems to me a very improper action on the part of a Treasury official. It is headed "John Skelton Williams, the Comptroller of the Treasury, to-day gave to the press the following statement." And in that statement he refers to the fact that he had called to his office a newspaper correspondent whom, he says, has written matter for the press asking that he should not be confirmed. He says that—

A memorandum had been addressed with a view of conducting a campaign to oppose the confirmation of the Comptroller of the Treasury in the event of his renomination. He (the newspaper correspondent) declined to affirm or deny his authorship of the memorandum.

Has not a representative of the press a right to send to his paper such matter as he may see fit, and does the Comptroller of the Currency have the right to call that man to his office to explain such correspondence and then send under the official frank of the Treasury Department such a letter as this of personal support of himself to every bank in the United States? The gentleman from Illinois a few moments ago called attention to the clogging of the mails from the soldiers. But if the use of the frank of the Comptroller of the Currency clogs the mails in any way for his personal aggrandizement, can not he stop it and give our soldier boys a chance to hear from the folks at home? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to supplement also the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts by calling the attention of the committee to another crime of the present administration of the Democratic Party. In my State, in southwest Missouri, we have a great industry down there, the zinc industry. Democratic tariff laws have seriously affected that industry, and there is pending now in this Congress a bill presented by myself to levy a tax of 2 cents per pound upon the content of all zinc ores. I am in receipt this morning of a telegram from the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri in reference to this serious condition, which I ask to have the Clerk read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *January 31, 1919.*

Hon. L. C. DYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Am instructed by the Missouri House of Representatives to inform you that there has been offered into and adopted by the house the following resolutions:

Whereas the zinc-mining industry of southwest Missouri is the greatest metal-mining industry in the entire State; and

Whereas that industry is now crippled to the extent of the closing down of 95 per cent of all the mines in said district, said closing down of the mines being occasioned by the vast importations of zinc ore into the United States from foreign countries, amounting in the last four years ending June 30, 1918, to 825,000 tons, being approximately three times the normal prewar production of the entire Joplin district, including Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri; and

Whereas there are now approximately 350,000 tons of zinc ore on the docks in Australia awaiting shipment; and

Whereas Mexico has a potential power of production of at least 150,000 tons annually, which must find its market in the United States; and

Whereas zinc-ore concentrates have also been imported into the United States in the last three or four years from 15 different countries, representing every continent and grand division of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, That we believe it to be the patriotic duty of the Legislature of the State of Missouri to memorialize the Congress of the United States by special resolution asking that there be at once incorporated into the pending revenue bill a provision providing for a protective tariff of 2 cents per pound on the metallic contents of zinc ore, in order to keep out further importations of zinc ore, and allow the zinc-mining industry of the United States to live and be again built up to its normal condition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DYER. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may finish the reading of it; it is only a line or two.

Mr. MANN. The time for general debate was fixed in the House by unanimous consent. Extend your remarks.

Mr. FOSTER. The time was fixed in the House.

Mr. DYER. But it will only take a half minute; it is only a line or two. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present. If Democratic Members see fit to stop the reading when there is only a line to read——

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that the time can not be extended, it being fixed in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I object. Let the gentleman make the point of order that there is no quorum.

Mr. DYER. I make it.

Mr. FOSTER. Make it; nobody cares.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty Members are present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Drukker	Johnson, Ky.	Russell
Bacharach	Dupré	Johnson, S. Dak.	Schall
Barnhart	Eagle	Johnson, Wash.	Scott, Mich.
Benson	Edmonds	Kearns	Scully
Black	Elston	Kelly, Pa.	Sears
Bland, Ind.	Emerson	Kennedy, R. I.	Sells
Booher	Estopinal	Key, Ohio	Shackleford
Borland	Fairchild, G. W.	Kiess, Pa.	Sherley
Britten	Farr	Kreider	Shouse
Brodbeck	Ferris	La Follette	Sims
Browne	Flood	LaGuardia	Sinnott
Browning	Flynn	Larsen	Smith, C. B.
Brumbaugh	Fordney	Lehlbach	Smith, T. F.
Burroughs	Francis	Lesher	Snook
Caldwell	Freeman	Linthicum	Snyder
Cannon	Fuller, Mass.	Longworth	Steele
Cantrill	Garland	Lufkin	Sullivan
Caraway	Godwin, N. C.	Lunn	Sumners
Carew	Good	McAndrews	Swift
Carter, Mass.	Goodall	McCulloch	Switzer
Chandler, N. Y.	Gould	Maher	Tague
Church	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Taylor, Ark.
Cleary	Gray, Ala.	Miller, Minn.	Taylor, Colo.
Coady	Gray, N. J.	Morin	Templeton
Connelly, Kans.	Griest	Mott	Thomas
Cooper, Ohio	Hamill	Mudd	Thompson
Cooper, W. Va.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Nicholls, S. C.	Tinkham
Copley	Hamlin	Norton	Towner
Costello	Harrison, Miss.	Oliver, N. Y.	Van Dyke
Cox	Harrison, Va.	Osborne	Vare
Crosser	Hawley	O'Shaunessy	Waldow
Dallinger	Hayes	Park	Walker
Davey	Heaton	Powers	Walsh
Delaney	Heintz	Pratt	Webb
Dempsey	Helm	Price	Welty
Dent	Helvering	Ramsey	White, Ohio
Dewalt	Howard	Rankin	Winslow
Dill	Humphreys	Reavis	Wise
Donovan	Husted	Riordan	Woods, Iowa
Dooling	Hutchinson	Roberts	Wright.
Doughton	Ireland	Robinson	Zihlman
Drane	James	Rowland	

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HENSLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15219) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, and that 263 Members answered to their names—a quorum—and presented therewith a list of the absentees for insertion in the Journal and RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The committee resumed its session, with Mr. HENSLEY in the chair.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield nine minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, upon the question that has been discussed for a few minutes so eloquently and well by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], and when he asked the question what could be done, I think I suggested a complete answer. We have not the time to repeat the outrages that are being perpetrated upon the young men of this country who, under the law and under the rules, are entitled to discharge. The Democratic Party now has it in its power to pass a resolution. I have not any pride of opinion about it. They can pass their own resolution, and, when you adjourn sine die at the close of this Congress, a nonpartisan committee can sit here, so that we can go home and can telegraph to some civil branch of the Government to get some sort of remedy for the boys we represent. If that is done, there will be no question about your ability to pass your bills and adjourn. If it is not, there may be some question raised, for, so far as I am concerned, I regard the treatment of these boys as one of the most important things before the present Congress.

I have not time now to recite the letters that have come to me within the last 24 hours, but I will insert in the RECORD word that comes from constituents of mine, very much like the last one that I put in the RECORD, protesting against their boy being sent to Siberia. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have in Siberia 15,000 American boys. In one place we have 221 United States officers, 10,042 enlisted men, consisting of Infantry, Signal Corps, Medical, Ordnance, and Quartermaster troops, and in western Russia, at Archangel, there is a total of 5,419 officers and men, or more than 15,000 men in all. What are they fighting for?

My resolution, which I have introduced, calls upon the Congress of the United States to exercise its constitutional power. For two long years you have sat here—and I say it with no feeling of disrespect—as rubber stamps. You have not dared to exercise any of your constitutional powers. You have not used them. The General Staff has run all the questions of military power. Everything they have asked you have given them. Most of us have consented to it. But here now, in the hour of peace, with 15,000 American boys dying and fighting in Russia, 500 miles from where we have a pound of scrap iron, with the pretense that they were sent there to defend American goods and American property, we have lost 50 men and 5 officers within the past week. They were not defending American property. They were more than 500 miles from Archangel, where that battle occurred; and they are fighting and dying in the snow.

And the Constitution you swore you would uphold and defend provides that the Congress of the United States shall make rules and regulations governing the Army and the Navy of the United States. [Applause.] And I want to know which one of you will stand up here now on either side of this Chamber and say that you approve of our men fighting and dying, when you know as well as I do that the war is over? There is no German menace in Russia. The Bolsheviki menace is no worse than the menace of the Czar. Which side are you fighting on?

Mr. OVERMYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I have but little time.

Mr. OVERMYER. I thought the gentleman challenged this side to ask questions.

Mr. MASON. Make it short.

Mr. OVERMYER. I was going to inquire whether the gentleman was opposed also to sending our troops to France in the first place?

Mr. MASON. I was not opposed to sending the troops to France; but I was in favor, if you want to take up ancient history, of sending volunteers, and we have sent more volunteers than drafted men and they have made the best soldiers, too. They have all made good soldiers. But even if I was opposed, and even if I was wrong, have you the courage to exercise your power as a Member of Congress in making rules and regulations for the Army and Navy and not say by your silence that you are in favor of slaughtering American boys in the snows of Russia and Siberia? And for what? No man answers for this administration.

My constituents have a right to ask me questions. I have received a letter this morning, signed by the father and mother of a soldier. It is as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 20, 1919.*

To the Hon. WM. E. MASON,
Congressman at Large.

DEAR SIR: We have a son who was conscripted supposedly to fight the German menace. My son was a Christian, home-loving, God-fearing, obeying the command to honor father and mother, the greatest comfort to us in the evening of life. Congressman MASON, we beg of you tell us why should he be sent to Siberia? What was the great need; we want to know? We are patriotic, so is he. Willing to do every duty required by the United States for the United States. But what is so important in Siberia that my son and hundreds of other United States boys must be exiled to fight for what? We can not understand. We ask you, who represent us, why was he sent there? When will he be sent home? We ask you in the name of justice will you use the great influence you possess to have them speedily sent home?

Most respectfully, yours,

JOHN JOHNSON,
EMMA JOHNSON,
Parents.

There is no more reason for American boys to sacrifice their lives in the snows of Siberia to-day, 500 miles away from where we have any American property, than there is for us to get into a fight here upon this floor, not a bit. [Applause.] There is no justification of law for it. And you must pass on this, gentlemen. You are Members of Congress. The Democratic Party is waiting for some signal from somewhere as to what to do. They are waiting for signals, perhaps, from Paris, as to what action to take or whether to take any or not. But are the Republican Members and the Republican Party to be silent on this subject? Have you constituents there? Have you a son there, fighting 500 miles from Archangel, without knowing what they are fighting for? What are the two contesting factions in Russia to-day? They are the royal party, that wants to put royalty back on the throne, and, on the other side, the wicked, as we say, Bolsheviki, who has not a real, genuine rule for government. We furnished these men and this money to help Kerensky. And now I am going to tell you what I think.

I do not know whether you will like it or not, for I have not the proof, but I am going to get the truth if I can. I charge as to the money that we have furnished to help win this war that a large share of it, running into millions of dollars, instead of being sent to feed the starving Russians, to-day is held by the Russian minister in the United States and is being used to pay the interest upon the bonds held by Morgan & Co. to their clients before America went into this war. I believe that. I have not the proof, but I expect to get it if you will give me a chance to examine the men who are handling the money in this country.

Then you are put to the question of your boys fighting and dying over there—50 killed last week—for the reason——

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

Mr. MASON. I would like to have three minutes more.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. MASON. But assuming that I may be mistaken about that, why not pass this resolution, bringing them home? There is no war in Russia between the United States and Russia. The war was between Germany and the United States. There is not a German within a thousand miles of any of our troops who are there. I tell you that our boys are being used to carry out the dreams and the theories of politicians in that country, and, so far as I am concerned, I see no difference between the Bolsheviki and the Czar. The Bolsheviki can not make a worse government than they had under the Czar. [Applause.] And, so far as I am concerned, I will never consent that a drop of blood of any boy in America shall be shed to help the politicians over there. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Michigan has a large number of soldiers in the vicinity of Archangel. Many of those men came from my district. I want to know if the gentleman has been able to ascertain who is responsible for sending our boys over there?

Mr. MASON. Only what I have seen in the reports of the newspapers and the statements that the State Department sent out, that they were sent there to protect American property from the Germans, with whom we were at war. We are not at war with them now. They have been under the command of Japanese and British generals, and Lloyd George has withdrawn the English troops and notified the English people that no more English soldiers shall be sent there. I say either give a million men to defend those 15,000 or else, if we are wrong, let us be

manly enough to come out of there and let the politicians of Russia settle their own game of politics without the shedding of any more American blood. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him to say that there are several boys from my district and State there. I have received many letters of complaint and protest from their families similar to those referred to by my friend from Illinois. I have permission to put some of these in the RECORD, and I shall shortly do so. I congratulate the gentleman upon his forceful statement of the situation. I agree with every word he says about this shameful proceeding and thank him for uttering them. [Applause.]

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentlemen. My time is about expired. You, gentlemen, can make war. You are the only power that can make war under the Constitution that we have sworn to support. You can order the troops out of Russia. Nobody likes to see the American flag retreat, but the American flag is just as beautiful moving one way as another. When it came down in Cuba I thought it was the handsomest flag in the world. Although it was coming down, it was keeping the promise of a great people. You have sent 15,000 boys into what may be a shambles, a slaughter pen, amid the snows of Russia, and you have no excuse for keeping them there except that party leaders intend to fight those who stand by the soviet, to fight against the Bolsheviki, and are in favor of establishing a Czar of all the Russias. [Applause.]

The following to-day:

PARIS, *January 31.*

Whatever forces may be sent to Turkey for garrisoning purposes, there will be no American troops among them, it developed to-day. It is pointed out that their use for this purpose would be inappropriate, as the United States has never been at war with Turkey.

Are we at war with Russia? You know we are not. If we are, let us command our own forces and send 2,000,000 men to uphold our flag, and not leave a handful of brave boys to be slaughtered in the bloody politics of the Bolsheviki and the Czar.

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

Mr. MASON. I append, Mr. Chairman, the resolution I have introduced:

Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress of the United States shall have exclusive power to declare war, and also provides that the Congress shall have power "to make rules for the Government for the regulation of the land and naval forces"; and

Whereas there is now in the Siberian expedition 221 United States officers and 10,042 enlisted men, consisting of Infantry, Signal Corps, Medical, Ordnance, and Quartermaster troops, and in western Russia (Archangel) there are a total of 5,419 officers and men, comprising Infantry, Engineer, and Medical troops; and

Whereas the sending of United States troops to Russia by the Commander in Chief would be without authority of law except to protect American lives and property, and any intervention on the part of the United States to assist any political party in the formation of a government would be a usurpation of power on the part of the Executive; and

Whereas the war between the United States and Germany has ceased under the terms of the armistice and there can be no possible need of protecting American supplies in Russia; and

Whereas there is a great state of unrest and anxiety in the minds of the American people whose sons have been sent to Russia and a great state of anxiety in the minds of the people whose sons are overseas for fear their sons will be ordered into the political fight in Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States is hereby directed to order forthwith all troops of the United States out of Russia, and in the meantime, while the troops are being removed from Russia, the Commander in Chief is directed to cease and desist from taking any part in the controversies of political factions now seeking political supremacy in Russia.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROSE].

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, a great deal has been said upon the subject of allotments, and one criticism after another has been hurled at the several departments of the Government. I am in receipt of a great many letters upon all kinds of subjects relating to the war, most of them abounding in complaints which are worthy of immediate attention and adjustment. I am now in receipt of a letter that is somewhat different in its nature from many that have come to my notice and touches upon subjects that up to this time have not been brought to my attention; and I have thought best to read the letter for the information of the Members of the House, and in the hope that relief may soon be granted to the anxious parents who are directly interested:

ALTOONA, PA., *January 17, 1919.*

Hon. JOHN M. ROSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: My son, Corpl. Henry U. Brandt, Company G, One hundred and Tenth Infantry, was killed in action July 30, 1918, at Courmont, France. Before he died he had made an allotment to me for $25 a month. Since his death I have been receiving this allotment every month, and up to the present time I have checks amounting to $125. I did not have any of these checks cashed for the reason that I do not think I am entitled to this allotment, since he is dead.

These checks are coming to me from the Quartermaster General's Department, and the volume number of the checks is 1240747. I wrote three letters to the Quartermaster Department calling its attention to this. In reply to these letters they stated that they have no record that there is an allotment by this soldier made in my favor, and that if he is dead I am no longer entitled to the allotment. They further said they could not give me any direction as to what to do with the checks since they have no record of this allotment. They also directed me to write to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Treasury Department, Allotment and Allowance Division, Stopped Payment Section.

I wrote to this address, called their attention to the matter, and asked what I am to do with the checks; but from this department thus far I have received no reply, but the checks are still coming, I having received one again yesterday. As I do not feel I am entitled to this allotment, and as I know there is a severe penalty for receiving money of this kind illegally, and as the War Department does not seem to make any effort to correct it, I thought I would write to you and kindly ask you to look into this matter and try to have it adjusted in some way.

Also, thus far, I have not received my son's back pay. I sent in my application blanks about the middle of September. I received a reply that the same were received, but thus far the matter has not been adjusted. I also wish you would look into this.

Again, I have not received my son's personal effects, although he is dead nearly six months. Immediately after I received word of my son's death, at the direction of the War Department, I wrote to the Personal Effects Depot, France, directing them where to send those effects, but thus far I have not received them nor have they written me a single line about it. I am in a quandary to know how this matter stands. I wish you would likewise look into this matter and see whether you can bring about a satisfactory adjustment.

Affairs must be in a terrible chaotic state at Washington, otherwise such things would not occur. It is certainly exasperating and humiliating for the families that have given their sons to make the supreme sacrifice on the altar of the country and then to get such treatment as this from those in authority. It is surely no wonder the people are dissatisfied.

Trusting that you can adjust this matter for me, and thanking you in advance for your favor, with kindest regards, I am,

Yours, sincerely,

CHARLES H. BRANDT.

I have been thinking, gentlemen, that unless something is done to correct these glaring errors the people might do with some of us as was done with ex-President Taft, according to the story told the other evening in an able address delivered by him on the league of nations. I was very much impressed with what he said, and I may say that it was my first opportunity to listen to the distinguished ex-President. In the course of an able argument defending the league of nations he said that during his term as President he was often interested in bills presented to the Senate of the United States, and that when many of them would be returned to him for his signature he was unable to recognize the bill and that he doubted very much whether the Senators themselves recognized it. That frequently he would throw the bill on the shelf and allow it to become covered with dust and hoping all the time that the Senators might change their minds or that the people would change the Senators, but instead the people changed the President. [Laughter.].

Now, I have an idea that is exactly what will happen to some of us if we permit these various complaints to go unheeded and do not provide for an investigation such as has been frequently advocated upon the floor of this House.

I want to remind you that the people of this country will rise up in their might and place men in the Congress who will have investigations made and have justice meted out to the soldiers of our country, and to the fathers and mothers who were willing to make the supreme sacrifice in order that we may have a democracy, such a democracy for which our boys so valiantly fought. [Applause.]

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I believe seven minutes remain of general debate. I yield that time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the mails of every Member of Congress are so full nowadays of complaints relative to various things that have occurred during this war that one expects an ordinary amount of that sort of thing. But the mail that I received one day

recently was so full of examples of carelessness, of stupidity, of ignorance that I thought it was justifiable and perhaps advisable to call attention to some of them.

As everyone knows, there has been great trouble in the distribution of our soldiers' mail overseas. This particular thing has been called to the attention of this committee before, but in this one day's mail are three letters that show a practice that is being pursued by somebody in the War Department somewhere that seems to me to be the very superlative of ignorance or stupidity. I am told in one of these letters that a soldier was in the Fourth Division overseas. He has received no mail from his wife since the 1st of August, although she has written him during that time four or five letters a week. He has been sick in the hospital since the 16th of last October. On the 15th of January there came back to his wife, who lives down in my country and who knew about his sickness, 15 letters that were marked across the back of them by some one who described himself as a censor, "Wounded and in base hospital." Since that time many other letters have been returned to his wife, who is down there grieving her heart out and trying to find through me and through the War Department and through the Red Cross whether her husband is alive or dead, and back comes this burden of sorrow to her, these letters marked "Wounded and in base hospital." The girl's father writes to me a very pertinent suggestion. He says, "This week she got 14 letters from France returned, all marked by the censor, 'Wounded and in base hospital.'"

