Mr. SMOOT. What is amendment numbered 4?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Amendment numbered 4 struck out the appropriation of $23,000 made by the House for the purchase of boxes, book rests, chairs, and so forth, in the Treasury Department. The Senate struck that out.

Mr. SMOOT. And the Senate conferees yielded?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senate conferees yielded.

Mr. SMOOT. Was there any additional reason given to the conferees why that should be done?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. They have only $160 available for this purpose. The Secretary of the Treasury stated that that was absolutely inadequate, and would leave him very much embarrassed.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is convinced that the appropriation ought to remain.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Yes; I am convinced of it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the report.

The report was agreed to.

BIRTHDAY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, on this particular day, fraught with such memories to the American people, it seems to me that something has been forgotten. I recognize that in these modern times pure Americanism may not be wholly so popular as once it was, but lest we forget, Mr. President, I want to read a very brief address delivered November 19, 1863:

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

"But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate, we can not consecrate, we can not hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Mr. President, as a mark of respect to the memory of the American, Abraham Lincoln, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. LEWIS. May I ask the Senator from California to withhold the motion that I may address the Senate for a moment on the subject?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, it was my intention to address the Senate for a moment upon this sacred theme, but since the able Senator from California has appropriately tendered the immortal address of Lincoln at Gettysburg, I ask the Senate to indulge me for but a moment while I tender a tribute of a word, which I will do tersely, taking no more time than the conditions of legislation will justify.

Mr. President, if the angels bore messages to the sanctified spirits in heaven, the sacred couriers would bear to Abraham Lincoln the tidings that on this birthday the world paid the tribute of thanks to God that Lincoln lived and taught. The celestial realms this hour ring with pæans that the gospel of Christ for the saving the souls of men for God; and the gospel of Lincoln for the saving the lives of men for liberty of life, at last fulfill the Scripture. These are "gospel to all men" and are "preached throughout the world." This day the ambassadors of peace to man and regeneration of worlds who sit in Paris are met in the name of Lincoln. In the name of his prayer they petition the Father of Justice to administer to men the liberty taught by Lincoln. Wherever men gather to preach to the text of freedom they speak in the name of Lincoln. Wherever nations are assembled to enforce right among men and justice to civilization they dedicate their petition in the spirit of Lincoln.

Mr. President, for 50 years the great revolutions and reforms have marched under the banner of Lincoln's declarations against wrongs. Every bugle blast calling the children of men to arise and strike for freedom from corruption from within and oppression from without, trumpets in Lincoln's name. From the United States the example that lifted men to action and inspired nations to immortal deeds were born of the urge of Lincoln on the spirit of life. The emancipation of the blacks by Lincoln to equality of liberty, the call of Roosevelt for integrity of character in public office, and the cry of Wilson for the end of tyranny through all the earth is but the prayer of Lincoln voiced by the patriots of the American Republic. All now march as the conquering crusader over the world gathering converts of kings and slaves until all the world rejoices in the saving grace that God has given mankind through the works of Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Wilson. All speak the creed of Christ, do the will of God in the regeneration of man to liberty and brotherhood through the undying deeds of the imperishable Lincoln.

As one of the Senators, a representative of Illinois, Mr. President, I delight to be privileged to pay this tribute to the distinguished patriot of my State—this immortal statesman of my country.

Mr. JOHNSON of California rose.

Mr. SMOOT. Just a moment, if the Senator from California will yield. It will be impossible for me to speak on this day after listening to the reading of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] of the most wonderful speech that was ever delivered by mortal man and by the greatest American, living or dead. Therefore I am perfectly willing to forego at this time what I had to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate do now adjourn out of respect to the memory of the great American, Abraham Lincoln.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 13, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *February 12, 1919.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Our Father in heaven, ever working in and through Thy children for the betterment of mankind. Many are called but few are chosen, since few are willing to meet the crucial test, the heroic, the sublime sacrifice. To be great is to be humble. To follow the path of duty is to be brave, noble.