He is a plain man down in the country, and his language, perhaps, is not parliamentary, but it seems to me rather in point. He says to me: "Now, W. J., don't it occur to you if that censor knew he was in a hospital the nut could have sent the letters to him easier than he could have sent them back to Floy?" That is the name of the wife. And does not it occur to you that way, gentlemen? What reason can there be, what plan is there in the War Department or among the people who are running this mail service across the seas which causes them to pursue such a cruel and unnecessary treatment of our soldiers overseas? If there is anything in God's world they want over there, it is to get their mail. I had the pleasure or displeasure, whichever it may have been, during the month of October, while this war was hottest and when the allied line was everywhere advancing, to meet many of these men in the hospitals overseas, and I talked with hundreds of them. And whether they were drafted men or whether they were volunteers, I found them all the same cheerful, brave, fearless, carefree lads; and not a complaint did I hear from any of them except the inquiry, "Why can't we get our mail from home?"

Mr. MASON. That censor that the gentleman refers to did not even tell them where the base hospital was?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No.

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

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Can you find out who the censor was and see if arrangements can not be made by the War Department to discharge him from the service and give him some job to which his mentality will be adapted?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I do not know about that. I have only a little time, and I want to pursue this further.

Mr. LITTLE. I offer that as a practical suggestion.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That was the only complaint our boys over there had. In spite of their wounds and misfortunes they were all cheerful. There they were in the hospitals, where some of them would lie for months having their wounds treated, making no complaint, except this one thing, and the failure to get their mail was doing more to shatter the morale of the soldiers across the sea and it has done more to shatter the morale of our people than any other thing that has happened.

Mr. GREGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; I have not the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. MASON], who just had the floor, said that in his opinion the volunteer soldiers were better soldiers than those who were taken by the draft. My friends, I do not agree with him. I found that wherever there was a soldier overseas, no matter where he came from, whatever class he came from, he was ready to do all and to bear all for the flag of his country, irrespective of how he got into the service. [Applause.] There were no best soldiers overseas, because they were all good soldiers, the best soldiers that ever followed a flag into battle anywhere in God's world. They were American soldiers. [Applause.]

Now, this sort of thing ought to stop, gentlemen. It is going on to-day. The same method is being pursued.

Mr. BLACKMON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; I do not have time to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. In the same day's mail I have another letter about a soldier in the Thirty-third Division, which contains most of the Illinois National Guard troops. His people have not heard from him since August 18, when he was in the hospital. Twenty letters came back the other day to his old mother. He was in the hospital on the 18th day of August, and she writes me heartbrokenly and wants to know why, in God's name, she can not find out about her boy. And why can she not? The War Department does not know. The Secretary of War does not know. The Red Cross can not find out. The cables under the sea are filled to repletion with fullsome accounts that are being written about somebody and somebody's plans over there for regenerating the world, but the wounded soldiers can not get their letters, and these letters are being returned in heaps to the dead-letter office, and then being sent back to the mothers and wives over this country.

I have another letter, in the same day's mail, which tells of a man who went over in August. On December 29 he wrote his wife and told her he had not received any letters since he had been there, although letters and packages had gone to him two or three times a week since he went over there in August. Not a thing had been received by him. Now, I want to say to you that that sort of thing affects seriously the morale of any country and injuriously affects public opinion. [Applause.]

The practice that I have mentioned is a general one. The leading Democratic paper in my district, the Rock Island Daily Argus, recently commented quite pointedly on this practice, as follows:

> It is hard to understand, however, why there have been so many cases in which the thread lost in a hospital or at some point where a transfer was made was not picked up later. The department might at least have taken a census of the various units after the armistice was signed and secured new records that would have made delivery in most cases possible, even if long delayed. That would have been better than giving it up and passing the job over to the dead-letter office. The military authorities can scarcely plead too much business during the last two months to give the subject of soldiers' mail the attention it deserves.

In that judgment so expressed I most thoroughly and completely concur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS, 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. 15219) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back without amendment with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point that no quorum is present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 2, answered "present" 3, not voting 178, as follows:

YEAS—246.

Alexander	Beshlin	Campbell, Kans.	Curry, Cal.
Anderson	Birch	Campbell, Pa.	Dale
Anthony	Blackmon	Cannon	Dallinger
Ashbrook	Bland, Ind.	Cantrill	Darrow
Aswell	Bland, Va.	Chandler, Okla.	Davis
Austin	Bowers	Clark, Pa.	Decker
Ayres	Brand	Claypool	Dempsey
Baer	Buchanan	Connally, Tex.	Denison
Bankhead	Burnett	Cooper, Wis.	Dent
Barkley	Butler	Crago	Dickinson
Beakes	Byrnes, S. C.	Crisp	Dill
Bell	Byrns, Tenn.	Currie, Mich.	Dillon

Dominick	Hensley	Mason	Sherwood
Doolittle	Hersey	Mays	Shouse
Doremus	Hicks	Merritt	Siegel
Dowell	Hilliard	Miller, Wash.	Sinnott
Dunn	Hollingsworth	Moon	Slemp
Dyer	Hood	Moores, Ind.	Sloan
Eagan	Howard	Morgan	Small
Eagle	Huddleston	Mott	Smith, Idaho
Elliott	Hull, Iowa	Nelson, A. P.	Smith, Mich.
Ellsworth	Hull, Tenn.	Nichols, Mich.	Snell
Elston	Humphreys	Nolan	Stafford
Esch	Igoe	Oldfield	Steagall
Essen	James	Olney	Stedman
Evans	Juul	O'Shaunessy	Steenerson
Fairfield	Kahn	Overmyer	Sterling
Ferris	Kehoe	Overstreet	Stevenson
Fess	Kelley, Mich.	Padgett	Stiness
Fields	Kelly, Pa.	Paige	Strong
Fisher	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker, N. J.	Sweet
Foss	Kettner	Parker, N. Y.	Taylor, Colo.
Foster	Kincheloe	Peters	Temple
French	King	Phelan	Thompson
Fuller, Ill.	Kinkaid	Platt	Tillman
Gallagher	Knutson	Polk	Tilson
Gallivan	Kraus	Pou	Treadway
Gandy	La Follette	Powers	Venable
Gard	Lampert	Purnell	Vestal
Garner	Langley	Ragsdale	Vinson
Garrett, Tenn.	Lazaro	Rainey, H. T.	Voigt
Gillett	Lee, Ga.	Rainey, J. W.	Volstead
Glynn	Lever	Ramseyer	Walton
Goodwin, Ark.	Little	Randall	Ward
Gordon	Lobeck	Rayburn	Wason
Graham, Ill.	London	Reed	Watkins
Green, Iowa	Lonergan	Robinson	Watson, Pa.
Greene, Mass.	Lundeen	Rogers	Weaver
Greene, Vt.	McArthur	Romjue	Welling
Gregg	McClintic	Rose	Whaley
Griffin	McCormick	Rouse	Wheeler
Hadley	McFadden	Rowe	White, Me.
Hamilton, Mich.	McKenzie	Rubey	Williams
Hamlin	McKeown	Rucker	Wilson, Ill.
Hardy	McKinley	Sabath	Wilson, Tex.
Harrison, Va.	McLaughlin, Mich	Sanders, Ind.	Wood, Ind.
Haskell	McLemore	Sanders, La.	Woodyard
Hastings	Madden	Sanders, N. Y.	Wright
Haugen	Magee	Sanford	Young, N. Dak.
Hawley	Mann	Scott, Iowa	Young, Tex.
Hayden	Mansfield	Scott, Mich.	
Heflin	Mapes	Shallenberger	

NAYS—2.

Blanton	Quin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Frear	Jacoway	Littlepage

NOT VOTING—178.

Almon	Drane	Kennedy, Iowa	Saunders, Va.
Bacharach	Drukker	Key, Ohio	Schall
Barnhart	Dupré	Kiess, Pa.	Scully
Benson	Edmonds	Kitchin	Sears
Black	Emerson	Kreider	Sells
Booher	Estopinal	LaGuardia	Shackleford
Borland	Fairchild, B. L.	Larsen	Sherley
Britten	Fairchild, G. W.	Lea, Cal.	Sims
Brodbeck	Farr	Lehlbach	Sisson
Browne	Flood	Lesher	Slayden
Browning	Flynn	Linthicum	Smith, C. B.
Brumbaugh	Focht	Longworth	Smith, T. F.
Burroughs	Fordney	Lufkin	Snook
Caldwell	Francis	Lunn	Snyder
Candler, Miss.	Freeman	McAndrews	Steele
Caraway	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Stephens, Miss.
Carew	Garland	McLaughlin, Pa.	Stephens, Nebr.
Carlin	Garrett, Tex.	Maher	Sullivan
Carter, Mass.	Godwin, N. C.	Martin	Sumners
Carter, Okla.	Good	Miller, Minn.	Swift
Cary	Goodall	Mondell	Switzer
Chandler, N. Y.	Gould	Montague	Tague
Church	Graham, Pa.	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Gray, Ala.	Morin	Templeton
Classon	Gray, N. J.	Mudd	Thomas
Cleary	Griest	Neely	Timberlake
Coady	Hamill	Nelson, J. M.	Tinkham
Collier	Hamilton, N. Y.	Nicholls, S. C.	Towner
Connelly, Kans.	Harrison, Miss.	Norton	Van Dyke
Cooper, Ohio.	Hayes	Oliver, Ala.	Vare
Cooper, W. Va.	Heaton	Oliver, N. Y.	Waldow
Copley	Heintz	Osborne	Walker
Costello	Helm	Park	Walsh
Cox	Helvering	Porter	Watson, Va.
Cramton	Holland	Pratt	Webb
Crosser	Houston	Price	Welty
Davey	Husted	Raker	White, Ohio
Delaney	Hutchinson	Ramsey	Wilson, La.
Denton	Ireland	Rankin	Wingo
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Reavis	Winslow
Dies	Johnson, S. Dak.	Riordan	Wise
Dixon	Johnson, Wash.	Roberts	Woods, Iowa
Donovan	Jones	Rodenberg	Zihlman
Dooling	Kearns	Rowland	
Doughton	Keating	Russell	

So the bill was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. CLEARY with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. FREAR.

Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi with Mr. BURROUGHS.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. COADY with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. FREEMAN.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. LEA of California with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. LESHER with Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. MARTIN with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. NEELY with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. OLIVER of New York with Mr. TEMPLETON.

Mr. SIMS with Mr. TIMBERLAKE.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. TOWNER.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. SELLS.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

On motion of Mr. GALLIVAN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. GALLIVAN, by unanimous consent, was given leave to extend and revise his remarks.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 15539; H. Rept. No. 1024) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUTLER reserved all points of order.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15462) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I would say that I have had no requests for time upon this side of the House, and I ask unanimous consent that general debate upon the bill be dispensed with, if that is agreeable to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I have had one request for 15 minutes from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. DENT. Then I ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed at the expiration of 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate upon the bill close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Military Academy appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Military Academy appropriation bill, with Mr. SABATH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, this bill appropriates $2,900,000 to be used in the next year by one school. I find that it gets so little attention from the House that nobody has any information or desires any information, such, at least, that leads him to want to discuss it, except perhaps myself. That shows a lack of interest in a very important feature of legislation which I greatly deplore.

I read in the newspapers the other day that the management now in control, which wants $2,900,000 for the next year, is preparing to put in force the old system of hazing at that school. Under that system a new boy who comes there from the country is at the mercy of the older and the bigger boys, upon the theory that that makes a nicer man of him, when, as a matter of fact, it makes of him a little coward and a snob unless he is a boy of considerable character. He gets a little older and in a higher class and then he wants to overawe somebody else.

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

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. The gentleman is aware of the fact that there is a statute against hazing?

Mr. LITTLE. Then, would the gentleman account to me for the fact that the newspapers gave us the information that the superintendent is going to resume hazing; and does not the gentleman know that hazing has been in force ever since he has been on the Military Committee?

Mr. FIELDS. I am advised by the superintendent that it has not been, and that is all I know about it. In 1911 one cadet was dismissed for hazing.

Mr. LITTLE. If I had been on the Military Committee as long as the gentleman and did not know any more about the hazing system than he does, I certainly would get out and look it up, at least.

Mr. FIELDS. I get my information from the superintendent of the establishment, while the gentleman gets his from the newspapers.

Mr. LITTLE. I get mine from young men who have been hazed, and, what is more, the system is in vogue in every school of that kind in the United States, and they all do it because West Point does. What is the result? It makes a snob of every man that goes out of the school who allows himself to be governed by the principles that it teaches. The theory is that an older boy is better than a younger boy, and instead of reaching out a helping hand and assisting him to grow up as a gentleman, they teach him there is somebody better than he is, who can run over him and mistreat him and do anything to him, and if he undertakes to whip the boy a couple of classes above him he has got to lick the whole class to get away with it.

And that is the way you spend $2,900,000, and one of your committee gets up and tells me that the superintendent tells him that they do not haze there, and there is not another man in the House who does not know that they do, and that is the kind of information that your committee brings to you on which to warrant an expenditure of $2,900,000. I am speaking as a friend of education and of military education. My own boy is in a military school, and has been for two years, and I appreciate the value of it when at its real best, and I know its faults, and I am merely saying here that when you discuss such an appropriation for a military school you ought to know what you are doing, instead of starting off by such theories as that is.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is aware of the fact that students have been dismissed from West Point for hazing, and that bills have been introduced and have been referred to our committee in attempts to get those men reinstated, and it could not be done.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] informs me that one was dismissed in 1911. The gentleman from Illinois says "students." He means "student," does not he—a cadet, not cadets?

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman referred a moment ago to the rule that the older classes dominate the lower ones. Is not that merely the rule of seniority, which prevails here and everywhere else? [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman is trying to get me away from the subject I was discussing. We will take that up a little later on. Of course, we all know that every time a new boy goes to another town he always has to lick every boy in the town before he can get along; but the truth is that at West Point they have adopted the cowardly custom of combining every upper class against the low class man, and, as I said before, if you beat one of the seniors you have to beat the whole class. Some gentleman here says that he does not believe that that is true. I would like to get him into West Point once.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I suggest that if the boy can lick two of them, he can lick them all.

Mr. LITTLE. Gentlemen, we all know that this bill should not go a step without some recommendation from the committee that this hazing must stop.

As I undertook to say to you when questioned by gentlemen whose information runs back too far to be useful [laughter], this makes snobs of the boys. What is the matter with the West Point boys? Why, they go into a community and they feel that they are of a different class because the minute they go to West Point they are taught that the other fellows in the upper classes are better than they are, and when they come out they think they are better than everybody else, and that is the reason in this war we are continually agitating in this House the question why we have dismissed from the Army of the United States brave and gallant officers simply because they were in the militia of the country. The Regular officers have grown weary of being eclipsed by Volunteers and are endeavoring to seize the laurels from those who deserve them in many instances.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I will.

Mr. GORDON. How long has it been since the gentleman heard of a case of hazing at West Point?

Mr. LITTLE. Since this war the newspapers say they have discontinued it, but they are going to put it back now.

Mr. GORDON. Oh, no; there has not been any hazing there for five years.

Mr. LITTLE. You see, you can not talk to these gentlemen. The gentleman should talk with some people who have met some of the cadets from West Point and talked to them within the last 5 or 10 years. You go down there on an announced inspection, and, of course, everything is fixed for an approving report.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the gentleman say he would prefer to talk with some one who had met some West Pointer?

Mr. LITTLE. Some student who has been through the business there.

Mr. GORDON. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. LITTLE. I must make this speech myself and I do not want the rest of the House to consume all the time. I can not yield any further. The gentleman could have gotten 15 minutes if he wanted the time. There is not anybody in this House who asked for time on this bill except myself until I succeeded in getting 15 minutes and began to talk on the subject, and they hop on me and want to talk all through my time. This is an important bill and you should investigate it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is not that the rule of seniority?

Mr. LITTLE. There goes another.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I want to corroborate the gentleman.

Mr. LITTLE. I thank you.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. And I want to dispute the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio that there has not been any hazing at West Point for five years, because I talked with a boy dismissed from West Point for hazing since this war started. They say it is not in vogue there, but this fellow was actually dismissed last year; so that is not a matter of past history.

Mr. LITTLE. Of course, gentlemen, we all know, except gentlemen who inspect in committees, that there is hazing at West Point, and I do not want to waste time on such ideas. The reason they do not get along with volunteers in any war, the reason they are sending out better men in the militia, is simply because they are not from the West Point clique, because they have retained their Americanism and go into the Army to fight, not as a profession. Now, gentlemen, I do not mean all of them are. There are some splendid young Americans from there, and they are in a majority, I presume, and there is nothing the matter with them when they come out except West Point; but many of them are tarred with that brush, otherwise splendid young fellows. We have known man after man, scores of splendid soldiers, put out of the Army because they did not belong to the clique during this war. What is the reason for that? What is the matter with West Point?

Gentlemen, in the Spanish War, in the Philippine War, in the Chinese War, not one single, solitary general officer who achieved distinction or commanded in any action of importance ever attended a military school. Miles, Lawton, Shafter, Otis, MacArthur, Wheaton, Wood, Miller, Funston, Chaffee——

Mr. SLOAN. And Col. Little.

Mr. LITTLE. Not one of them ever went to a military school, and you can not name any man from West Point who achieved distinction as a general officer in the Spanish War, in the Philippines, or the Boxer War; not one. Every one volunteered without military education. Occasionally a West Pointer succeeded by simply getting out of the Regular Army and getting into the Volunteers, like Frank Bell. Now, there is some reason for that, and that is the reason why we should be examining this bill closer than we are doing. They tell us about the Civil War, that they were all West Pointers.

There was a West Point before the Civil War, but it was nothing but a little high school, except they taught them higher mathematics. That did not come to be compared with the West Point of these days. If that West Point made all these great soldiers, West Point to-day is useless, as there are 50 better military schools in this country now than there was at West Point before the Civil War. The great soldiers of the Civil War were all in the Mexican War—Grant, Lee, all of them; every one of them.

A MEMBER. They were from West Point.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman says they were from West Point. They came from the West Point High School, but they did not become great soldiers in the Civil War because they had been at West Point and studied a few simple things, but because their experience on the battle fields in Mexico made

them great soldiers. That is what made great soldiers out of them, and I do not——

Mr. McKENZIE. Something was said this morning about the Leavenworth clique. I would like to hear the gentleman on that clique.

Mr. LITTLE. They have a fine school at Leavenworth for these boys to go to after they are out of college and become officers. Many old Army friends and comrades of mine go there. I have no quarrel with them. They are organized there just like a college secret society and all stand together.

Is it not enough for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] that I venture to challenge the infallibility and perhaps the serious utility of West Point without being involved with the Leavenworth clique too? What is he trying to do to me? Does he wish to involve me in ruin, absolute ruin? When "Wild Bill" Hickok was marshal at Hays City, Kans., a half dozen soldiers from Gen. George A. Custer's famous Seventh Cavalry at Fort Hays came to town, took a few drinks, and celebrated. Wild Bill beat them up a bit and put them in the calaboose. Their captain, Tom Custer, regarding that as lese majeste, turned out the whole troop and they started for town to kill Wild Bill on sight. Bill drove to the next station and left for Kansas City till the storm was over. He said, "I'm perfectly willing to fight a reasonable number, but I am not going to try to lick the whole United States Army." The gentleman from Illinois must understand my list is full now, without taking on any "Leavenworth clique."

The best men at Fort Leavenworth, the best teachers there, have not been from West Point. Many of them are from the Philippine service—the very best of them. The fact of the business is, gentleman, that this military business is not a profession. It is a business and must be learned in the field, like other business.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas whether he would be in favor of abolishing West Point or not?

Mr. LITTLE. Well, you think from what I say that it ought to be abolished. If I can prove that no officer from West Point achieved distinction of the first importance in the Spanish-American War, would you think it ought to be abolished?

Mr. McKENZIE. If you ask me that question, I will say very frankly to you that I think West Point, from all I have been able to learn, is the greatest military school not only in this country but in the world.

Mr. GORDON. And has been for a hundred years.

Mr. LITTLE. As to my own views, the fact that my own boy has been in a military school for two years shows what I think of a military school and its possibilities. I am not saying, nor have I intimated, that West Point should be abolished, though possibly we would be better if, like Switzerland, we had no professional officers; but the gentleman jumps as if he had been stuck the minute I discuss its foibles. If it is so bad that when I lay my finger on the sore spot he jumps, something ought to be done. The minute I suggest these facts you think it ought to be abolished. I send my boy to a military school, and I think they are useful institutions. I would like to see West Point improved until its boys can rank with volunteer officers, until they furnish a share of the generals like Miles, Wood, Funston, Chaffee, McArthur, Wheaton, and Lawton.

Mr. OLNEY. Did not Lee and Stonewall Jackson and Grant graduate at West Point?

Mr. LITTLE. I discussed that. You must have been out. Every one of them got his military education in the Mexican War, and everything that was of any use to him he got there. It is shown that this school could be greatly improved, and it would be improved if more people would take an interest in it instead of letting it go by the board in this way. That is no reason why it should not be subjected to careful analysis and criticism when we are asked to spend millions on it.

Mr. RAMSEYER. How do you come to a conclusion that it has not turned out any soldiers for any of the past wars? [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. The attitude of the advocates of this institution can be exhibited by that question and that applause. I did not say it had not turned out any good soldiers. I simply said the fellows who did not go to school were better soldiers. That is all. [Laughter.] They do the best they can with the handicap of the snobbery they get there. All the brilliant leaders of the Cuban, Philippine, and Chinese wars were civilian volunteers.

Now, I am going to close. The friends of West Point, the minute you put your fingers on their sores, begin to protest.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the worst thing about West Point is that it is responsible for the caste sentiment that exists in our Army to-day?

Mr. LITTLE. And a snobbery that forced so many splendid militiamen out of the Army in the last war.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would simply like to ask the gentleman what he does when a young man asks him for an appointment to West Point. Do you name him, or do you advise him that it will be his ruin if he goes to West Point? [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTLE. What has that got to do with it? [Laughter.] If he is a friend of mine, I advise him to do something else. If he insists on it, I appoint him. [Laughter.] Perhaps we will get somebody in who will be as good as John A. Logan or Forrest. I can give you the key to this situation from a general officer of the Confederacy, who, I presume, graduated from West Point. He was the son of a President of the United States. I refer to Gen. Dick Taylor, a great officer. He said this, and it is the final word that I want to say: "You take the ordinary boy and send him to West Point and keep him there four years in that artificial environment, and put him two years on the frontier at some little fort with a few men, and then send him down to the department to sit around and unwind red tape for two years, and you have the finest example of arrested mental development the world ever saw." [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920:

Mr. GORDON and Mr. WOOD of Indiana rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee, is recognized.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have just been regaled by an address from a gallant volunteer officer here, in which he said some things that I approve and some things to which I dissent. I had the honor to head a committee which made the annual inspection of West Point four years ago, and I made some inquiries into the matters and things which he has discussed here. I have been on this committee for nearly six years now and have given reasonable attention to the Military Academy as we appropriated for it annually. West Point is the finest military school in the world, and has been for over 100 years.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. No. I have only five minutes under the rule. When James Monroe, who was one of the greatest military men who ever occupied the office of President, was Acting Secretary of War he sent a message to Congress in which he discussed West Point at length. That was about in 1820. In that message he said that West Point was then the finest military school in the world. And there is no doubt that it has been such for a hundred years.

Now, the question of hazing there is a question that has not come within the cognizance of the committee since I have been a member of it, for the simple reason that it has been punishable by dismissal for the last five years, and that is what I now say. The gentleman from Michigan undertook to controvert that by saying that a fellow whom he appointed there did some hazing and was dismissed. As to that, I undertake to say——

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I did not say exactly that.

Mr. GORDON. Well, he said he took part in a hazing enterprise and was expelled. You can not hold the military authorities up there responsible for hazing if they visit condign punishment upon those guilty of that offense, so that, practically speaking, hazing has been abolished, just as larceny and other crimes are considered abolished by being made penalized. I have not known of any hazing since I have been on this committee.

The argument against educating and training officers is just like the argument sometimes made against college education. You often hear men say that because some of our great men had not an opportunity to obtain a college education therefore that proves that a college education is of no account. Of course, there is nothing in that argument. The best man that ever lived intellectually would have been the better if he had had the advantage of college training. [Applause.] I think everybody will admit that if he will use judgment and common sense.

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

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Would it have improved Shakespeare? Is it not a fact that Bob Ingersoll said that "A college education polishes the pebble and dims the diamond"?

Mr. GORDON. Yes; but if Bob Ingersoll said that, I beg to disagree with him on that as well as some other things that he said. [Laughter.]

West Point is a very expensive institution to the Government. It is located in a beautiful place, which is, however, not adapted to its expansion. They have plenty of land there, but the trouble is that it is located upon the side of a hill, and the hill is of solid stone, and construction work is exceedingly expensive; and as the gradual increase of the attendance at the Military Academy has come on from year to year, the cadets recently having been authorized to be doubled, of course they are cramped for room. That is one of the serious questions which the committee has had under consideration, and which will probably confront the coming Congress peremptorily.

Now, I do not consider it necessary to answer some of the observations that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] has made here, because they are all covered in the general statement that our military officers are better from having been educated in military subjects than they would be without that education. Originally West Point was an engineering school exclusively, but since then the course has been enlarged, and it is now a very comprehensive one and covers perhaps more subjects than are vitally necessary. But it certainly does equip young men and prepare them to be officers of the Army better than any other school in existence anywhere on earth.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be some training in commercial work, business training, connected with the military training in West Point? That seems to have been avoided altogether.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman may have his time extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Ohio may be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I asked the question of the gentleman from Ohio because I believe that if there is a weakness in the training of a military officer it is in the lack of business knowledge.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman is exactly right about that, and, as I just observed, we are teaching too many things that are not vitally necessary to the Military Establishment just now. If I were to solve the problem, I would separate the business part of the Army from the Army itself, as they have done in France. I would have at the head of the Quartermaster's Department a business man. I would not have an Army officer at all, and that would furnish a complete solution of the real weakness in our military organization, to which the gentleman has called attention. The real weakness of the average Army officer is that he has no conception of the value of money and no knowledge of practical business.

Mr. MADDEN. If I may be permitted, if I had the power, I would allow the man who has technical knowledge to write the prescription, as I would allow the Army officer to outline the policy, but I would employ a man who understood how to spend money to fill the prescription.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman is exactly right about that. That is what ought to be done in the Army. The Quartermaster General ought to be a business man. The Army officers are not qualified to act as business men. That has been demonstrated in the last few years by useless expenditures for millions and millions of dollars' worth of stuff that we did not need. Under the stress of military necessity, our civil officers immediately laid down, and if an Army officer wanted to order, for instance, $100,000,000 worth of matches, he would order them, and they have just piled up things that they will never need or use in a hundred years, and, of course, there has been enormous waste.

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

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. I will just make this suggestion to the gentleman and leave it to him as to whether I am right. Does not the gentleman think the best thing that could happen to the West Pointer would be to be made to go out and work for two years and hustle for a living?

Mr. GORDON. No.

Mr. LITTLE. I think a practical education would make a better man and a better soldier of him. If he did that, he would make a better officer in the Army.

Mr. GORDON. No. I think the officers educated at West Point are the finest officers and the best equipped, physically and mentally, in the world. You might as well look at the question just as it is.

Mr. LITTLE. Did the gentleman say the best in the world?

Mr. GORDON. Yes. Because Col. LITTLE made a fine officer without a military education he assumes that no education is necessary. I think he makes the same mistake that I referred to in my opening remarks in regard to a college education. Education does not hurt anybody, and to say that an officer can be over-educated in military matters, it seems to me, is absurd.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. I think perhaps the gentleman can give me some information. The usual course at West Point is four years?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. But after the war came on it was shortened to three years, and then to two, and then to one.

Mr. GORDON. Yes; they started in a system of rushing and cramming the boys up there and graduating them ahead of their time.

Mr. HAMLIN. Now, what I want to know, and this is purely for information, can the gentleman tell us whether the four-year course will be resumed shortly?

Mr. GORDON. That is a matter which is now under consideration, and we have just received a copy of a report from the academic board, which report is now under consideration by the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of War, but no report has been made upon it. That is a matter which is now the subject of discussion, but it is not involved in this bill at all.

Mr. HAMLIN. I will ask another question which perhaps the gentleman is not prepared to answer, but I want him to think about it. Will the young men who have been graduated prematurely, as compared to the old system, be permitted to reenter?

Mr. GORDON. They are going to send them back. They have sent back one class already, and I think it is the intention to return them all to finish their education.

Mr. HAMLIN. I did not know how that was.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is there no law fixing the length of service at West Point?

Mr. GORDON. There is not. That is my understanding about it. It is a matter of regulation.

Mr. MANN. Purely a matter of regulation?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Who regulates that?

Mr. GORDON. The Secretary of War.

Mr. MANN. There was a law as to Annapolis.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes. If I am in error about what I have just stated, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The gentleman is not in error as to the fact at present, but the change is a recent one, and I will submit an amendment presently to cover that very situation. The academic board were requested by Gen. March to make a report on whether or not the course could be shortened.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Gen. March asked the academic board to make a report as to whether or not the curriculum could be shortened. This academic board is made up of the various professors and instructors of that institution, including the superintendent. That board unanimously reported against any change in the four-year course. They reported that the four years could not be shortened by placing any part of the instruction in the remaining three years, because the time of the boys was fully taken up now, and they would not have any time to include any more studies, and that the only way in which the course could be shortened would be by cutting off either the last year's course or the first year's course. If they cut off the last year's course the student would be deprived of all military instruction, because in that last year is included the principal military instruction received by the boys at that institution. If they cut off the first year's course they would raise the standard so high that only college graduates could be permitted to enter the institution, and the high-school graduates and boys whom we have been accustomed to appoint would be excluded.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Before the war was the length of the course a matter of regulation?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Until very recently it was fixed by law at a four-year course, but recently it has been changed, and is now a matter of regulation.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. When was the change made?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I can not recall, but it is a recent change. The result has been that the Chief of Staff is taking steps, without the permission of Congress, to alter the course at the Military Academy, or he is making inquiries along that line, and I am going to ask this body to adopt an amendment fixing the course at four years.

Mr. MANN. I was under the impression that we had authorized the graduation of classes before the regular time.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. You can do that in time of war.

Mr. MANN. We have done it.

Mr. GORDON. I thank the gentleman. I will say, in further answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois, that another plan has been suggested, and that is to convert West Point back into an engineering school, building another institution to deal with other subjects. Upon the question of shortening the course at West Point, it seems to me that their plan is well worthy of consideration by Congress. My impression was that the length of the course at West Point was a matter purely of regulation and had been ever since I have been in Congress. If I am in error about that I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think the change ought to be left to Congress and not to the Chief of Staff?

Mr. GORDON. No; I do not think so. I think that if the Congress has any comprehensive plan it is satisfied to adopt it ought to go ahead and do it, but unless it has it ought to be a matter of regulation on the theory that military training requires a matter of expert knowledge.

Mr. DENISON. The greatest complaint I have heard against the institution is that there is there taught, or there grows up there, a spirit of snobbery or military caste which makes the man that comes out have contempt for other men who go into the military service. Has the gentleman any suggestion by which Congress or the department could take some action that would democratize the institution and get rid of that tyranny?

Mr. GORDON. I do not think there is any legislation that would cure the difficulty. The real truth about it is, the thing which the gentleman complains of is incident to the Military Establishment, and especially the Military Establishment of the United States. Our military system was organized by Baron von Steuben, who had been a Prussian officer on the staff of Frederick the Great. He came to the United States early in the Revolutionary War and cast his lot with us, gave his services to us, spent the remainder of his life in this country, and died here. He was a very distinguished officer and, of course, he gave us the Prussian system. He was the first Inspector General of the United States Army, and naturally the system which he planted here has continued in the same lines in the Regular Army.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Does the gentleman think, in view of the results that have been accomplished in the last four years by the Prussian system, that we should adhere to it?

Mr. GORDON. I will tell you that if you want a first-class military system you can not find a better one than the Prussian system. That has been demonstrated in this war. Of course, I want you to understand that I am opposed to it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. But they got licked, did they not?

Mr. GORDON. Finally, but it was some job. [Laughter.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I wish to make a few remarks about a subject which I expect every Member present is more or less familiar with, and that is order No. 77, promulgated some time ago by the War Department, whereby is was supposed that the boys in the military service might be relieved by making a proper showing. Every Congressman who represents an agricultural district is being besieged by his constituents asking why it is that after they have complied with the requirements of this order they can not get action, let alone favorable action, on their petitions. We were led to believe by the order that if a farmer made application for the relief of his son, who was wanted on the farm, and filed with it the proper affidavits of disinterested people as to the facts set forth in the application that he was needed on the farm, unless there was great reason why he should not be relieved he would be permitted to go home and do work on the farm. Thousands and thousands of farmers have filed these applications. They have been absolutely ignored in most cases. I do not know who is at fault, but there ought to be some remedy applied.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I had a letter this morning from the Secretary of War, stating that it was not the policy of the War Department to discharge a man because he had a position awaiting him at home.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Then they have misled every Member of this House. I have been misled by this order 77. I want to call the attention of the House to a case, and I dare say I am but reiterating your own experience. I have a case where there is a position awaiting a young man at $150 a month. He is supposed to be occupying a position of clerk in the Army, but as a matter of fact he makes the beds and washes windows, and they say they can get nobody to take his place. I asked for a report on this from The Adjutant General's office the 8th of last month. The Adjutant General informs me—and I have no reason to doubt he is telling the truth—that he has called again and again for a report in reference to the case, but down to this good hour the officer in command of that company does not deign to give him an answer.

I have another case where a widow living in Benton County, Ind., whose husband died since her boy entered the Army, filed an application with the necessary supporting affidavit that her son was her sole reliance and that she could not get along on the farm without his help; that she needed him for the purpose of farming 160 acres of land. The captain receiving the application acknowledged the receipt of the same and expressed some delight at the sufficiency of it. But he said that "while it is true the armistice is signed, it does not necessarily follow that peace will be declared, and your son is a member of the Thirty-fourth Field Artillery, a combat unit, and to discharge him or any other member of this unit would have a depressing effect on the peace congress now being held in Paris." [Laughter.]

I took the letter from that captain to The Adjutant General of the United States more than three weeks ago and asked that it be investigated, and I suggested that a captain who had no more sense than to write a letter of that kind was not fit to command pigs, let alone men. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Has the gentleman any idea that this captain is one of those that we have been hearing about who wants to keep the company in order that he may keep his captaincy?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not know; but I do know this——

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

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do know this, that in one of these camps there is a captain who was a sergeant in the Regular Army before we got into this war. He was getting $44 a month as a sergeant. He was made a captain. He gets $200 a month as a captain and he gets $44 for commutation of quarters and another small sum for commutation of light. Then he gets his fogies, which, by reason of his service in the United States Army, amount to $60, so that in all he is getting $320 a month as captain. The very minute that he loses his position as captain he goes back into the Regular Establishment at $44 a month. That gentlemen has made the remark that he proposes to hold on to what he has as long as he can.

There is another thing to which I desire to direct your attention, and if gentlemen do not know that what I am telling is true they can find out by inquiry, for it is prevalent in almost every camp in the United States. There are companies with five and six and seven captains, with five and six and seven first lieutenants, and with five and six and seven second lieutenants. Perhaps they may have a dozen privates. What are they doing there? Yet you can absolutely get no relief either by addressing a telegram or a letter to these commanding officers, and you can get no relief by going to The Adjutant General of the United States. He seems to be absolutely impotent to give any satisfactory reply to any inquiry involving this want of consideration on the part of these petty officers.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Would it not be possible for this House to obtain some information in respect to this inter-

esting situation by requesting these gentlemen on the Military Affairs Committee to report to us in relation to it? What are they here for?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That may be, but the time is soon coming when the Congress of the United States will be held responsible by constituents for this condition of affairs, for, after all, these gentlemen are not monarchs of all they survey. They are answerable to the Congress of the United States, and it strikes me that in the interest of the farmer, in the interest of the business man of this country, who are alike interested in seeing some order come out of this chaos, the Congress of the United States ought to take some action requiring the Secretary of War to inaugurate some scheme whereby Members of this Congress will be treated at least with respect, and where at least The Adjutant General of the Army will be treated with some respect, and some provision made that these men answer his inquiries.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, reverting to the fact of so many captains to the same company, a matter which can be easily established, has the gentleman any possible explanation of why it is?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The only explanation that I have heard from even those who are attempting to defend this thing is that they are being held there until some place can be assigned to them where they may be of real service. They are being held in these places where there are five and six and seven captains and five and six and seven first lieutenants and five and six and seven second lieutenants for the purpose of drawing their salaries, and nothing more.

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

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. These companies of which the gentleman speaks, where there are so many captains and first and second lieutenants, the gentleman does not mean to say are Infantry or Artillery companies, does he? Surely he is referring perhaps to the Motor Transport Corps.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They are not all in the Motor Transport Corps by a long measure. They are very much diversified, and I dare say that you will find there is no branch that is entirely guiltless when it comes to this thing. The Congress of the United States, in the last analysis, is responsible for the conduct of the Army, for we are the ones that provide the regulations that are supposed to control it, and our constituencies will be looking to those who are responsible for its control to furnish them the relief that has been promised by the Secretary of War and which is being denied, and because of which so much hardship is resulting.

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

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Has the gentleman any concrete idea that he would like to suggest? If so, the Military Committee would like to have it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think it would be a good idea for the Committee on Military Affairs to adopt some plan whereby soldiers who are needed in civil life can be released for the purpose of entering civil pursuits where they are needed, and whereby their requests would not be dependent upon the whim or caprice of these petty officers. [Applause.]

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

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to one other concrete case which came to my attention today. This is the case of a young man from Jasper County, Ind., who is wanted at home for the purpose of managing 1,500 acres of land. His mother is a widow and joint owner with a brother who is incapacitated by illness. I have asked repeatedly for the discharge of this boy, furnishing all of the required proofs and affidavits, and get this character of answer: The commanding officer says that while it is most commendable that this man should want to go home and help supply food for the country in the conduct of 1,500 acres of land, it is likewise commendable that he stay there where he is a valuable man in the discharge of his services as a clerk, thus showing that these commanding officers do not intend that their convenience shall not be interfered with, no matter how important the case presented for a discharge may be.

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

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House know that I am not prone to bring in mere kicks or to deal in matters connected with "sore toes," "sore heads," or anything of that kind. The matter just referred to, however, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] has been a real abuse. Either the War Department has tried to put something over on the soldiers and their families in this country or the orders issued by the War Department, apparently in good faith, have not been carried out.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Just for a question. I desire to finish in the five minutes.

Mr. LONDON. Is not the real complaint that heads of the Army seem to have no plan in reference to demobilization?

Mr. TILSON. That may be.

Mr. LONDON. Is not that the real trouble?