We lift up our hearts to Thee, on this natal day, for the life, character, and public service of Abraham Lincoln—the greatest miracle of modern times.

Born in poverty, reared in penury, with little opportunity for even a primary education, yet by dint of his own efforts he became the greatest among the great. The truths he uttered, the message he brought in his faultless rhetoric and logic live and will live through all time.

He belongs to the ages. May we cherish his memory, emulate his virtues, tell his story round the fireside, in our schools, churches, and in all public places to coming generations; to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

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

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] is recognized to read Lincoln's Gettysburg address. [Applause.]

Mr. RUBEY (reading)—

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

"But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate, we can not consecrate, we can not hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. By order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, it is well that we should pause for a brief moment from the strenuous duties of this session to recall something of the life and services of that greatest of Americans, Abraham Lincoln. His life, his character, his greatness is more apparent and grows brighter and brighter as the years come and go. To honor him and his memory is but to honor ourselves. To follow his precepts and his example is to glorify our country and its institutions. As we listened to the reading of that wonderful Gettysburg Address, we could realize how the very soul of a great man and of a great people could be expressed in few words—but words that grip the heart of a Nation. The great oration of Everett on that occasion was received by the multitude with tumultuous cheers and applause, but his words are forgotten. Lincoln's brief address, following that oration, was received in silence—silence and awe, as profound as though the great audience had listened to a voice from another world; and the words of that address live to-day, and will live forever, as the expression of the hopes, the wishes, the ideals of the lovers of freedom and free government the world over. As Lincoln then said, "Let us here highly resolve, * * * that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." We should here cherish that sentiment to-day and give to it its full meaning and expression. Abraham Lincoln represented that sentiment in all his life and all his public service. His greatness of mind and heart was not derived from modern education or from schools and colleges. It was from the very soil from which he sprang. He did not look over the people's heads. He sympathized with them in all their thoughts, their ideals, and their aspirations. He was of the people and for the people, and therein lay his greatness of soul and thought and action. In his sympathy with and love for the people, his kindness of heart, he came as near to the divine example of the Man of Nazareth as any other man who has made an impression on the history of the world. Coupled with his great heart the Almighty gave him also great intellect, that he might in the good providence of God lead a free people to higher and better things. Much may be found in the record of his life and teachings that we may well consider now in connection with the tremendous problems that confront this Nation and the world.

I recall one thing he often said. It was this: "Teach and practice economy; that is one of the first and highest virtues. It begins with saving money." I commend that advice to the majority in this Congress, and to the present administration, as being worthy of thoughtful and even prayerful consideration. I apprehend that the people of this country will soon be heard in very earnest commendation of this advice of Abraham Lincoln.

Gen. Richard J. Oglesby, of Illinois, then a young man, but afterwards a Senator of the United States and three times governor of Illinois, was on the most intimate terms with President Lincoln during his term of office. I have often heard Gen. Oglesby repeat the advice which Lincoln gave him, which was, "Keep close to the people, Dick, keep close to the people, and they will never mislead you." It was good advice to follow. Too many in this day of men in high positions look over the heads of the people and fail to appreciate the ultimate fact that all power rests with the people and that "the voice of the people is the voice of God."

We have just emerged from a great world war, another demonstration of the eternal conflict that has been waged for ages between autocratic power and the right of the people to govern themselves. Again in the good providence of God the people have won in the contest, but let us not forget that it is the victory of the people and not of any man or any set of men or of any clique or clan; and what the people have won in this last great conflict they will at every cost maintain and perpetuate. The brave boys of America who have been fighting the battles of humanity are coming home, some of them in health and strength, thank God, and others with cruel wounds as evidence of what the conflict has cost them. Let us now remember Lincoln's words: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to go on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." [Applause.]