Mr. TILSON. I am not sure. Here are the facts. I always try to deal in facts. Instead of criticizing anybody I like to present the facts, and if those facts hit anybody on the head, all right. I am not responsible for the facts, except to bring them before you. The War Department, on the 21st of November, issued Circular 77, which says that—

> Department commanders within the United States, commanders of ports of embarkation, and commanders of camps not under the jurisdiction of department commanders or of chiefs of bureaus of the War Department are authorized to discharge enlisted men upon their own application when there is sickness or other distress in the soldier's family or when he is needed to resume employment in an industry or occupation in which there is urgent need of his service.

Circular No. 77 was not lived up to fully by all commanding officers, so on January 6 Circular No. 6 was issued by the department. It says:

> Applications for immediate discharge under the provisions of Circular No. 77, War Department, 1918, will be acted upon as expeditiously as possible, and the applicants will be informed without unnecessary delay of the action taken. Deserving cases should be investigated, and where the applicants have not correctly or fully stated their reasons for asking immediate discharge, officers should render such assistance as may be necessary to correct them so that the application may be properly presented and acted upon.

These circulars, fairly construed, indicate an honest intention on the part of the War Department to release the men therein described.

If there were good reasons why no men whatsoever should be demobilized or good reasons why the entire Army should be demobilized by units, and the War Department had so announced, then there would not have been the same ground for complaint. The gist of my complaint is that either these orders were not issued in good faith or that they have not been lived up to in good faith.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman is on the Committee on Military Affairs and probably knows more about the policy of the War Department in respect to demobilization in this country than the ordinary Member of Congress.

Mr. TILSON. I try to know something about the subject, but have not succeeded very well.

Mr. GARNER. What is the policy of the War Department in reference to demobilization of the Army on the American Continent? I saw a statement in the newspapers that Gen. March said that within 30 days they will be all demobilized. I wanted to know if the gentleman knows——

Mr. TILSON. I do not.

Mr. GARNER (continuing). What the policy is and whether they are going to demobilize all of them in 30 days or not.

Mr. TILSON. I know only what is vouchsafed to us through the public press in regard to demobilization. Through the official orders issued by the War Department I try to get information——

Mr. GARNER. I understand you have been having hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. TILSON. On the appropriation bill.

Mr. GARNER. It does seem to me that the gentleman could have gotten from some man in authority what is to be the policy in reference to demobilization of the Army in this country.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] in charge of the deficiency bill, which covers the earth, stated the other day in response to a question which I put to him that the Army officials before the Committee on Appropriations, the proper officials, stated that all of the troops in this country would be demobilized within 30 days' time. Of course, I do not believe——

Mr. GARNER. That word "all" means a great deal.

Mr. MANN. The statement was made. It did not mean everybody in the Army, because the Committee on Military Affairs has not yet reported the bill providing for any Regular Army or enlistments in a regular way.

Mr. GARNER. If all troops are to be demobilized in 30 days, of course these complaints will cease at that time, but I do not understand that they will demobilize all, because they would have to keep sufficient troops to take care of the different camps, and so forth.

Mr. TILSON. Even if what the gentleman suggests takes place that does not take care of the real grievance which these men have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TILSON. Can I have three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Secretary of War did appear before the committee, and this particular question was asked him. His direct testimony was that they could dismiss these men faster by units than they could in an attempt to investigate the individual cases. The Chief of Staff has stated, as the gentleman from Texas has called to our attention, that inside of 30 days all the units in this country would be dismissed, except those necessary for the preservation of the different camps, and that a different policy has been declared.

Mr. TILSON. Here is one of the many reasons why the instructions of the War Department have not been carried out. Circular No. 77, signed by the Chief of Staff, was dated November 21. I hold in my hand an order issued by a company commander on December 16, 1918, nearly a month after the order of the Chief of Staff had been in full effect. It reads as follows:

OFFICE MOTOR TRANSPORT COMPANY No. 377,
Camp Bragg, N. C., December 16, 1918.

No further action will be taken in regard to discharges. Commanding officer will not discuss the matter with anyone until definite information as to possibility of securing same can be obtained from higher authority.

This is signed by W. S. Patteson, first lieutenant, Motor Transport Company, at Camp Bragg, N. C. I have in my possession evidence to the effect that a number of applications were filed, coming clearly within the terms of Circular No. 77, giving indisputable cases of dependence, cases that would have exempted men under the selective-draft law if they had been presented, and yet this high and mighty first lieutenant refuses even to accept the applications and posts an order over his own signature to the effect that no further action will be taken in regard to discharges. As I have the official order with the signature of this mighty warrior, I shall insert it as a part of my remarks if permitted to do so.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield.

Mr. DENT. I understood the gentleman to make the statement a moment ago that the regulations had not been properly carried out by those in authority.

Mr. TILSON. That is my belief.

Mr. DENT. I am sure the gentleman does not mean to say that the General Staff and the Secretary of War did not issue the order in good faith?

Mr. TILSON. I did not mean to say that at all. I say it has not been carried out; but I am of the opinion that it might have been carried out better if authority higher up had informed subordinate commanders that full compliance with the letter and spirit of these orders would be insisted upon.

Mr. DENT. Now, I want to ask the gentleman, inasmuch as he is a very valuable member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House——

Mr. TILSON. Thank you.

Mr. DENT. In this individual case did he call that to the attention of the War Department? I have had similar cases, and I found when I called them to the attention of the War Department they were straightened out.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GARNER. I know a number of cases similar to the one the gentleman refers to, and they have sent them to the War Department and can not get a reply from them.

Mr. TILSON. I have had cases both ways. In some cases I have gotten relief; others I have not. However, the attitude of the War Department has been a surprise to me in this, that its efforts to hold subordinates to a strict compliance with orders have taken the form of a mild request, as if to implore these lieutenants to please discharge these men from the service.

Mr. GARNER. In reference to the good faith of Order No. 77, undoubtedly we must assume that it was issued in good faith; but I want to call the gentleman's attention to one fact, that I have not heard up to date where a lieutenant, a captain, or a major, or anybody else, has been reprimanded or otherwise punished for his failure to carry out that order.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman has stated the crux of this whole matter. That is the place where the War Department lays itself open to a charge of lack of good faith, namely, in not seeing to it that these officers are called to account for their failure to live up to the spirit and letter of the orders publicly promulgated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting the order which I read to the House and a letter accompanying it.

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

The following is the order and the letter referred to:

OFFICE MOTOR TRANSPORT COMPANY No. 377,
CAMP BRAGG, N. C., *December 16, 1918.*

No further action will be taken in regard to discharges. Commanding officer will not discuss the matter with anyone until definite information as to possibility of securing same can be obtained from higher authority.

W. S. PATTESON,
First Lieut. M. T. C., Acting Motor Transport Officer.

1. As per letter January 3, the following is submitted on the above subject:

A. Keeping up morale at Camp Bragg.

Great difficulty is experienced in maintaining morale among voluntary enlisted men who have been in service for periods ranging from 16 to 10 months when so many draftees are obtaining discharges. This difficulty is increased by publication in newspapers of irresponsible and incorrect statements, such as speech of Representative TILSON, of Connecticut, in House of Representatives, January 15. This same speech has caused discontent and unrest at this station, where conditions absolutely require personnel to be kept in service.

In order to combat this influence soldiers are being given as much freedom as is possible, and efforts are being made to provide social entertainments. It being found that civilians in near-by town of Fayetteville charged admission prices for dances far beyond the means of men in uniform, "a soldier-boys club" has been organized by personnel of Motor Transport Company No. 377 and Companies A and B, of Forty-sixth Infantry, stationed here as guards, which provides dances at reasonable rates in cooperation with certain people in Fayetteville having the welfare of the soldiers at heart. The first dance given by this club was held Wednesday, January 15, and has been pronounced as the most enjoyable social function that has taken place in that town for some time. It is contemplated to have a masquerade in the near future. It is also contemplated that this organization will put on a minstrel show or some other form of entertainment in the near future.

W. S. PATTESON, *Motor Transport Officer.*

—

JANUARY 22, 1919.

Representative JOHN Q. TILSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I trust you will pardon the liberty I am taking in addressing this letter to you, but I have been requested by one of the men still in service to present the following facts to your attention:

Your speech as reported in a recent issue of the New York World, in which you stated that some officers in the Army were not carrying out their instructions in regard to discharging men of their commands, as they wish to retain their present positions, was absolutely correct and "hits the nail square on the head."

I would like to call your attention to the following facts concerning Motor Transport Corps 377, now stationed at Camp Bragg, Fayetteville, N. C. This corps was formed with enlisted men 16 or 18 months ago, with the distinct promise to all the men who enlisted therein that they would see immediate overseas service. This promise was never fulfilled, and up to a month ago they were permanently attached to Camp Merritt, N. J., where they did all the construction work as well as troop movement, this being the port of embarkation. The "boys" did not complain, although they were very anxious to get across, as they realized that somebody had to do the work on this side. They worked hard and "did their bit" cheerfully, and their work brought forth words of praise from the commanding officers of the camp.

Last December they were ordered to report to Camp Bragg, N. C., and left Camp Merritt on the 3d of that month driving their two-ton Pierce-Arrow trucks over the road. They arrived at Camp Bragg December 12.

The commanding officer of this company is First Lieut. William S. Patteson, whose home is in Penn Yan, N. Y. Before Lieut. Patteson entered the Army he was holding down a position in his father's lumber mill at a salary of not more than $15 or $20 a week. Several of the men in his command come from his home town and knew him intimately for many years before he entered the Army. They will vouch for the truth of the above statement. Lieut. Patteson has many times expressed the wish that he did not want to get out of the Army before being commissioned a captain, and in that case he would remain in the Army for several years yet. He realizes that if his command is demobilized he will lose his present job, and consequently has done everything in his power to prevent the discharging of his men. He absolutely refuses even to discuss the matter of discharges with his men and has told several of them who have insisted on trying to take this very important matter up with him that he would see to it that they would be the last to be discharged, as they refused to follow the order he had posted on the bulletin board and which I am inclosing. This order speaks for itself.

He also will not issue any of the forms for applying for discharges, as he says they would not get any further than his hands. Before the company left Camp Merritt the questionnaires for discharges were filled out by all the members of the company, but that is all that ever happened to them. They are still locked up in the company safe.

Camp Bragg, as you no doubt know, is still being constructed, and except for two guard companies and M. T. C. 377 there are no other enlisted organizations on the reservation. The camp has not been turned over to the Government and will not be for a long time yet, as

the building process is very slow. The contractors are in charge, and the men feel that they are in the same position as a gang of convicts hired out by a State government to a contracting company. They are doing absolutely nothing that is conducive to maintaining the troops still on the other side or helping in any way the return of those troops. If such was the case there would not be a word of complaint. As it is they are absolutely wasting their time, and as most of the men have families who are dependent on them for their support, this delay in being discharged is working a real hardship on them.

Since the company has arrived in Camp Bragg not one of the Government Pierce-Arrow trucks has turned a wheel, as it is utterly impossible for them to be operated on account of the heavy sand and impassable roads in and around the camp. They have just stood out in the rain and are deteriorating from the effects of the elements. This in itself is a big loss to the Government, as the large sum of money that is represented by these 30 trucks is not paying a single dollar on the investment. The only work the company is now doing is to drive civilian foremen of the constructing company and a few officers around in Fords.

There was a report from Camp Jesup, Atlanta, Ga., that they would not send any extra parts to keep the Fords running, as they understood that the camp was to be demobilized. Whether this is true or not, I can not say at the present moment. Lieut. Patteson has gone down there, and if he follows out his usual policy he will no doubt do everything in his power to have this order canceled, if it is true.

Lieut. Patteson is woefully lacking in knowledge concerning motor trucks and automobiles. After being in command of a truck company as long as he has one would think that he would at least know something concerning the working of a motor, but such does not seem to be the case. The other day he displayed this ignorance by asking in all seriousness if a Ford motor had valves in it. He is absolutely incompetent to command a company, and it has always been a mystery to his men how he ever managed to receive a commission.

I am also inclosing a true copy of the weekly letter sent to headquarters at Camp Jesup. I think that also speaks for itself. I might add that Lieut. Patteson had absolutely nothing to do with getting up the dance he mentions, as the boys did it themselves on their own initiative. As for the "Soldier Boys' Club," they have never heard of it.

Trusting that you may be good enough to look into this matter and see if something can not be done, so that the boys may soon be returned to their families, I have taken the liberty of writing you. All the boys ask for is a square deal, and they do not feel that they are getting it under the existing conditions. They have gladly done their bit and worked hard, with no hope of the glory and praise that falls to the lot of the men who were lucky enough to be sent over. What they are complaining about is the fact that they are now nothing but "meal tickets" for Lieut. Patteson.

Very truly, yours,

ONE WHO IS DEPENDENT ON ONE OF THESE BOYS.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, returning to the Academy bill, for the purpose of the information of the House, I wanted to submit a report of the academic board on the subject of a course of study at the United States Military Academy at West Point, for the purpose of having the same inserted in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the extension referred to:

REPORT OF ACADEMIC BOARD.

From: The general committee.
To: The Superintendent United States Military Academy.
Subject: Course of study at the United States Military Academy.

1. In compliance with the third and fourth paragraphs, War Department letter of November 16, 1918 (File No. 351.1 West Point), the general committee submits the following report covering the suggestions therein relative to a revision of the course of study at the Military Academy.

2. In its deliberations upon the proposed revision of the curriculum the general committee has been guided by its conception of the functions of the Military Academy. The functions are to graduate young men capable of at once performing the duties of junior officers and with the fundamental moral and mental training which will insure them the ability to use their rational faculties to the fullest advantage under the varied conditions of the service, such ability being the most useful result of education, and which with after years of development will enable them competently to fill positions of leadership and high responsibility. In the military profession the graduates of the Military Academy should set the standard of the Army. Upon this standard depends the ability of the country to organize and employ without undue wastage its military resources.

3. With these functions of the Military Academy constantly in mind, the general committee is unanimous in the opinion that the quality of the graduates is of far greater importance than the number. Even should Congress in its reorganization of the Army largely increase the peace establishment, the committee believes that it would be a mistake to allow the need for a large number of junior officers to force a general lowering of the Military Academy standards. Such a demand should be met by the establishment of other academies.

It has never been the policy of the Government to draw its officers exclusively from the Military Academy. Indeed, it is doubtful whether such a policy would be desirable. The opportunity offered to enlisted men and to graduates of other institutions to gain commissions has been an inspiration to many and has resulted in the addition of a large number of efficient officers to the Army. By the existing policy, however, in which the Military Academy graduates form only a part of the officers, the necessity for the high quality of its graduates is accentuated, as it should be their province to set the standards of professional training and character for the whole Army. Any plan, then, which would result in lowering the standards of the Military Academy graduates would react injuriously on the Army as a whole.

4. The importance of this emphasis upon quality is revealed by the experience of the war which has just ceased. The enormous expansion of the Army, involving complicated duties of organized equipment, transportation, supply, training, and leadership, required a large number of general officers of ability. For the supply of such officers the Government naturally and rightly looked first to the graduates of the Military Academy. From such graduates of 30 or more years of service the Government selected most of its general officers.

5. In support of the statement just made, the following statistics are given from the best information available:

Class.	Number in active service.	General officers.	Percentage.
1880	13	9	69.2
1881	19	13	68.4
1882	11	10	90.9
1883	22	16	72.7
1884	20	15	75.0
1885	13	11	84.6
1886	36	25	69.4
1887	36	26	72.2
1888	26	23	88.5
1889	28	14	50.0
1890	35	22	62.9
1891	40	17	42.5
1892	43	12	27.9

The average percentage appointed general officers from the classes of 1880 to 1888, inclusive, is 76.8.

6. From the facts cited in paragraphs 4 and 5, it is evident that in attempting to fulfill its immediate functions, the Military Academy is also training the material for future general officers in times of crisis and capable in the meanwhile of maintaining a high standard of professional efficiency in the Regular Army. If the graduation requirements are lowered to a point where the fundamental education and training are an insufficient foundation upon which to build, then the graduates of the Military Academy will no longer be able to qualify themselves for the positions they must fill in peace and war. The emphasis in the past upon quality rather than quantity, and the present urgent recommendation of the committee that this emphasis be maintained in the future are thus justified.

7. The course of study at the Military Academy has been mathematical and scientific, and it should continue so. The military profession is scientific and technical in character, far more so than formerly and certainly to become increasingly so in the future. The committee thinks that the profession of an officer in our Army is more likely to demand men of character and logical power than simply men of information and knowledge; the committee is convinced that the power and habit of clear, exact, and logical thought engendered by the proper study of mathematics and in the application of mathematical principles and processes to mechanics, engineering, electricity, ordnance, and other practical sciences are the best assets that can be provided our graduates, and the academy should supply them. The work of the graduates in this war, as in our past wars, has proved that the character of the course of study is essentially sound. The system has been adequately tested, and it has stood the tests. Graduates from all parts of the classes have shown their ability to develop the professional knowledge required, even though such development after graduation from the academy has been allowed to be largely individual and voluntary. No radical change in the system at the Military Academy should be made. Preserving the present character, the course should be developed and improved in every way possible. Such development and improvement the various heads of the departments are continually striving to introduce.

8. The criticism that a course of mathematical and scientific character contains subject matter not apparently of direct application in this or that branch of the service is answered by the fact that the Military Academy is not training or educating officers for only a particular branch of the service, nor does it claim to prepare a finished product in any branch of the service. It is giving a sound basis of education, which by proper effort upon the part of a young officer can be readily expanded to meet any other minor scientific activities of the service; of such activities there always have been and must continue to be a large number in the hands of line officers. This basic education is also the foundation upon which any officer may safely build in preparing himself for the duties and responsibilities of higher command. The value of the Military Academy to the country is being judged to-day in large part by the work of its graduates of thirty or more years ago; not upon what was actually taught them as cadets but upon the adequacy of their mental training and character, as a foundation for their later development.

9. If the character of the course of study is to remain essentially mathematical, and the course itself is to remain essentially scientific and technical, as the committee believes they should, then no material change should be made in the relative times devoted to the scientific and to cultural subjects. The course is now all that the average cadet can carry, and any increase in one subject can only be accomplished by a corresponding decrease in some other. The mathematical and scientific subjects constitute a logical and continuous development, of which no step can be omitted. Any increase of the cultural subjects would necessitate the omission of some of the scientific subjects, a change which, in the opinion of the committee, would do a great deal more harm than good.

10. If the course of study at the Military Academy is to be shortened to three years it can be done in one of three ways:

(a) By a complete change in the whole character of the course.
(b) By cutting off a year at the end of the present course.
(c) By cutting off a year at the beginning of the present course.

11. If plan (a) is advocated, it must be with a view to the substitution, in a shortened course, of some cultural subjects for the mathematical and scientific subjects. In considering this plan it should be remembered that the military profession is more closely akin to the various branches of the engineering profession than to any other. For many years the Military Academy was the leading technological and scientific school of the country, graduating men who led in all the engineering activities of our country at the same time that it was sending forth such soldiers as Grant and Lee, Sherman and Joseph E. Johnston, George H. Thomas and Stonewall Jackson, and others. The important and technical nature of the duties of our Engineer officers is well known, but the great variety of minor engineering activities that are often required of line officers is not generally known.

The duties of line officers in our Army are more varied and more comprehensive than in any other military service in the world; these are constantly detailed to duties requiring technical knowledge. The quartermasters of our service are, very many of them, line officers detailed to that duty; they build posts, quarters, and all the various utilities which pertain to posts, with all their mechanical accessories, and keep

the same in constant repair. Then, too, owing to the smallness of our Engineer Corps and the fact of the great amount of civil work imposed upon it, line officers frequently have to perform the duties of engineers.

In field operations in time of war with our small Engineer Corps it is increasingly essential that many line officers should be capable of performing the duties of field engineers and be able to construct various forms of emergency bridges, field works, build roads, repair railways and telegraphs, erect temporary structures—in short, to meet the requirements of temporary exigency. In addition to this it is of the first importance that line officers should be able to conduct military topographical surveys and reconnoissances and prepare field maps. It is a matter of record that our line officers in recent years, as well as formerly, have performed every variety of scientific duty above enumerated and others not mentioned.

In this connection it is deemed hardly necessary to mention, but it should not be forgotten that the technical nature of all the material appliances of war is far greater than ever before, and this applies to means of transport as well as to all weapons of combat, on land and in the air; if our officers are to be more than skilled craftsmen in the technical duties of the service, their mathematical and scientific attainments can not possibly be diminished.

The committee is convinced that for the purely practical purpose of being able to perform intelligently the duties likely to devolve upon graduates, as well as for the reasons given in paragraph 7, the course at the academy must be scientific rather than cultural. No engineering school would think of substituting cultural for necessary scientific studies.

Were this school being inaugurated for the first time some of the issues here presented would lack the test of experience, but West Point has been tested by the varied exigencies of a century of national growth. From the beginning of the last century to the close of the present war in every important activity of the Nation's life the influence of its graduates has been felt and universally recognized, at critical times often directing and exerting a decisive influence. A full discussion of this subject can not be here undertaken, but the overwhelming evidence as to the efficiency of the academy's work shows that it is not the result of accident or chance; the worth of its individuality has been proven beyond a doubt. The committee is convinced that any experiment would be unwise which would disintegrate or materially modify the influences which result from the character and scope of its curriculum, its discipline, its traditions, and its admirable system of instruction, upon all of which depend the results of the academy's work.

12. If plan (b) is to be followed the subjects covered during the last year of the present four-year course, including law, Spanish, ordnance and gunnery, and civil and military engineering (covering fortifications, army organization, and military history) will have to be omitted. These subjects can not be added to those taught in the earlier years of the course, for the work of those years is already as heavy as the average cadet can bear. Certain of these subjects, too, as ordnance and gunnery and civil engineering, rest upon the previous courses of study and can not be properly taught until the completion of those courses. All of these subjects except Spanish are essentially military, and their entire omission in the education of an officer would be inconceivable.

13. It may be suggested by some that these subjects of the last year of the Military Academy course can be taught in the service schools. The committee fails to see any advantage in such a system. The necessary plant is already available at the Military Academy; the students are under full control; their pay is that of cadets; the training and teaching staffs are already organized and efficient. The change of system would require the organization of new departments in the service schools, entailing a waste of effort by duplication; the supply of considerable equipment at large expense; and the payment of the students on the status of officers instead of that of cadets.

14. Under plan (c), the Military Academy course would be shortened to three years by increasing the entrance requirements to cover one year's work. The entrance requirements would then include algebra (complete), plane and solid geometry, plane trigonometry, English grammar, English composition and literature, history, geography, and beginners' French. Inasmuch as successful mastery of the advanced courses in the academy depends upon the thoroughness of instruction in the fundamental branches, the only proper test for entrance to such three-year course would be by examination. The only way by which qualified candidates can be secured in the various sections of the country for such a course is by State-wide competitive examinations.

Under the conditions thus set forth, namely, admission by State-wide competitive examinations, covering algebra (complete), plane and solid geometry, plane trigonometry, English grammar, English composition and literature, history, geography, and beginners' French, the general committee could and would approve a three-year course, and believes that the academy could continue to graduate men well qualified for later development. These conditions are the only conditions upon which the general committee believes that it would be justified in recommending that a three-year course be established.

15. If the three-year course under the conditions indicated in paragraph 14 be considered desirable, certain practical difficulties must be faced and solved before attempting to put it into effect. If these difficulties do not permit of solution, the committee believes that the attempt to introduce a three-year course should be abandoned. These difficulties are as follows:

(a) Enlisted men would be no longer able to qualify. Even with the present requirements, very few enlisted men qualify; with increased requirements, probably none could do so without extensive furloughs for special preparation.

(b) The entrance requirements would lose touch with the public free-school system, for few public schools cover thoroughly all the subjects in the proposed entrance requirements.

(c) Few of the most desirable class of young men would present themselves for examination. The class of young men who by their college work would be considered most desirable would normally have progressed so far toward completing their education for business or profession that they would not care to exchange their college for the Military Academy. Experience has shown that even under peace conditions few young men leave college to enter the Military Academy; in the absence of compulsory military service no greater number is to be expected as a result of increased entrance requirements.

16. The question of the length of the course of study is thus seen to be dependent upon the question of whether there is any widespread desire on the part of young men of good scholastic ability to come to the Military Academy. The evidence presented by the many failures on the present entrance examinations and by the general character of the certificate now submitted for admission indicates that there is not. It seems probable that a substantial increase in the entrance requirements would bar much of the material now seeking admission, and the committee sees no reason to believe that any higher class of material would present itself if the requirements were raised.

The general committee believes that the difficulties mentioned in paragraph 15 are insurmountable.

17. If the War Department agrees with the committee in believing the difficulties involved in increasing the entrance requirements to be insurmountable, the committee is thoroughly convinced that the existing four-year course of a scientific and technical character should be followed in its essentials in the future. This present system is very desirable. The full period of the collegiate education is covered here, so that thoroughness can be required at all stages. It places the cadet under full control before he has developed beyond the impressionable stage in the majority of cases, so that the military discipline, physical training, and moral influences of the academy have their maximum effect.

18. In determining the length of the course at the Military Academy little weight should be given to any arguments based upon the lengths of the courses at foreign military schools. Compulsory military service enables entrance standards to be set at discretion and the material to be chosen with care. The Military Academy must continue to offer a collegiate education and be satisfied with the character of material attracted.

19. The committee does not feel justified in submitting at this time any recommendation based upon the relation of the Military Academy to the post-graduate schools. All of these schools are now closed, so far as their regular work is concerned, and the committee assumes that modifications of the former courses will be desirable as a result of the experience in this war. The committee believes that there should be thorough coordination of the work of the post-graduate schools with that of the Military Academy and to that end recommends that, as soon as conditions clear up enough to give some definite idea of what the future is to be, a board be appointed, on which the Military Academy and all branches of the service shall be represented, to formulate a general plan for the educational system of the Army. The members of this board should be officers of rank and experience. The system of education, while taking care of the immediate needs of each branch of the service, should also provide for the broader development of officers with a view to their general usefulness in high command. The committee hopes that in the system adopted, which must primarily take into account the needs of the multitude of officers who are nongraduates, a way may be found to provide for the continuous development of the graduates of the Military Academy.

20. In conclusion the general committee desires to call attention to the fact that continual modifications in the curriculum are being made as the necessity of adjusting the course to changed conditions becomes evident. The committee has at no time regarded the course as fixed and rigid. As examples of such modifications in very recent years the following may be mentioned: (a) Establishment of the department of military hygiene; (b) formation of the department of English and history; (c) development of practical shop work in ordnance and gunnery; (d) reorganization of the instruction in drawing and military sketching; (e) changes in the department of chemistry, involving the omission of mineralogy and geology, the expansion of the work in electricity, and the preparation of a course in the principles of internal-combustion engines; (f) changes in the department of philosophy, involving the curtailment of work in astronomy, the introduction of fundamental instruction in physics, and the further development of the course in mechanics, including the mechanics of flight; (g) the temporary omission of Spanish and substitution of a longer course in French to meet the war emergency; (h) introduction of a supplementary course in minor tactics. The general committee earnestly desires that it should be recognized that the departments at the Military Academy are endeavoring constantly to adapt their work to the best interests of the service and the country.

[First indorsement.]

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY,
West Point, N. Y., December 13, 1918.

To THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF THE ARMY,
War Department, Washington, D. C.:

1. This report is approved by the academic board and fully concurred in by the superintendent in reference to letter from The Adjutant General of the Army, November 16, 1918. (351.1.)

(Signed) S. E. TILLMAN,
Colonel, United States Army, Superintendent.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, what are we to gather from the remarks to which we have listened to-day in criticism of the War Department? What lesson do they teach us? What do they mean? What do the gentlemen have in mind when they project into this body a series of assaults of the character that have been made upon our military system, and upon the high command, charged with the conduct of the war? Are we to gather that our whole military system is imbecile, unjust, and inefficient? Is that the lesson intended to be taught? Are we to understand that the Chief of Staff, the General Staff, Gen. Pershing, and everyone connected in a military way with the responsible management of our military affairs have been absolutely incapable, and wholly unjust, and unfair, in their dealings with inferior officers, and in the administration of the system over which they presided? If there is any responsibility for the alleged grievous wrongs, and acts of flagrant misconduct that have been recounted in our hearing, to whom is the responsibility for that long catalogue of injustice and misdoing intended to be imputed?

Let us look the facts of the situation squarely in the face. We sent Gen. Pershing to France with plenary power. I undertake to say that no military commander was ever put into the field with larger authority than was lodged in him with the

willing assent of this House. We gave him everything for which he asked. We were lavish both with respect to affording the means of warfare, and with respect to the authority for its conduct. If as suggested there has been absolute failure and breakdown of the military machine in France, who is the responsible man, or men, to be visited with our reprehension?

If these attacks are well founded, then some responsible head must be sought for this functional failure. One gentleman in the course of his remarks to-day, referred to some mysterious Leavenworth clique. Who and what is the Leavenworth clique, that is apparently superior to the commander in chief in charge of operations in France?

Are we prepared to believe, as Members of this House, that the Military Establishment in France teems with injustice, that capable men are demoted through military prejudice, and in utter disregard of the merits of their claims, that officers of confessed ability are unable to secure a fair hearing, that injustice runs rampant and triumphant? Supposedly we have had a commander in chief in France who has been popularly regarded as conducting a successful campaign to the entire satisfaction of the American people, and in conformity with the requirements of military propriety, as well as of military discipline. Where was the commander in chief, what had become of his authority, and headship, when this Leavenworth clique, whoever they may be, were perpetrating the wrongs that have been recited in our hearing? Were they able to do these things, without the knowledge of the man in supreme command, or did they perpetrate them in defiance of his authority? I repeat that if these wrongs were flagrant, and widespread, as intimated, upon whose shoulders is responsibility for the existence, and continuance of these misdeeds intended to be placed? Who is making the charge, who is demanding an inquiry? Where is the point upon which we may put our finger and say, "Here is where the responsibility rests"?

I am not here as the champion of any individual and certainly do not condone any act of injustice, or any collective acts of injustice; but an ex parte statement does not establish a case. If we accept at their full value the charges and complaints that have been made in the course of this legislative day, then they indicate one unescapable conclusion, and that is that the entire Military Establishment is incapable, imbecile, and flagrantly capricious and unjust. Is this House ready to accept that conclusion? I believe not. I believe that it will reserve judgment until it hears from the men who have been attacked either directly, or by necessary implication.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. It seems to me, without knowledge—and I am not criticizing—that the responsibility resides in the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Very well. Then that means that these attacks are upon Gen. Pershing.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. He is not commander in chief.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, you mean that the President is responsible? Very well. I will accept that proposition. He is undoubtedly ultimately responsible, but the more immediate responsibility must rest upon some one below him. Has it been shown in any wise in this body that the President has interfered in any way in France with respect to the exercise of authority by Gen. Pershing? Has it been shown in this body, or suggested, that as the result of mischievous interference by a civilian—for the President is but a civilian—the commander in chief in France has been in any wise hampered, or hindered in the enforcement of proper military discipline in the Army under his charge? If injustice has been done in France to individuals, or groups of individuals, if merit has been disregarded, if carping jealousies have prevailed, where a generous appreciation of duty well done, should have been manifested, is it suggested that it can be traced to some reprehensible interference by the President, with the supreme authority of the commander in charge of operations at the front? If so, those acts of hampering interference should be indicated, so that just responsibility may be placed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know who is responsible, and I do not know what the abuses are; but the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy constitutes his Cabinet, his Secretary of War, his Chief of Staff, his——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Who was the supreme military potentate in France? Gen. Pershing. During the progress of the war, this body has been asked from day to day, and from time to time, to stand by the high command in France, and we have never failed to give the support asked at our hands. I do not for a moment undertake to say that I believe that these assaults are just, but if they are well founded, then some one is responsible. If it is not intended to intimate that responsibility attaches to the commander in chief in France, to the supreme head of the military machine, in that area, then to what person or persons in authority, is responsibility supposed to attach? If an organization does not function properly, the man at the head is supposed to be at fault. Certainly in case of success, credit for that success is ascribed to the responsible head.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. Is the gentleman aware that Circular No. 77 does not apply at all to the troops under Gen. Pershing's command, but applies only to the troops in the United States?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am not talking about troops in the United States, but about operations in France, where the Leavenworth clique has been supposed to be doing, or to have done its mischievous work.

Mr. TEMPLE. And the criticisms have been directed largely to proceedings in the States.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed for five minutes more?

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The criticisms of the proceedings at home, are only a part of the general body of criticism. I am perfectly willing to take up the discussion of the cases at home. If there is some one in this country other than the military heads, the Chief of Staff, or the General Staff, who is responsible for any of these alleged wrongs, and doubtless some mistakes have been made, and some injustice has been committed, why may not the Committee on Military Affairs of this body investigate these cases, and fix responsibility on the appropriate parties? [Applause.]

Mr. BAER. You are right.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman would not desire to cover up anybody further down the line than the head?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not want to cover up anyone. On the contrary I want to uncover everybody, from the President down to the privates. I wish to fix responsibility where it belongs. As it is, the whole Army is being besmirched. A few months ago we were proud of our Army in France, men and officers. Keep up this continual inuendo, and imputation of systematic wrongdoing, and the public will not know what to think, or where credit should be given.

Mr. TILSON. Not the privates, but somebody down about to the grade of company or regimental commanders. Suppose they are not living up in good faith to the orders issued by the War Department itself. Does the gentleman think it is unjust criticism for us to suggest investigations, as we have to determine the facts in the case?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No.

Mr. TILSON. And to point out that they have failed to carry out the orders they have received?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No. That is not the question, though.

Mr. TILSON. It has been suggested here to-day that it is unjust to do that.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have not done so. Not a bit of it. I am upholding your hands. I ask you, a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, what have you done to investigate these cases, and establish responsibility? [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. I have at least 500 letters——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have as many, possibly.

Mr. TILSON. I have gone through them all, and from them I have selected a few and have presented them here to the House by way of extension of my remarks.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is just what I am protesting against. Why are you loading up the records of this House with matters which appropriately belong to your committee for investigation? [Applause.] Bring before your committee the men whom you think are responsible for this injustice, and when you deal with them you will find that this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, will uphold your committee. [Applause.] I wish to see specific action taken looking to the ascertainment of the merits of these complaints, and the fixation of responsibility.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman knows that members of the Military Affairs Committee on his own side of the House have opposed such action.

Mr. DENT. Name some of them.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Have you made any effort along this line? Have you undertaken to have any action taken by the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. TILSON. I have suggested to the House of Representatives some of the facts I have found.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Why not take specific action along the line I have indicated?

Mr. DENT. What is the specific action that the gentleman suggests?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will tell you what is the specific action that I favor.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. There is a specific statement made by the gentleman from Connecticut that a first lieutenant——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman. I wish to get at the facts in this matter.

Mr. DENT. I thought the gentleman yielded to me?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the gentleman from Alabama had not finished, certainly I yield to him.

Mr. DENT. I ask the gentleman if he has any concrete plan that the Military Affairs Committee could adopt that would correct the various individual cases? Unquestionably some of these individual cases are not getting just treatment.

In an organized Army of nearly 4,000,000 men it is impossible that there should not be such cases. Now, I want to know what the Military Affairs Committee of the House could do by resolution or by inquiry that would correct this situation?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I think I have in mind something that could be done.

Mr. DENT. I would like to have it. I want a practical suggestion.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will give you one for what it is worth, as a practical proposition. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has presented the facts of a specific case, which indicates that gross injustice has been done. Let him bring these facts to the attention of your committee and ask for an inquiry. I think your committee possesses the authority, or can readily secure the authority to deal with that, or any other case, and secure the facts.

Mr. DENT. And then do what?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Why, when you have investigated the facts, bring back a report to this body, and I have no doubt that we will take further and appropriate action. First let us get the facts by appropriate inquiry.

Mr. FIELDS. Let the gentleman introduce his resolution.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Now, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I think by yielding I will lose all of my time, but I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman a while ago said it would be advisable to have special instances called attention to. I was about to call attention to the specific instance mentioned by the gentleman from Connecticut, where a first lieutenant undertook to override the general orders. It seemed to me that that might well come within the jurisdiction of the Military Committee.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I think so. It seems to me that the Committee on Military Affairs might well take up the case of a first lieutenant who attempted to override the orders of his superior officer, and bring before them not only the lieutenant, but the superior officer, and ask the latter why he has allowed proper military authority to be set at defiance by a subordinate.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will yield.

Mr. LONDON. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] made a very serious charge in reference to the conduct of Army officers in France.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. That a number of military enterprises and a number of assaults were ordered on unknown ground solely for spectacular purposes. If there is any truth in that charge, it is a very serious indictment, and I believe that that particular accusation ought to be looked into.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If it is made as an accusation——

Mr. LONDON. The most serious charge that I ever heard.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If there is a foundation of sufficient fact for that charge, what conclusion do you deduce from it? Evidently that there has been a great failure somewhere in the high command in France. Are you prepared to believe that?

Mr. LONDON. The charge was made——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I understand perfectly well what the charge was. We had fondly believed that in France we presented an illustration of the most successful and perfect scheme of military operations ever conducted in any country. But if the charge made is true, that a series of acts evincing gross incapacity, and egregious favoritism, has marked the military management of affairs in that country, then we may well hang our heads in shame. We ought to take some action to ascertain if the charge is true and not leave the whole Army machine under suspicion.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I have heard it said that Gen. Pershing was responsible for the conduct of the war in France. I do not know how you could get the information, but the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee is here, and he ought to have more information on that subject than anybody else.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman ask his question? I have but little time, hence have but little to yield.

Mr. GARNER. I will ask the question, Who is responsible?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have the same knowledge that the gentleman has and no more. We sent Gen. Pershing overseas and in substance said, "Go to it. We will furnish you all the men, money, and authority that you need." This we have done.