To us mortals the ways of the Almighty are ofttimes inscrutable, but I believe that his guiding hand has ever been over this Nation, and that, as Lincoln quoted, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." The great emancipator's work was done and God called him for his own, using the cruel hand of the assassin for the purpose. As Lincoln's life was ebbing away in the early hours of the morning in that little chamber on Tenth Street, in this city, the anxious watchers at the bedside stood with bated breath until that loving heart ceased to beat, when the great Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, tenderly crossed the hands upon the lifeless breast as in awestruck tones he said, "He belongs to the ages." And so Abraham Lincoln sleeps to-day in the capital city of the State from which he came, and there thousands of freedom-loving pilgrims come, and will come for generations in the future, to pay tribute to the name of one of the world's immortals.

Illinois is justly proud of the immortal names that illumine its history all down through the hundred years of its statehood in this Union.

Not without thy wondrous story,
Illinois, Illinois,
Can be writ the Nation's glory,
Illinois, Illinois;
On the record of thy years
Abraham Lincoln's name appears,
Grant and Logan and our tears,
Illinois, Illinois.

[Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 83) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to certify certain findings of fact, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a change of reference of the bill S. 3392, from the Committee on the Public Lands to the Committee on Irrigation.

The SPEAKER. What is it?

Mr. EVANS. It is a reclamation project and clearly belongs to the Irrigation Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to a change of reference for the bill S. 3392, from the Committee on the Public Lands to the Committee on Irrigation. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SECOND DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the second deficiency bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read the conference report and statement, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1058).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, 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 and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 6, and 7, 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: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: On page 3 of the bill, in line 4, strike out "$12,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

SWAGAR SHERLEY,
JOHN J. EAGAN,
J. G. CANNON,
Managers on the part of the House.

THOMAS S. MARTIN,
O. W. UNDERWOOD,
F. E. WARREN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report as to each of said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Appropriates $6,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $12,000 as proposed by the House, for expenses of community forums and civic centers in public-school buildings in the District of Columbia.

On No. 2: Authorizes the use in the District of Columbia of $9,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $5,000 as proposed by the Senate, of the appropriation for carrying on the work of the Employees' Compensation Commission in France.

On No. 3: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the paragraph providing for the occupancy of the Navy Department annex by the Auditor for the War Department.

On No. 4: Appropriates $23,000, as proposed by the House, for furniture and other office equipment for the Treasury Department.

On No. 5: Appropriates $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House, for temporary employees of the War Department.

On No. 6: Provides for the restoration to their former positions of all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service, in the manner as proposed by the Senate, instead of in the manner proposed by the House.

On No. 7: Appropriates $2,614.84 for rent of buildings for the Navy Department, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,570.84 as proposed by the House.

SWAGAR SHERLEY,
JOHN J. EAGAN,
J. G. CANNON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, the statement deals with the seven amendments that were in conference, but it is in error in a slight degree as to amendment No. 1. The Senate struck out the provision put in in the House for $12,000 as a deficiency for community forums and civic centers. In conference there was an agreement for the restoration of the provision, but appropriating only $6,000. The statement makes it appear that the Senate had originally suggested $6,000.

In regard to the two other amendments of any magnitude, one increases the appropriation from four to five million dollars in connection with temporary clerks for the War Department. When before the House Committee on Appropriations they asked for $6,000,000. We gave them $4,000,000. They insisted before the Senate that they needed the $6,000,000, but the Senate agreed to allow them $5,000,000. I do not think anybody can tell with any degree of accuracy just the amount that is needed, but their representations were so pronounced that even the $6,000,000 that they asked for would supply them with hardly sufficient clerks, and in view of the action of the Senate in the reconsideration of the action of the House allowing four millions, the conferees acquiesced in the amendment allowing five millions.

The other amendment which is of importance is one in relation to the restoration of soldiers to positions that they held prior to their entering into the Army and giving them preference over civilian employees, provided they are qualified to do the work. The change made by the Senate was to strike out the House provision, which was a limitation on the expenditure of the fund, and by identical language as a separate provision to make it a substantive law, applying generally. The House conferees, believing that that was in accordance with the view of the House, as expressed in its limitation, agreed to the proposal of the Senate.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I do not remember exactly the form of the amendment. I think there has been an amendment agreed to of that character upon several different bills, one on the deficiency bill, one on the census bill, and I am not sure but there was one on the legislative bill.