Mr. GARNER. That is the statement; but is there any record of it?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not know any more about the facts than the gentleman does. I have only the knowledge common to every Member of this body.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think we are all in sympathy with proceeding in an orderly way, so, following up the gentleman's suggestion, how could any committee of the House, or how could Congress, interfere in a matter involving discipline in the Army which, under the provisions of the Constitution, is under the supervision of the Commander in Chief?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Then, if we can not do anything, why discuss these alleged wrongs and injustices? I am not one of those who believe that we are powerless in this matter, and believe that we can correct this, or any other evil in the Army, the Navy, or the body politic, once we are agreed on action.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman knows——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am rather short of time——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman knows that I am speaking in good faith, and my high opinion of the gentleman's knowledge of the law is that he knows himself——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman put his question?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This is a serious question, and there is no doubt that there have been abuses, some of which ought to be cured, and perhaps some have gone beyond it, and I ask the gentleman as a lawyer trained in such matters, How can the committee correct a breach of discipline in the Army?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The rules of discipline in the Army are not established by the Constitution.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The enforcement of them are; the responsibility of command and obedience.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The regulations of discipline in the Army, are regulations established under authority afforded by the legislative body, a civilian body.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The enforcement of discipline in the Army is distinctly a function of the Commander in Chief, constitutionally.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Of course, once the rules have been established.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is exactly it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That brings us back——

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. How are we going to correct an individual infraction of those rules?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Let us come back to the immediate matter I have been discussing, namely, the administra-

tion of military law by the military authorities in France. If the charges that have been projected into this body, rest upon a solid foundation of fact, then there has been a very gross abuse of administration by those authorities. Now who is responsible for that abuse? First establish the facts, then fix the responsibility, then apply the remedy. But do not treat these ex parte charges, as establishing a case against Gen. Pershing and the other military heads in France. At least we ought to reserve judgment until a counter-statement is made.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I think there is no question in the mind of anybody that when Gen. Pershing was put in control of the Army in France he was given carte blanche. The Secretary made that statement to me. I am not stating that he ought to be criticized.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Neither am I stating that he ought to be criticized. I am asking the Members of this body, and the public to reserve judgment. In the meantime I maintain that the continued presentation of these ex parte complaints, and unsigned criticisms, as they are played up by the newspapers, serve no useful purpose whatever. They merely operate to besmirch the whole military organization, to sap and undermine public confidence both in its integrity and capacity. When we sent Gen. Pershing to France, you will recall that he was told to use the pruning knife, to cut out all of the dead timber, to remove all of the inefficient officers, and to leave only those in charge of the fighting men who were intellectually, morally, and physically fit for the job. Did you not know at the time that if Gen. Pershing executed the authority afforded, relentlessly, and inexorably in the spirit in which it was intended, that grievious complaints would follow? Have you ever seen a man removed from office in civil life, on the ground of incapacity, who recognized the justice of his decapitation?

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

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to continue for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I shall try to complete what I have to say, in the time given. Was it not inevitable that in this great war some acts of injustice might be done, and grievous complaints would be made in other cases, where the action taken was entirely proper?

It was inevitable that these incidents would attend the development of our gigantic military machine. But to accept as true in advance of inquiry every ex parte complaint, is to give judgment before we hear the facts. It is one thing to believe that in the functioning of a great military machine, occasional acts of injustice may be done. It is quite another to accept offhand charges that, if fully sustained, reveal a military machine fundamentally incapable of doing justice, since the just authority of the Commander in Chief has been replaced by the lawless and mysterious power of a self-constituted clique, which apparently has superseded the Commander in Chief, since it is not alleged that these acts of wrongdoing, have been done with his acquiescence, or by his direction. But in a peculiar sense, the head of an army is responsible for the practices that prevail in its military administration. If these imputed practices have prevailed, then some military head is responsible. Somewhere in the military organization, in the President, the Chief of Staff, the General Staff, the commander in France, this responsibility must be found, if the practices alleged have been allowed to continue, if they have permeated the military system. If they were manifested in an acute form in France, then, the investigations should be conducted in that quarter to ascertain whether they were done with the acquiescence of the supreme authority, or conformably to his directions.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am a good deal concerned about the American troops having been sent to Archangel, and I would like to inquire——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Suppose we confine our attention for the time being, to France, and the abuses of authority alleged to have occurred there. I am not undertaking to give information about Archangel, or Siberia, or other remote portions of the earth.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is a similar charge, and one that is grave, to my mind.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will ask the gentleman, was the Leavenworth clique operating in Archangel?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have never heard anything about that.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Then evidently the gentleman was not here this morning when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] addressed the House.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I was here when he presented the pension bill and until he yielded the floor, and I did not hear——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman did not hear him say anything about the Leavenworth clique?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Not during the time that he was presenting that bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Then the gentleman must have been asleep.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; not asleep.

Mr. MANN. Mr. GALLIVAN, the gentleman from Massachusetts, took the floor a second time.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman from Virginia hold that in view of the charges made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], which were brought about, as he said, by the Leavenworth clique, that that is any evidence of the Army being incapable or inefficient?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly, abundant evidence, if the charges can be sustained.

Mr. McKENZIE. Might not they be very capable and very efficient and yet these abuses carried on within the military organization over which, in my judgment, this Congress has no power?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me to say, the gentleman has asked for something that the Military Committee could do, and he has asked if there is any clique that runs through the Army that is stronger, perhaps, than the commanding general, and I am going to offer the gentleman what I think to be an answer and a suggestion. I am going to say I have every reason to believe—and it has been suggested that some of this is all a vicious assault upon the United States soldier—in my judgment I can demonstrate that on the morning after the battle of the Argonne, when a division came out of battle—that was one of the hardest fought that the world ever saw—a member of this clique from general headquarters came down the day after the battle, as they came out, with all the confusion of battle and with all the tired feeling that a soldier in that shape would have, and wrote in a report the most disgraceful, villianous, villification of the American soldier that was ever made in the history of the world, and I demand now that the Committee on Military Affairs discover—if they can not find, I think I can—the report of Lieut. Col. Peck—that is his name, I think—which was made on the 2d of October, about the division Gen. Traub commanded, the day after the battle. I think if the record warrants it that he ought to be court-martialed and discharged from the Army if his report seems to indicate that he should be. Now, take that.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not think the gentleman has suggested a plan.

Mr. LITTLE. Maybe I have overlooked something. My suggestion is that the Committee on Military Affairs look for the report of Lieut. Col. Peck of October 2 about the Traub Division, the Twenty-seventh, I think, and if they find that it is a disgraceful insult to the volunteer soldiers of the Republic they should request the War Department to dismiss the man promptly from the Army. There will be a lot——

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman does not mean the Twenty-seventh Division, does he?

Mr. LITTLE. Coming from Fort Sill, I may have the number wrong. It is the one commanded by Gen. Traub.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I was going to say——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will ask for two more minutes and then I will positively yield the floor. Much of my time has been consumed by interruptions to which I will say however I have cheerfully yielded.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—but how long does the gentleman from Alabama intend to keep the committee here to-night in the consideration of this bill?

Mr. FIELDS. The gentleman from Alabama is off the floor just now, but he intends to try to get through as quickly as possible.

Mr. MANN. Intentions are a good deal like the military policy.

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

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have but two minutes more and I am committed to finishing what I have to say in that time.

I desire to say in conclusion, that I have no doubt that there have been some acts of injustice and some abuse of authority, but with respect to these acts if anyone will offer a resolution looking to an investigation of the same, either of an individual case, or of an aggregate of cases, and the fixation of responsibility, whether in the result that responsibility will attach to the President of the United States, or to some subordinate official, it matters not to me whence that resolution comes, I will vote for it. [Applause.] This is the proper course to be pursued. Unless some specific action is asked, we should not fill the RECORD, and encumber our proceedings with extraneous matter which in the form in which it reaches the public inevitably tends to create the universal impression that the military authorities in France have rewarded demerit, demoted merit, mismanaged military operations, and by incompetence in the field wasted precious American lives. This body should be careful to do nothing, and say nothing which will dim the glory of the American soldiers, and the American officers who reflected undying luster upon their country by their recent achievements upon the historic battle fields of France.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of Military Academy: Permanent establishment: For pay of seven professors, $26,500.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman has not read the first part of the bill. I want to move to amend on page 1——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas will be obliged to secure unanimous consent to return to the first paragraph.

Mr. LITTLE. I do not think so. I was on my feet in plenty of time. I ask unanimous consent——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent——

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that part of the bill has been passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just so ruled.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes and to return to page 1 for an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to return to the first paragraph. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LITTLE: Page 1, line 6, after the words "nineteen hundred and twenty," strike out the colon, insert a comma, and the following: "but none of this money shall be expended until the custom of hazing lower-class students by upper-class students has been abolished at the West Point Academy."

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that is not in order.

Mr. LITTLE. That is a limitation. Of course it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. It is a limitation on this money. It says, "the following sum shall be hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, an hour and a half ago I took the liberty of reserving 15 minutes' time to discuss this West Point bill, it being announced there would be no debate thereon. It seems that I have precipitated a discussion of an hour and a half on it; and, after all, there was something in that discussion. I am glad the Committee of the Whole takes an interest in the military bill. I think the first thing you have got to do to rid the American Army of some of this criticism is to stop hazing at West Point. The most trifling feature of hazing is its purely physical development of beating and overawing the younger and weaker men by gangs of cowards and roughnecks from an upper class who would not dare tackle the smaller boys alone. If the superintendent of the academy would apply a paddle to the posterior of each of these desperate devils, who are only desperate when they run in herds and catch freshmen out alone, the whole system would disappear in 20 days. The absolute menace of hazing is the social system at West Point, which Prussianizes young Americans by teaching them that somebody else is better than they are and that they are better than somebody else, establishing a military caste just as dangerous to our Republic as the Bolsheviks.

On a Nile dahbeah a man from Devon and a man from Kansas joshed about the social etiquette of their respective countries. Calling attention to the lofty position of a British duke in England's social order, the Englishman inquired what attitude the American would have toward such a social dignitary. The Kansan said, "Oh, I wouldn't look down on him particularly. In America every citizen is a sovereign, wielding the sovereign power. In England there is only one sovereign, and every Englishman inferior to him socially is necessarily inferior to every American sovereign. But no gentleman would emphasize that to the embarrassment of a nice man." Every American boy should be trained to know that he is the equal of every man alive. This West Point system tends to destroy that natural independence and to make a herd of snobs, Rajputs, and Prussians. We should eliminate snobbery from West Point before we spend another dollar on that academy.

The gentleman from Alabama, chairman of the Military Committee, has suggested that I offer something tangible. One of the worst results of this system of snobbery produced by hazing and its social corollary at West Point is the report of Lieut. Col. Peck on the Thirty-fifth Division, where he saw those men come out of the six days' battle, under all the troubles and difficulties that they would have after such fighting.

He did not know anything about such a fight, because, from all I could learn, he was never in one. If he has been a real soldier he should be more loyal to his comrades than to try to ruin their fame and glory. Lieut. Col. Peck, so far as I can learn, was never in any fight. In spotless attire, rolling on the scene in a limousine, he had the gall to offer his puny and presumptuous criticism of those whose shoestrings he was unworthy to unloose. His report is made. That report is an attempt to break down the militia of this country and to destroy the character of the volunteer soldier. It springs from hazing and its consequent snobbery, effective in after life. It springs from this so-called "Leavenworth clique" and its effort to eliminate the National Guard. It is a combination of all the infamous outrages of this war that have been discussed, where professional soldiers have attempted to insult and overreach and drive out of the Army volunteer soldiers. If the committee will take this report and examine it they will find that it is a vicious insult to our soldiers, the flower of the Republic; and if they find it so, then they will see that he has not behaved like an officer and a gentleman; and if he has not he is subject to court-martial. And if this committee wants to do something to purify the Army from these charges—some true and some not—they have an opportunity to do it. This man made a report on the Kansas and Missouri boys—the Thirty-fifth Division—after he inspected them as they came out of the six-day battle in the Argonne, which, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD.

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

HEADQUARTERS THIRTY-FIFTH DIVISION,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
October 16, 1918.

Memorandum for: C. G., Sixty-ninth Infantry Brigade; C. G., Seventieth Infantry Brigade; C. G., Sixtieth Field Artillery Brigade; and to their respective regimental commanders.

1. The division commander directs that the attached copy of report of Lieut. Col. R. G. Peck, inspector general, corps inspector, be furnished you, together with copy of his reply.

2. The reflection on the discipline makes the division commander's cheeks burn, and he counts on his brigade and regimental commanders to eradicate the cause of these disparaging remarks.

3. Each regimental commander will immediately investigate, report upon, and make recommendations concerning the loss of Stokes mortars, Chauchat rifles, pistols, and rifles in each organization.

H. S. HAWKINS,
Colonel, General Staff, Chief of Staff.

HEADQUARTERS FIRST ARMY CORPS,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
Headquarters First Army Corps, October 12, 1918.

From: Lieut. Col. R. G. Peck, I. G., corps inspector.

To: Commanding general, Thirty-fifth Division, American Expeditionary Forces.

Subject: Irregularities and deficiencies noted at recent inspection.

1. Under the provisions of Army Regulations, 692, the following statement of irregularities and deficiencies observed during the inspection of your command October 2–9, 1918, is furnished you:

(a) March discipline: The march discipline of the division observed during the three days' marching was poor, and the following faults were noted:

All parts of units failed to move at the appointed hour, which caused several columns to meet and try to move on the same road.

There was no attempt to maintain distance between battalions, regiments, or even brigades. On October 2 practically the entire division, less the artillery, with combined field and combat trains marched in a solid column without any interval between units or gaps in the transportation.

There was little or no supervision on the march on the part of the officers. Enlisted men throughout the division fell out of ranks at will and rejoined the column as best they could or became stragglers. There was, however, very little real straggling noticed. There was no evidence of officers or anybody in authority being detailed to march in rear of organizations with a view of insuring proper march discipline.

At rest halts there was no apparent effort made to have foot troops clear the road. At times traffic was blocked by men sitting and lying in the road.

Many unauthorized men were observed riding on wagons. Sick men had been ordered to ride on wagons instead of being placed in ambulance by proper authority.

Mounted men failed to dismount at halts.

Wagons were poorly loaded and overloaded. In many instances wagons were loaded with rations, ammunition, baggage, etc. There was

no evidence that an attempt had been made to load the various classes of supplies in separate wagons.

The march discipline of the Field Artillery brigade, which marched separately, was good. It was noticeable that at each halt the mounted men immediately dismounted and looked over their animals, officers supervising.

(b) Camps and billets: Camps and billets were in fair condition, except those pertaining to the One hundred and thirty-eighth Infantry, although kitchen areas in practically all units were dirty and showed lack of inspection on the part of officers concerned. The One hundred and thirty-eighth Infantry was inspected 18 hours after arrival at its permanent location. At 9.30 a. m., the hour of inspection, the shelter-tent camp at the two battalions was in a disgraceful condition. A few straddle trenches had been dug, but apparently not used * * * The enlisted men were very dirty, and most of them had made no attempt to wash that morning, although water was close by and available. Arms and equipment were strewn about the camp. Nearly every rifle inspected was covered with rust and dirt and no attempt had been made to clean them. The animals of the supply company had not been groomed.

Except in the One hundred and fortieth Infantry, whose billets were in very good condition, there was a very apparent lack of inspection on the part of battalion and company officers. No orders had been given for a neat and orderly arrangement of blankets and equipment.

(c) Animals: The animals of all units, except the Artillery and One hundred and tenth Ammunition Train, were in fair condition, considering the hard work they had performed during the recent operations; that is, long hauls, long hours under harness, and short rations. There is practically no disease among them, and all they need is rest, good grooming, and sufficient food for a week or 10 days to put them in good shape.

The animals in the Artillery brigade and the One hundred and tenth Ammunition Train are in very weak and run-down condition. They have been overworked and underfed, and, in my opinion, it will be several weeks before they are in good condition.

Animals on hand in the division:	
Sept. 25	5,370
Oct. 6	4,152
Loss by casualties and evacuation	1,218
Shortage Oct. 10	3,000

The shortage in the Artillery brigade and One hundred and tenth Ammunition Train is so great that until replacements are received these units are practically immobile.

Animals on hand and shortage in above units.

	On hand.	Shortage.
One hundred and twenty-eighth Field Artillery	333	641
One hundred and twenty-ninth Field Artillery	375	799
One hundred and thirtieth Field Artillery	461	977
One hundred and tenth Ammunition Train	328	296

(d) Clothing: The division needs practically an entire reissue of clothing. There has been no issue of clothing in this division since it left the Vosges sector about September 1. Most of the units were without dubbin, and the majority of the men inspected had never used any on the shoes they were wearing.

(e) Equipment: The division was well equipped, with the exception of transportation, just prior to the recent operations, commencing September 26. Nearly all organizations are now short considerable personal ordnance equipment. Accurate figures could not be obtained, but the division ordnance officer reported that he believed there was a 15 to 20 per cent loss of mess kits, knives, forks, pack carriers, etc. The following shortages of other ordnance equipment now exists: Forty-four machine guns, 5 Stokes mortars, 304 Chauchat rifles, 1,876 pistols, and 2,600 rifles.

It will be noted that this shortage is for present strength, and indicates considerable loss on the battle field. Two hundred and ninety-nine men of the One hundred and thirty-seventh Infantry were noticed marching in ranks without rifles who were supposed to have them. The regimental commander reported that these men did not have rifles. A considerable number of men rejoined the division between October 1 and 9 from hospitals without equipment, which accounts for part of this shortage. The One hundred and thirtieth Machine Gun Battalion lost 22 machine guns, put out of action or abandoned. Company D of this battalion lost 11. The battalion commander stated that the company became disorganized September 29 in the Montrebeau Woods and fell back without their machine guns.

There is practically no gun oil in the division. All units reported that they had been without it for some time. There is also a great shortage of saddle soap and oil for harness and other equipment.

(f) Quartermaster supplies: A number of rolling kitchens are missing and many others are in an unserviceable condition. In the One hundred and thirty-eighth Infantry there is a great shortage of kitchen utensils throughout the regiment. Several companies in this regiment had practically no equipment to prepare food and were improvising and borrowing as best they could; other shortages of quartermaster supplies are small.

(g) Ambulances: The division has only 12 mule ambulances, 8 motor ambulances, G. M. C., and 3 motor ambulances, Ford.

(h) Discipline: The division as a whole has none of the outward signs of a well-disciplined organization. Saluting throughout is very poor. Individuals and groups of men pay no attention to passing officers, and in many cases fail to get up when spoken to. It was very noticeable that the junior officers made no attempt to enforce discipline. Hundreds of men were noticed out of billets on the streets in improper uniform and with blouses unbottoned and no attempt made to be neat or orderly. Passing officers paid no attention to them and made no effort to correct these irregularities.

Most of the organizations inspected showed all the earmarks of National Guard units, which they are. Captains and lieutenants were continually noticed on most familiar terms with enlisted men. Most of the orders that I heard given were in a more or less apologetic and familiar tone, and the results were what could be expected. The regimental commanders and field officers accompanying me practically asked the enlisted men to stand at attention and salute the inspector.

R. G. PECK.

Mr. LITTLE. When their country called, the boys of Kansas and Missouri marched off to victory or death on the plains of Europe. The tramp of their marching feet shook the hills of the Argonne. The thunder of their "hell-roaring howitzers" scorched the skies. They charged the nests of machine guns that held the poilu at bay for four long years and drove the boches across the Rhine. As they came out of the frightful combat and glorious triumph, worn, weary, battle stained, but with magnificent victory perching upon the banners of these civilian soldiers, they were met by this lily-fingered inspector, Lieut. Col. Peck, forsooth a West Point expert:

Neat, trimly dressed,
Fresh as a bridegroom; and his chin new reap'd
Showed like a stubble land at harvest home;
Perfumed like a milliner.
And as the soldiers bore dead bodies by
He called them untaught knaves, unmannerly,
To bring a slovenly, unhandsome corse
Betwixt the wind and his nobility.
With many holiday and lady terms
He questioned me;
For he made me mad,
To see him shine so brisk and smell so sweet.
And talk so like a waiting gentlewoman
Of guns and drums and wounds. God save the mark!
And that it was great pity, so it was,
This villainous salt petre should be digged
Out of the bowels of the harmless earth.
And but for these vile guns
He would himself have been a soldier.

Inspector Peck forgot to tell Shakespeare's Hotspur, "they showed all the earmarks of a National Guard unit, which they are." Shakespeare forgot to say that "captains and enlisted men from Kansas and Missouri in the Thirty-fifth Division came out of the gates of hell at the Argonne 'on most familiar terms' and 'gave their orders in a more or less apologetic and familiar tone.'"

Harry Hotspur's inspector overlooked the fact that "saluting was very poor" as Kansas and Missouri units of the National Guard came off the field where they had beaten the German disciplined, professional army to death, after everybody else had failed in the task. Hotspur doesn't mention the fact that they came out of battle "with blouses unbuttoned," "which passing officers paid no attention to." One line of Inspector Lily-fingered Peck's opinion of the heroes of the Argonne is so much better fitted for disinfection than for perusal, compels its omission. "Wagons were poorly loaded or overloaded" as they came out of the Argonne. Where was the expert Peck and his comrades in expertness when they loaded the wagons in the Argonne? Where was he at 4.30 in the morning, when the big guns began to roar the first day of the battle? Where were Peck and his like when the lads from Kansas and Missouri National Guard went over the top? Where was Peck when they charged in the teeth of machine guns that swept the earth like hailstones? Where was Peck when the Thirty-fifth Division outmarched its artillery and did not wait for the divisions to the right and the left, but fought its way through the German fortifications and shattered the concrete fortifications that "these military men," these experts had declared impregnable? Where was Peck, the educated and trained expert, when civilian soldiers fought and died for their country? Where was Peck when 827 soldiers of the Thirty-fifth Division died in battle in six days for the country that educated him at West Point and stands between his family and starvation every day in the year? Why, he was back at headquarters, perfuming for the fray that he would start when they straggled back in glory and honor, in mud and rust, in disorder and triumph, but, thank God, in familiar love and affection between officers and men who in six days' fighting at the Argonne had forgotten that the principal duty of a soldier was to salute a lily-fingered inspector and march in such gilded and orderly array as would please his corseted soldierdom and his belladonnaed eyes of criticism.

On the indorsement of Peck's report, I read, signed by H. S. Hawkins, colonel, general staff, chief of staff:

The reflection on the discipline makes the division commander's cheeks burn, and he counts on his brigade and regimental commanders to eradicate the cause of these disparaging remarks.

You can see that the Thirty-fifth Division had a faithful comrade in the chief of staff who sent them into action. Not a line has he to say in protest against this villainous assault upon the men he sent into battle, not a word to tell of their valor, of their courage, or their heroism, and of the skill with which they beat the best-disciplined army in the world into the bowels of the earth among its wrecked concrete. The Thirty-fifth Division should have marched without salute, in disorderly array and on familiar terms, by Hawkins and Peck and spat on them till the current carried them downstream into the depths of

oblivion, followed by the everlasting curse of every gallant soldier who ever risked his life for his country.

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

While it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' "Tommy, fall be'ind,"
But it's "Please to walk in front, sir," when there's trouble in the wind.
There's trouble in the wind, my boys, there's trouble in the wind;
Oh, it's "Please to walk in front, sir," when there's trouble in the wind.

For it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' "Chuck him out, the brute!"
But it's "Savior of 'is country" when the guns begin to shoot;
An' it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' anything you please;
But Tommy ain't a bloomin' fool—you bet that Tommy sees!

If this report is an insult to the heroes of the Argonne he is liable to court-martial for not being an officer and a gentleman. If this committee will investigate it and determine that he is not, and will ask for his court-martial, you will have brought the whole thing to a head, and you will secure the reform in the Army we need.

Gen. Pershing is not to blame for that report. No fighting man is. The men who make such reports never go to battle, but are what are called "experts" in the Army. They have failed in all their expertness. Their claim to efficiency has been exploded and yet they undertake to destroy the reputation of volunteer fighting men by such a report as this. And if you take that fellow and court-martial him and discharge him from the Army you will bring the whole thing to a head, and you will do more good to stop hazing and snobbery and its vicious outcome than you can do in any other way.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I can not yield just yet. This man Peck picked out a division of heroes coming from one of the world's greatest victories. The man probably never participated in any action at all and had no comprehension of the conditions natural and inevitable among such troops at such a time. Any soldier could have explained it to him, but he was a military man, and he wished to destroy the standing of civilian soldiers in order to increase the reputation of professionally trained and educated military men. He showed the cloven foot and divulged their whole scheme to wreck the National Guard. Less than 40 per cent of the Regular Army and its West Pointers went to France, and a very small percentage, I am told, of those in action leading troops were educated professionals. This man should be court-martialed and his name should be placed in an eternal pillory that he who runs may read that the American boy who enters the Army to fight is the man who wins all our battles from Concord to Guiguinto.

Now, that is the suggestion I make; and I want to say in conclusion, gentlemen, that all the upshot of this is—and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] wants to know the upshot—that the alleged "military experts" have fallen down practically every time during this war, and the tide of battle in this war was turned at Chateau-Thierry by raw soldiers, some of whom had been in the Army only 16 weeks. And if the battles of this country are won, as at Chateau-Thierry, by volunteers and drafted men, and not by the military experts, for that reason it is not proper that they should be subjected to the criticism they have received from such men as this. If the committee will do what I have suggested with Col. Peck, it will do a lot of good to the whole American Army for centuries to come.

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

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

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

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take exception to the statement that snobbishness exists in our Military and Naval Academies to-day, as discussed by the gentleman from Kansas. I think most of us Congressmen, and Senators, too, conduct examinations under the Civil Service Commission when selecting men for nominations to these academies, and thereby we get men of all classes, kinds, and conditions. In my own experience I know that the 10 or a dozen young men whom I have appointed to Annapolis or West Point in the past four years have been young men in humble circumstances. One boy's letter especially appealed to me. He says:

Mr. OLNEY, I have been playing tennis here at Annapolis. I thought this was a rich man's game.

I have appointed boys to West Point and Annapolis who sold papers and periodicals as a livelihood before entrance into the academies, or who were engaged in other useful occupations, and I find that such boys make good, rank high in their studies, and exert a good moral influence at West Point and Annapolis. I want to repeat that I take exception to the criticism that there is snobbishness prevalent to any extent in our military and naval academies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I divert for a moment from the discussion of West Point Academy by reciting some experiences during a visit I paid this afternoon to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia. I shall attempt to prove that the criticisms directed against the management of the institution are unfair, unjust, and without foundation. I thought to myself, as perhaps many of you did, that it was an improper place as a hospital for the insane to send soldiers and sailors convalescing from overseas and from our camps and cantonments in the United States to recover.

I found registered there to-day 3,782 patients, of which 2,425 were white men, and 420 colored men. There were about 1,200 soldiers and sailors there.

The gentleman from Illinois may have seen fit very justly to criticize the War Department for sending to St. Elizabeths 300 men detached from the hospital surgeon's office to take care of the patients, but it was absolutely necessary on account of the existing shortage of labor especially in the class of hospital attendants. I went out to the institution unannounced and Dr. White, manager of the hospital, accompanied me through various buildings. I am impressed with his humane treatment of patients, and am thoroughly convinced that the institution is conducted in an efficient manner, and that the inmates are not subject to cruel and abusive treatment. I confirm the statement made in the House a few days ago by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in effect that St. Elizabeths should be stamped with a clean bill of health.

I talked with several patients, and from observation I can say to you that none are sent to this institution unless they have been under careful medical observation in other hospitals throughout the country for various kinds of diseases; and if they are pronounced partially insane or entirely insane they are sent to St. Elizabeths Hospital, where they can be watched carefully and can be treated by eminent specialists in diseases of the mind. Mind you, no soldiers or sailors are sent to St. Elizabeths except those who are suffering from partial insanity, depressed condition of the mind, and whose mental condition would be benefited by treatment there.

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

Mr. OLNEY. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLE. Just what has this insane asylum to do with West Point?

Mr. OLNEY. Nothing at all; but I asked the patience of the House for departing from the subject of the bill to a subject not quite germane to the Military Academy. But I thought, as a member of the committee, I might correct an impression which many Members of Congress may share, that things are not perhaps properly conducted at St. Elizabeths Hospital. There are 1,200 soldiers there in various stages of convalescence, and the only particular criticism I had to direct to Dr. White, the superintendent, was that certain patients who had convalesced and who had become greatly improved as to their mental condition should not be allowed to associate in those wards where there were almost violently insane patients; and he answered that such cases were being corrected as rapidly as possible.

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

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment, and I will ask the Clerk to read it as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. GORDON. Yes; I will reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LITTLE: Page 1, line 6, after the figures "1920," strike out the colon and insert a comma and the following: "but none of this money shall be expended until the superintendent has certified to the Secretary of War that the custom of hazing of lower classmen by upper-class students has been abolished at the West Point Academy."

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. If this amendment is adopted, will it permit the hazing of the upper classmen by the lower classmen? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not regard that as a parliamentary inquiry. Does the gentleman from Ohio make his point of order?

Mr. GORDON. I do not see any objection to the amendment now in its modified form, unless the chairman wants to make a point of order.

Mr. DENT. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. LITTLE) there were—ayes 7, noes 27.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I ask the Clerk to report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia: At the bottom of page 1 insert the following: "*And provided*, That the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy shall continue to be the present regular four-year course until Congress by appropriate legislation shall provide otherwise."

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve all points of order on that.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is simply to keep the course of instruction at West Point just as it now is, four years, until Congress shall by appropriate legislation determine what shall be the policy at that institution. It seems to me that is a matter that ought to be determined by legislation and not by an Executive order or the Chief of Staff.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. In a parallel case, as, for instance, the curriculum and courses of study in our State universities, does the gentleman believe that the State legislature should determine the course of study or that it should be left to the regents of the respective institutions?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I think the State legislatures generally determine those matters.

Mr. STAFFORD. They do not in the State of Wisconsin or the State of Michigan.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. When they appropriate the money they determine what character of institution they propose to have.

Mr. STAFFORD. They do not prescribe the length of the course of study to be pursued by the students who attend the university, either the professional schools or the academic.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. They may not determine what studies shall be pursued, but they certainly determine the character of the institution.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Is it not the practice of most legislatures of the States to say that before a degree shall be granted to a student, whether of medicine or of law, or a doctor of philosophy or a bachelor of arts, that so many years of study, or their equivalent elsewhere, shall be passed in the institution which the State conducts?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That has been my understanding, of course.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I do not understand that the State undertakes to prescribe just what textbooks shall be used or what particular subject shall be treated at any institution, but that it does determine the character of the institution.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Of course, the gentleman is quite aware, as we all are, that this debate now is proceeding on the merits of the amendment rather than on the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. The point of order is not made, but reserved.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand that. Having that in mind, I should like to ask the gentleman a question. I am more or less in sympathy with the idea that there ought to be some revision of the length and character of the course of study at West Point, but I think the gentleman, as well as many others of us who have given some attention to the subject, are persuaded that this is not a good time to put ourselves on record in one direction or another with regard to finalities on that question.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. This does not.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is my fear that, while it is intended not to do that, the effect of for the first time writing into our statute law a limitation as to the course of study at West Point, a thing we have not done in this generation, will be taken as a precedent and a basis upon which argument in the next Congress will be so firmly attached that we will never be able to dislodge it.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That is not my information. My information is that until recently the course has been prescribed as a four-year course by law.

Mr. GORDON. When was that?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I do not know. That is what I was informed at the Military Academy—that until recently it was a matter prescribed by law.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Even at that, it is not now prescribed by law, we are informed. Ought we to go to the point of writing into law this unnecessary thing, which may act to prejudice against writing into the law hereafter just what we may want?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. My object is to write this into the law now to prevent the Chief of Staff changing the course until Congress has an opportunity to say whether it shall be changed. In other words, if the provision is not incorporated in this act, it is my belief that an Executive order will change the whole course of instruction in that institution. It is for that reason that I desire to obtain a statutory provision to keep the West Point of to-day until Congress can say whether we shall have a West Point of another character and kind to-morrow.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I sympathize with the gentleman's intention most heartily, and I think such interchange of personal opinion that we have had heretofore accords with that, but it seems to me, from a parliamentary viewpoint, this is the wrong way to go about it, and I shall have to object.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the point of order, I want to ask the gentleman, this is new legislation, is it not? There is no legislation of that kind now on the statute books?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No, sir.

Mr. LITTLE. What is there on the books anywhere in the way of legislation that would authorize this appropriation?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. My understanding has been that until recently the statute prescribed the course at West Point that it should be four years, and it has been continued as a four years' course until recently. What I am afraid of is that by Executive order, or military order, the whole course at the institution will be changed.

Mr. LITTLE. Is not this new legislation, and if it is not, what is the old legislation?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I will admit that perhaps it is new legislation.

Mr. LITTLE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. It is as easy for us to make points of order as it is for the committee.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. I notice by the hearings that Col. Tillman says that the class that entered last June will go out in 1920. What does the gentleman understand by that?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The gentleman will understand that during the war we needed officers, and they graduated two classes in advance of the regular time of graduation, and then they had an appointment of two cadets by each Congressman to take the place of those that graduated. The intention was if the war had continued to graduate them at the end of one year. Now they are trying to get back to the four-year course.

Mr. PLATT. They could not immediately get back to it, and would not the gentleman's amendment prevent it?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No; my amendment is to keep the institution as it now is until Congress can adopt a plan for the institution. It is going to mean a great deal for every Member of this body if by Executive order the character of that institution should be changed. As a Member said a few minutes ago, we have been accustomed to go out among our young boys, taking them from the high schools and from all walks of life, and sending them to this institution to be there trained and developed. If the character of that institution is changed none of those boys can get into that institution, because the standard will be so high that nobody but a college graduate can enter. In other words, the report of the academic board, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made a part of the RECORD, which is a report made in response to the request of Gen. March

that the course be adapted to a three-year course, goes fully into the question. It shows that it is absolutely necessary to cut off one year either at the end of the course or one year at the beginning of the course. It can not be done at the end of the course, because that is when the cadets receive their military instruction, and the boy would have to receive that instruction, if he did not receive it at West Point, at some other military institution. Therefore, it would be necessary to cut out the first year's course, and in doing that the high-school boy, the plain, simple country boy, would be denied admission to the institution.

Congress, in 1916, increased the number of cadets to twice the number theretofore authorized, and it seems to me plainly indicated the high popular regard in which the institution is held.

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

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing selections from certain letters that I have received in regard to a matter discussed this afternoon on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, upon the ground that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to withhold that for a few minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall withhold the point of order for the accommodation of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. It seems to me very clear that the course at West Point could well be and ought to be cut down to three years. I have read the report of the general committee of the academic board on this subject, and it is obvious there is but one way to do it, and that is to cut one year off the beginning of the course. They say in order to do that they will have to require algebra (complete), plane and solid geometry, plane trigonometry, English grammar, English composition and literature, history, geography, and beginning French. Nearly every college in the country requires about that for entrance.

The Military Academy at West Point is below the average college in requirement, and, strange as it may seem, that is one reason why boys fail to pass West Point examinations. At the average age for entrance to West Point the average boy preparing for college has progressed in his school work way beyond West Point requirements, and in order to pass the examination has to go to a fitting school and cram up on stuff which he studied five years ago and which he has partly forgotten. If you raise the West Point requirements to the average college requirements, and require a modern language, algebra (complete), and plane and solid geometry, and plane trigonometry, which can be studied in every high school, there will be less trouble for boys to get into West Point than now. They will then enter a year later, and the course can just as well be cut down to three years as not. It is merely necessary to make the West Point requirements conform to the requirements of the college entrance board. I taught for two years in a military school and I used to prepare boys for West Point. Furthermore, West Point is in my district and I have long been interested in its work and have tried to keep somewhat in touch with it.

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

Mr. PLATT. Not at present. I have discussed the matter with instructors at West Point; some are for it and some are against it. I have read this report with a good deal of interest, and I think their conclusions are more or less ridiculous. There is no word of recognition in the report of the fact that college entrance requirements are above West Point requirements. The average requirement for all of the great eastern colleges—Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Cornell—are all higher than for West Point, and I have no doubt the same is true in respect to most of the western colleges. Practically every high school gives these studies which the academic board says "few public schools cover thoroughly," and where there may be now and then one high school that does not, a little extra study would prepare any bright boy to enter West Point on the requirements they say are necessary to cut a year off the course.

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

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Reverting to the requirements for entrance in colleges, what is true of the eastern universities is true throughout the country.

Mr. PLATT. That is what I believe.

Mr. FESS. Each State has a college association. Membership in that college association is determined by the standard of entrance in it, which is 15 units. Then there are the general college associations, taking in colleges of the various States, so that the gentleman is correct as to the requirements of the college being higher than the requirements mentioned here.

Mr. PLATT. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his statement. The gentleman was until recently a college president and is an authority on the subject.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Is it not true also that one of the reasons why the standard for entrance is kept low is the fact that West Point still continues to teach an academic or high-school course of a general character before it begins to specialize on military science and kindred sciences?

Mr. PLATT. It does. Its first year is practically a high-school year, with, of course, rather more intensive work than that in most high schools.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes; and the result is that, founded years ago when secondary schools were not common, they thought they had to give, as they did have to give, an academic education as well as a military education to a young candidate for a commission.

Mr. PLATT. I think that is largely true.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is not true of the social, economic, and educational conditions of this generation.

Mr. PLATT. Certainly not. The high schools practically all afford an opportunity to prepare boys for college to-day and therefore the requirements ought to be brought up to the average college requirements. There will be no trouble; it will not hurt anybody, and I believe the raising of the requirements will make it easier for a great many boys to get to West Point than it is at present. We have the cases of boys from 19 to 20 years of age who have gone through all these simple subjects four or five years before in the high school. It seems to me that the conclusions of the committee of the academic board in paragraphs 15 and 16 of their report are almost wholly unwarranted. The entrance requirements would not lose touch with the public-school system. More, rather than fewer, of the most desirable class of young men would present themselves for examination. In order to make sure that I was not wrong about my comparison of college entrance requirements with West Point requirements—for my own teaching days were a good while ago—I talked the matter over very recently with a couple of preparatory school mathematics teachers in Baltimore, and they agreed with me fully. I was a little in doubt about what the academic board meant by algebra (complete), but they assured me that this does not include what is known as higher algebra, but is what they are teaching every day in preparing boys for college. Even if algebra (complete), solid geometry, plane trigonometry, and French were added to the present West Point requirements they would not be equal to the entrance requirements of the leading eastern colleges. Some of them require Latin and Greek, or an equivalent, besides.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The amendment seeks to take away discretion that now lodges in an executive department to determine the curriculum, the course of study at the Military Academy at West Point. In the debate this afternoon on this institution it was admitted, as I recall, that there was no law existing as to the length of the course of study at West Point. Certainly if there is such a law it was violated during the present war, when the course of instruction was reduced from four years to one year. The fact that the course of instruction was reduced without any direct authorization by law rather confirms the position that the length of the term is a matter of regulation rather than of legislation. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, if the course of instruction is determined by regulation, therefore this amendment would interfere with the discretion now lodged in the executive officers. There are plenty of decisions that hold that even an amendment in the form of a limitation that limits the discretion of an executive officer in the performance of his duty necessarily is legislation. I think I have said sufficient to show the Chair that this is legislation and is not in order on this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia if he concedes this is legislation?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I think it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of cadets, $960,000: *Provided*, That the pay of cadets shall be fixed at $780 per annum and one ration per day, or commutation therefor, such commutation to be 67 per cent over and above the cost of the Army ration, to be paid from the appropriation for the subsistence of the Army: *Provided*, That the provisions of the item above shall be operative from and after July 1, 1918.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph. There is on the calendar a bill that embodies the same provision as incorporated in this paragraph, which seeks to increase the allowance to cadets from $600 to $780 per annum and increases the commutation of rations 67 per cent over that which they now receive. I make the point of order.

Mr. DENT. The point of order, of course, is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Having made the point of order to the entire paragraph, does the gentleman from Alabama wish to make any amendment for pay of cadets?

Mr. DENT. I will have to reduce the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to ask unanimous consent to return?

Mr. DENT. Not at this time—until I have the figures.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extra pay of officers of the Army on detached service at the Military Academy: For pay of one superintendent, United States Military Academy (brigadier general), in addition to his regular pay, $1,000: *Provided*, That the provisions of the above item shall be operative so long as Col. S. E. Tillman continues as superintendent of the West Point Military Academy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that part of the paragraph after the word "Academy" in line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to concede the point of order?