Mr. GARNER. There was.

Mr. MANN. I am very anxious that we should not get our wires crossed and put a provision in the census bill which will be in conflict with the provision in the deficiency bill, both of which may possibly be in conflict with some provision in some other bill, not to mention a bill that is now pending, reported from one of the committees, covering the whole subject. I thought the whole thing was covered in the census bill amendment that was agreed to.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I agree thoroughly with the gentleman as to the desirability of having one enactment rather than a number that may be in conflict, and for that reason I questioned the wisdom of placing it in the form of a limitation upon this bill when the matter was pending in the House.

Mr. MANN. At that time the census bill had not been agreed to.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; but a similar provision had been put on the legislative bill. It is my understanding that the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, in dealing with the legislative bill, have put into it the exact amendment that they are putting here in the deficiency bill, and in order that the RECORD may show just what they have put in and what the House conferees agreed to, I shall read it, with the hope that those who are conferees on these other bills will see to it that the action that is taken, if any, shall be in accordance and not in conflict with this provision. The provision as it now exists reads as follows:

> That all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated on application to their former positions, if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the position.

Mr. MANN. I think that is not in conflict with the provision in the census bill. This is applicable only to reinstatements?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The census bill provides in reference to original appointments all through the service.

Mr. GARNER. Giving the preference under the civil service?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. The effect of this was simply to take it from the form of a limitation as it passed the House and put it into the form of substantive law, and, therefore, the House conferees felt they were but obeying the wishes of the House in agreeing to the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, referring to the appropriation for the naval training station at the Great Lakes, the Bureau of Navigation has issued an order that all students at such institutions shall be discharged upon their own application. I find that that station and other similar places do not seem to grasp that order. I do not suppose the gentleman can, but I wonder if he might be able to tell us whether it is the intention of such places to obey this order or to continue to do as they darn please.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I assume that it is the intention of every department affected to obey the order. I have no personal knowledge touching the particular matter to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. Speaker, just one word more. The Senate did not affect the bill as it passed the House in any of its major particulars. It still repeals the appropriations and authorizations in the amount it did when it passed the House, and I again express the hope that the action of Congress taken in this pronounced way may result, as I believe it will, in the curtailment of unnecessary expenses and will be the medium of saving to the country moneys in very, very large sums.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to ask the gentleman, with reference to one of the minor amendments, amendment No. 7, referring to the rental of additional quarters for the Navy Department. The Senate strikes out the amount $2,570.84 and inserts the amount $2,614.84.

Mr. SHERLEY. That was a deficiency, and the amendment is simply to correct an error in amount. As the gentleman sees, it amounts to something under $100.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

ARMY 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 further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15835) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

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 further consideration of the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I find one or two typographical errors or omissions in the report, but I think they are self-explanatory. As stated in the report, the department submitted estimates when Congress reassembled on the first Monday in December which they afterwards requested should not be considered, because the estimates as then submitted were purely tentative, and asked for further time in which to make complete and final estimates. The committee waited for those estimates until the middle of January, when we finally received from the department their final estimates. Immediately upon the receipt of these complete estimates the committee proceeded to sit morning and afternoon and sometimes at night in order to complete this bill as early as possible.

As chairman of the committee I wish to say that I have had the full and complete cooperation of the members of the committee on both sides of the House in endeavoring to work out a bill as rapidly as possible, and I am glad to say that the committee comes before the House with a bill as to which we are in practical agreement. There may be one or two items of legislation in it about which there is some little difference of opinion, but in the main the committee has reported the bill unanimously.