Mr. DENT. I think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one commandant of cadets (lieutenant colonel) in addition to pay as captain or major, $1,100.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Perhaps this place is not as opportune as was some other paragraph upon which to base my remarks. I take this opportunity to make an observation as to the discharge of soldiers now in this country not because of any definite knowledge of my own, but quoting some that is going out to the country and which I assume is correct. Gov. McKelvie, of our State, was importuned by the farmers of the State to do what he could to obtain the release of boys for the 1st of March farm work. He came to Washington and interviewed the Secretary of War.

The governor before leaving said that he was assured by the Secretary of War that the soldiers would be demobilized by the 1st of March. I thought it would be proper to have it understood here as to what word is going out to the country.

But what I particularly desire to talk about is the matter of Army and West Point snobbery suggested to-day by Col. LITTLE, and on the 28th of last month by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]. If, as a matter of fact, the institution at West Point does teach the snobbery that we find some officers later practicing in the Army under certain circumstances, I would not be in favor of voting one dollar for its support. As to the snobbery at West Point I do not affirm or deny.

I desire to read in your hearing that which went into the RECORD on the 28th of last month as a part of the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], which is embodied in an order issued by Gen. Buck, who is in command of Camp MacArthur. It is as follows:

OFFICERS ADVISED SOCIALLY—CAN'T MINGLE WITH ENLISTED MEN—BY COMMAND OF GEN. BUCK ORDER POSTED REGARDING ENTERTAINMENTS.

The following order has been posted at Camp MacArthur:

Headquarters, Camp MacArthur, Waco, Tex., January 6, 1919, General Orders, No. 1.

1. The attention of officers of this command is called to the impropriety of attending social affairs at which enlisted men, or persons in the uniform of enlisted men, are present.

Any institution in this country, supported by public money, that teaches a doctrine of that kind should be wiped off our political and economic map. [Applause.] More than that:

Hereafter any officer of this command who finds enlisted men present with proper authority, i. e., duly invited or permitted to pay their way in, at any social affair at which the officer is a guest, such officer will at once depart from such social affair, and if he finds persons in the uniform of enlisted men permitted to be present he will take the same action.

I know across the water that "person" is the word that indicates "inferiority or degradation." They say, not "this man," not "this soldier," but "this person."

When an officer finds enlisted men present at any social affair without proper authority, he will take such steps as the occasion may warrant to cause them to leave, and will report any violation of regulations which may occur.

By command of Maj. Gen. Buck.

W. H. WOOLWORTH,
Major, Infantry, United States Army, Acting Executive Officer.

Official:

E. E. LAMBERT,
Major, Adjutant General's Department, Adjutant.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield there for a moment?

Mr. SLOAN. I will.

Mr. LITTLE. I suggest to the Committee on Military Affairs, that wanted suggestions, that an officer who issued an order like that in time of war about American soldiers is not an officer and a gentleman, and under the articles of war is subject to court-martial. If the committee wants to do one thing more than anything else to improve the Army, it will call the attention of the department to that and advise that this fellow be court-martialed.

Mr. SLOAN. Now, to invite or to force any boy into the ranks from the homes of America and give him to understand that he is not as good without shoulder straps as he is with them is un-American. I should like to see some good, manly, young enlisted man, when insulted as he would be by the observance of that order, send out his good right arm and send his insulter to mother earth. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. May I interrupt the gentleman in order to call his attention to the article of war which says that if an enlisted man as much as lifts his hand as though to strike a commissioned officer he will be punished by death?

Mr. SLOAN. And he could not sell his life at a better price than that, to raise the question in America as to whether there are to be these obnoxious social distinctions in the American service. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given another five minutes.

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

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. SLOAN. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Just following up that last statement that the gentleman from Nebraska has made, that he believes the soldier ought to take the law into his own hands, now, the gentleman is himself a lawyer and a peaceful, law-abiding citizen; and does he recommend to our young men under military discipline that, disapproving of any order, they should, without any judicial inquiry whatever, knock down an officer that issued the order?

Mr. SLOAN. No man, with shoulder straps or without, has a right to insult a fellow American.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I said the gentleman is a lawyer, but he need not prove it by any evasion.

Mr. SLOAN. I am glad you say I am a lawyer in the open, with all these witnesses about. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I want you to give me an answer to my question. Are we to understand you to say that without any judicial investigation or trial of the facts in the case, a young soldier's opinion as to whether that order was insulting or not would be to him a full warrant, or sufficient warrant, for violence on his part?

Mr. SLOAN. No intelligent, red-blooded American would have any doubt that the enforcement of that order is an insult to an American soldier.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. This matter has been settled by the courts-martial of this country, and the question that the gentleman from Vermont asked has been answered. During the Civil War, Gen. Nelson, a volunteer, a very able man from Kentucky, who probably saved that State to the Union, was assembling and marshaling the forces, when Col. Jefferson C. Davis, a West Pointer, a little fellow, went in to see Nelson. Gen. Nelson, a big man, said to the little regular, "How many men have you in your regiment?" Davis said, "About 800." Nelson turned on him, and to those about him said, "That is a correct answer, is it, for a colonel of the Regular Army to make? Blank blank you, go out and find how many men you have got." Jefferson C. Davis went out and got a pistol and came back and shot him dead. That is the answer that the Regular Army makes when it takes the law into its own hands. I think that answers the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am appealing to another authority,

Mr. LITTLE. I think a client ought to be satisfied with the dictum of his court.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am satisfied if the gentleman from Kansas is satisfied.

Mr. SLOAN. I enjoy the ingenuity of the gentleman's interrogations.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I would rather be treated to facts than be smothered in a bed of roses. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. Then why does not my friend get some facts? I have a great store for him.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am asking you for them now. Do you recommend as an established doctrine for the discipline of the Army at any time that every soldier, feeling himself aggrieved by the text of an order, should himself be empowered to construe its intent or effect and determine whether it was proper or improper, whether it was insulting or what not, and, having made such a consideration of it in his own mind, take the law into his own hands and punish by physical violence the officer who issued that order?

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman has taken into his question entirely too much territory. My statement was made with reference to and within the scope of the obnoxious order quoted and its enforcement. The order being discussed does not relate to rank or obedience while in the ranks, in battle, or anywhere else where military discipline is involved. The soldier owes obedience to his superior officer in things military. But he should not admit inferiority or degradation socially, morally, religiously, or politically.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is the statement the gentleman made in substance.

Mr. SLOAN. When an order is made that where a soldier is invited to his father's house, or to his friend's house, and finds an officer there, and the officer drives him forth, or, with much ostentation, leaves himself, so that the insult is palpable, I think the argument ad hominum, delivered in the manly American way, in accordance with the American art of offense and defense, is the only proper treatment. It is the only argument that some men, vain coxcombs and mere martinets, under many circumstances are ever able to understand. It is the only way that brings them to a realization of what they ought to do. I know that a Green Mountain boy, such as my friend GREENE was in the Philippine War times, would not put up with an insult without visiting condign punishment, such as a man has the right to visit upon a soothless insulter, whether he ranks him in the Army or out of it. [Applause.]

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the item on page 2, for pay of cadets, where I wish to offer an amendment, in view of the fact that the proviso was held to be subject to a point of order. I ask unanimous consent to return to page 2, line 5, for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to return to page 2, line 5, for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: Page 2, line 5, insert:
"For pay of cadets, $600,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SABATH, 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. 15462) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 a. m. on Monday. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina what he plans to take up on Monday out of the ordinary?

Mr. KITCHIN. I shall ask unanimous consent that the House dispense with the business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar for the purpose of concluding the Military Academy bill, and that after the Military Academy bill is disposed of we go back to the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that on Monday the business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar be dispensed with pro tanto; that is, until the Military Academy bill is finished, and then that the House take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are quite a number of bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar that Members are anxious to dispose of. These bills are quite important. No one knows how long it will take to dispose of the Military Academy bill if we take it up on Monday morning. It may take a very large part of the day, in which event the unanimous-consent business would not be considered. It seems to me that it would be just as well to take up the unanimous-consent business at 11 o'clock in the morning, dispose of it, and then take up the Military Academy bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. I suggest that it would be impossible to dispose of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, for the reason that Members want to move to suspend the rules on so many bills.

Mr. MONDELL. I think it is true that there are a number of requests for suspension of the rules, which the Speaker expects to take care of, but that is an additional reason why we should have a large part of the day Monday for that business.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can we come to this understanding, if the gentleman from Wyoming will permit, that we shall proceed on Monday for an hour and a half in the consideration of the Military Academy bill? Many of us expect it will be concluded in that time. Then, if it is not concluded, we can go ahead with the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. DENT. I suggest to the gentleman that he make it two hours for the Military Academy bill. The bill itself will not take that time, but the outside discussion which developed here to-day is what takes up the time.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think unquestionably we can finish the bill in two hours.

Mr. DENT. We can without any doubt if the discussion is confined to the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would that meet the objection of the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. KITCHIN. Let us make it two hours, and I will modify my request and ask that, if at the end of two hours the Military Academy bill is not finished, the committee shall rise and go back into the House, when the House shall take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the House meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday, when not more than two hours shall be devoted to the consideration of the Military Academy bill; that if the Military Academy bill is finished before the end of the two hours, or if it is not, then at the end of two hours the House shall take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, are we to understand that the Committee on Military Affairs during the past two months of this session has not had authority to sit during the sessions of the House?

Mr. FIELDS. We thought we had, and think so now, but there was some question raised in the committee.

Mr. GORDON. You have been in almost continuous session?

Mr. FIELDS. We have been in almost continuous session.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the Military Affairs Committee be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Sunday, February 2, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the president of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co., transmitting report of the East Washing-

ton Heights Traction Railroad Co. for the year ending December 31, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1748); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., with a list of its stockholders, for the year ending December 31, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1749); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1750); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GANDY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12589) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1025), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. PRICE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13588) for the relief of the Baltimore Dry Docks and Ship Building Co., owner of a dry dock at Baltimore, Md., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1021), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WELLING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11833) for the relief of Seth J. Harris, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1022), 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. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15506) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Howe, county of Lagrange, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15507) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Howe Military School, in the city of Howe, county of Lagrange, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15508) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to what is known as Presidents Corners, in the county of Allen, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15509) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a public building at El Campo, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 15510) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Reynoldsville, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 15511) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Warren, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 15512) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Spanish Fork, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BESHLIN: A bill (H. R. 15513) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mercer, Pa., four German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15514) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Warren, Pa., six German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15515) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Oil City, Pa., five German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15516) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Franklin, Pa., four German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15517) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of St. Marys, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOOD: A bill (H. R. 15518) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newbern, in the State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 15519) for the erection of a public building at Okolona, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 15520) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Astoria, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 15521) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a public building at Paris, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15522) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a public building at Milan, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15523) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a public building at Salisbury, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15524) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Trenton, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOOD: A bill (H. R. 15525) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Goldsboro, in the State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15526) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Trenton, in the State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15527) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Jacksonville, in the State of North Caroline, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15528) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Clinton, in the State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15529) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bayboro, in the State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15530) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Burgaw, in the State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15531) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Kenansville, in the State of North Caroline, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15532) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Beaufort, in the State of North Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 15533) to provide for the erection of memorials and the entombment of bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington National Cemetery, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 15534) for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Brunswick, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 15535) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city parks of Wichita, Kans., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 15536) to provide for the building of certain roads in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 15537) providing that Indians and other persons on Indian reservations and superintendencies shall be subject to certain State or Territorial laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 15538) providing for the transportation from the District of Columbia of governmental employees whose services no longer are required or who may resign from their positions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 15539) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 15540) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Monticello, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15541) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Crown Point, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15542) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Battle Ground, Ind.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 15543) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Tryon, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15544) for the extension, alteration, and repair of the United States Government building at Asheville, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 15545) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at North Vernon, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 15546) for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a post-office building at Pauls Valley, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 15547) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Temple, Tex., one German fieldpiece or piece of artillery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 15548) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pell City, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15549) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ashville, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 15550) making an appropriation for the reclamation of lands to furnish employment and farm homes for discharged soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 15551) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 15552) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Dewey, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15553) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Greer, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15554) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Ellis, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15555) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Kiowa, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15556) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Washita, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15557) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Roger Mills, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15558) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Harmon, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15559) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jackson, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15560) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Tillman, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15561) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Custer, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15562) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Beckham, Okla., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 15563) for the erection of a public building at Modesto, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15564) authorizing the acquisition of a site for a public building at Hallettsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 15571) to regulate the sale of stock, lots, contracts, or securities of private corporations in States or Territories other than those in which such corporations are incorporated; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15572) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to certain towns in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15573) to erect a public building in the city of Childress, the county seat of Childress County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 402) to express the opinion of the Congress of the United States in reference to continued expenditures of public money heretofore appropriated for the construction of military camps and cantonments during time of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 66) to withdraw United States troops from Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the retirement on annuities of men and women in the employment of the United States who are over the age of 68 years; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 15565) granting an increase of pension to John A. Vermeulen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 15566) granting an increase of pension to Frank Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 15567) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Drinkwater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 15568) for the relief of the estate of Jarib L. Sanderson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 15569) granting a pension to Carson Rummel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15570) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Livezey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Joint Conference on Retirement for Civil Service of the United States, indorsing Keating retirement bill, House bill 12352; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of members of South St. Paul Live Stock Exchange, protesting against the adoption of Sims bill (H. R. 13324) to give President power to purchase and operate the large stockyards, adopted by the shippers of Minnesota and Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of faculty of the Western Illinois State Normal School, favoring House bill 4987, to create a Federal department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Ohio mine workers in convention at Columbus, Ohio, January 14-18, 1919, against militarism and any form of physical training or mental education tending to inculcate same, and favoring a return of prewar status of our Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolutions of Division No. 16, Ancient Order of Hibernians, and Division No. 4, Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Pascoag, R. I., urging self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KRAUS: Petition of sundry citizens of Huntington, Ind., on Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of Creek County National Farm Loan Association, of Creek County, Okla., relating to the removal of restrictions and sale of restricted Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Rotary Club of Philadelphia, Pa., urging that the name of Panama Canal be changed to Roosevelt Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, relating to railroad control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of Northern White Cedar Association, favoring the early return of the railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., asking for repeal of postal zone rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of J. J. Leavy and 41 citizens of Albion, Mich., favoring six months' additional salary for soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petition of T. L. Andre and 30 others requesting an early discharge from the Army of all soldiers who were engaged in agricultural work at the time they were inducted into the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAGUE: Telegrams from certain business men of Boston, Mass., regarding proposed taxes in the 1920 revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, Philadelphia, Pa., opposing Government ownership of public utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Huntington Lodge, No. 104, International Association of Machinists, favoring House bill 10550, relating to Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SUNDAY, *February 2, 1919.*

(Legislative day of Friday, January 31, 1919.)

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

[The proceedings of the Senate will be found in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.]

The Senate (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Monday, February 3, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SUNDAY, *February 2, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal God, Author of the Universe, Father of all souls, in the midst of the impenetrable mysteries which surround us, we come with profound faith, eternal hope, that in Thy wisdom, power, and goodness we shall be exalted, ennobled, glorified, in Thine own good time.

Let Thy richest blessings descend upon us now as we gather here to give expression to the worth of the men who were dignified by the people and made Members of the Congress of the United States. What they did to glorify a Nation of freemen will live and be a blessing to future generations.

Let Thy loving arms be about their dear ones to comfort and sustain them in this hour of trial. Give them a vision of the larger life and help them to look forward to a reunion with their dear ones in a realm where mysteries shall be dissolved and the brightest hopes realized in the dispensation of Thy Providence. Through Him who died, that we might live. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal may be dispensed with until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with until to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the special order for to-day.

THE LATE SENATOR WILLIAM J. STONE.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. RUCKER, by unanimous consent,

Ordered, That Sunday, February 2, 1919, be set apart for addresses upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. WILLIAM J. STONE, late a Senator from the State of Missouri, and the Hon. JACOB E. MEEKER, late a Member of this House, from the State of Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 543.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. WILLIAM J. STONE, late a Senator of the United States from the State of Missouri, and the Hon. JACOB E. MEEKER, late a Member of this House from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of their distinguished public careers, the House, at the conclusion of the exercises of this day, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the families of the deceased.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. IGOE took the chair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when Gov. Benjamin Gratz Brown, one of the most brilliant of all Missouri statesmen, on a historic occasion said: "Missouri is a grand State and deserves to be grandly governed," he uttered an immortal truth. He might have added, with equal veracity, "She deserves to be grandly represented in the Congress of the United States," and she has been in the main, particularly in the Senate, where paucity of members and length of tenure more surely fix a man in the public eye than service in the House.

First and last, Missouri has commissioned 26 different men to represent her at the other end of the Capitol, in the less numerous branch of the National Legislature, in the Chamber of the Conscript Fathers, in "the Upper House of Congress," improperly so called, or, as Senator Morgan, of Alabama, would have it, "ambassadors of a sovereign State" to the Federal Government. Beginning with David Barton and Thomas Hart Benton, her pioneer Senators, who at once attracted general attention and challenged universal admiration by reason of their commanding talents, down to this very hour, when, in the persons of JAMES A. REED and SELDEN P. SPENCER, she holds high position in that conspicuous arena, Missouri has taken second place to none of her sister States.

These 26 Senators naturally divide themselves into two classes—the Barton line and the Benton line, 18 in the former and only 8 in the latter.

In the Barton line are Barton himself, Alexander Buckner, Lewis F. Linn, David R. Atchison, James S. Green, Waldo P. Johnson, Robert Wilson, Benjamin Gratz Brown, Charles D. Drake, Daniel T. Jewett, Francis P. Blair, Lewis V. Bogy, David H. Armstrong, James Shields, George G. Vest, William Joel Stone, Xenophen P. Wilfley, and SELDON P. SPENCER.

In the Benton line are Benton himself, Henry S. Geyer, Trusten Polk, John B. Henderson, Carl Schurz, Francis Marion Cockrell, William Warner, and JAMES A. REED.

Lucky the man who gets into Barton's seat; luckier, far luckier, the man who secures that of Thomas H. Benton, as the precedents indicate a longer public life for him.

An examination of the dates at which Missourians entered and left the Senate will disclose two curious facts in Missouri history. She is the first State that ever elected two men for five full consecutive terms to the Senate of the United States—"six Roman lustrums," as Benton was wont to boast in his pompous way. These were Benton and Cockrell. The only other State to do that is Maine, Missouri's political twin. Missouri was the first State that had only one Senator for any considerable length of time through failure to elect another. By reason of the unrelenting warfare between the Bentonites and the anti-Bentonites the legislature chosen in 1854 never could and never did elect a Senator, as it was in duty bound to do, so that for two entire years Henry S. Geyer was Missouri's only Senator.

What is more, the governor did not appoint or attempt to appoint anyone to fill the vacancy, nobody then dreaming that the governor had such power. But in these later days several States have followed Missouri's example in failing to elect Senators, and, strange to say, divers governors have insisted on the right to fill vacancies by appointment under similar circumstances, until finally the Senate, after lengthy and ponderous debate, solemnly vindicated the wisdom and knowledge of constitutional law possessed by the governor of Missouri in 1855 and 1856, Sterling Price, by declaring that a governor has no right to make such ad interim appointment under such circumstances.

Of Missouri's 26 Senators there were 18 Democrats, 1 Whig, and 8 Republicans. Of 156 years of senatorial representation to which she has been entitled, 2 were not used, 6 fell to Whigs, 28 to Republicans, and 160 to Democrats.

This roster of Missouri Senators is an array of names of which the Nation, no less than the State, may well be proud. There are many great men—scarcely a small one—in the list.