Let me state to the committee in a general way the purpose of the Military Committee in drafting this legislation. The armistice having been declared on the 11th of November, 1918, and Congress having convened only a short time afterwards, necessarily the permanent policy of the War Department and the permanent military policy of Congress was undetermined. The result was that the committee finally reached the conclusion that the only thing that could be done at this session of Congress was to fix a limitation upon the size of the Army to be appropriated for the next fiscal year, with the express understanding that this is not to be considered the permanent military policy of the country.

The War Department, in considering the question as to how long it would probably take to demobilize the Army, recommended that there should be an appropriation for an Army of an average size during the next fiscal year of 28,579 officers and something like 509,000 enlisted men.

Mr. GARNER. Would it interrupt the gentleman if I should ask him a question?

Mr. DENT. Not at all.

Mr. GARNER. The next fiscal year begins July 1, 1919, and ends July 1, 1920, and this bill, if I understand it, appropriates money to carry an average army in this country, not counting what is in France, of about 537,000 men and officers. Does the War Department think you are going to have an average of that many men in the service from July 1, 1919, to July 1, 1920?

Mr. DENT. Well, I do not know that the gentleman catches exactly the idea I was undertaking to convey. This does not indicate what is to be the strength of the Army at all, but it means simply this, that on the 1st day of July of this year, for instance, we may have 1,200,000 men in the Army, whereas on the 1st day of next May or next June we may have only 200,000 men.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman mean in the United States—within the boundaries of the United States?

Mr. DENT. In the entire service.

Mr. GARNER. Does this bill provide for the payment of troops in France?

Mr. DENT. Certainly; it provides for troops wherever they are.

Mr. GARNER. That is what I was trying to get the gentleman's attention directed to. This bill provides, then, for the payment of troops in France for the next fiscal year. Is there any money for the next fiscal year by which troops can be paid outside of this?

Mr. DENT. No; there is not. Of course, if there are troops in France, this bill will provide for the payment of those troops. Whether there will be any troops in France or not or how many I do not know.

Mr. GARNER. If there are no troops in France on the 1st day of July, 1919, it is inconceivable to me that you would have 1,200,000 men on that day.

Mr. DENT. There are bound to be some troops in France on the 1st day of July of this year. The committee was informed by the War Department and the testimony before the committee was that by February the department hoped to begin to return troops at the rate of 200,000 a month; that by March they hoped the monthly return of troops would reach 250,000; so that if you figure on 200,000 in February, this month, and 250,000 in March it will be impossible for us to bring back 2,000,000 men who are in France between now and the 1st day of July.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question right at that point?

Mr. DENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAZARO. Can the gentleman tell the committee how many men there were in the service when the armistice was signed and how many men have been brought back since the armistice was signed up to date, as near as possible?

Mr. STAFFORD. We can not hear the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will permit——

Mr. LAZARO. I asked the gentleman if he could tell the committee how many men were in the service on the day the armistice was signed and how many men have been brought back since the armistice was signed?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. In Europe?

Mr. LAZARO. Certainly, in Europe.

Mr. DENT. I am going to put those figures in the RECORD.

Mr. KAHN. If my colleague will allow me, Secretary Baker published a statement in the Review of Reviews for this month in which he said there were 2,002,000 and some odd men that had crossed to the other side and were over in France, or Belgium, or Germany, or Russia, and that there had been about a million six hundred and some odd thousand left in the United States.

Mr. DENT. We had in round numbers on the day the armistice was signed something like 3,700,000 men in the Army.

Mr. LAZARO. On the other side?

Mr. DENT. No, in all. The latest figures I have as to the number that have been actually returned since the signing of the armistice is something like 175,000. I am going to put in the RECORD figures furnished me only this morning.

Mr. LAZARO. The question was asked for information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we could not hear the reply of the gentleman to the question of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. DENT. I said in round numbers we had in the military service something like 3,700,000 men when the armistice was signed and the latest figures that I have had of the number that have been returned up to date is about 175,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is just this difference in the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama and that made by the gentleman from California: The gentleman from California says that Secretary Baker in an article in a publication known as the Review of Reviews, which we may or may not see, has said that there were 2,002,000 men on the other side of the water. Now, if there are 2,002,000 men over there in France, in Germany, in Belgium, and in Russia, as the gentleman from California indicates, how many men have been brought back of those 2,002,000 men?

Mr. DENT. I said the latest figures I have been able to get were about 175,000 in round numbers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A hundred and seventy-five thousand out of a total of 2,002,000?

Mr. DENT. The figures as given to me are just a little over 2,000,000 men in France, enlisted men; a little less than 2,000,000 enlisted men, and with the officers making a little over 2,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman state whether the Secretary of War has given Congress or the Committee on Military Affairs any such figures as he has given to the Review of Reviews, as quoted by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN]?

Mr. DENT. That is substantially right; yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the fact is that, though the families of the soldiers in the United States are worrying about the return of the soldiers, and the soldiers themselves are anxious to get home, feeling that their work is done, many of them suffering and more of them dying in France, Belgium, Germany, and Russia, we have brought back up to the present time, since the signing of the armistice, from the 2,002,000 men over there, only 175,000 men?

Mr. DENT. That is substantially so.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That accounts very largely for the fearful expense bills that we are obliged to incur and that this Congress and the people of the United States must pay in the way of taxation.

Mr. GARNER. Can the gentleman tell us the reason why there has not been more than 175,000 men brought back?

Mr. DENT. The reason they give is because they can not get the transportation facilities.

Mr. GARNER. Does the War Department give that reason?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Do they undertake to convey the idea that just as fast as transportation can be furnished they will be brought back?

Mr. DENT. Yes; and giving preference to the wounded soldiers.

Mr. GARNER. Let me ask the gentleman this question. I notice in the press reports that our fleet has just gone down to the southern waters to maneuver. Could not those vessels be used to bring troops back from France?

Mr. DENT. I can not answer that question. The gentleman knows as much about that as I do.

Mr. GARNER. Where could we get that information?

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. In addition to what the gentleman has said about the 175,000 men that have been returned, the Secretary of War stated that they first return the wounded, which require more space and more time to handle, and after getting the wounded soldiers back they would, of course, increase the numbers that could be brought back, because they could bring more men in the same space and it would take less time to handle them.

Mr. GARNER. Maybe the gentleman can give me the information. Does the gentleman know just why these vessels—the 15 that are going down to maneuver for several weeks—could not be used to bring the troops back?

Mr. FIELDS. I do not know why.

Mr. LAZARO. I wanted to ask a question for information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman from Louisiana will yield to me just a minute, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he knows anything about the truth of the statement that the steamship *George Washington*, which took the President over, came back with space and sleeping accommodations for a thousand men vacant?

Mr. DENT. No; I do not know anything about that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may be permitted to make his statement consecutively and without interruption.

Mr. LAZARO. Can the gentleman tell the committee if they agreed on the number of the army of occupation—that is, from our standpoint—how many men we are supposed to furnish there until the peace treaty is signed; and, second, whether our allies are helping us in bringing our boys back home?

Mr. DENT. In answer to the first question of the gentleman, I stated, I thought, right at the outset that this entire program as recommended by the committee is purely a temporary proposition, and there is absolutely no understanding as to the size of the army of occupation that is to remain in Europe; and I am informed that the British are helping us in bringing our troops back.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I notice under the legislative provision of this bill, if I read it correctly, that provision is made for enlisting volunteers for an army of 500,000 men and a little more. Is that in addition to taking care of the men who are already in the Army?

Mr. DENT. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES. It says that the Secretary of War is authorized, while making further provision for the national defense, to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States by adding a force sufficient to maintain an aggregate commissioned enlisted strength of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men. Is that an additional force?

Mr. DENT. I will explain to the gentleman in this way: The purpose of that is to restore voluntary enlistments, so that, whatever the size of the Army we may have during the next fiscal year, it will be raised by voluntary enlistments in two ways—first, a regular permanent establishment under the national-defense act of June 3, 1916, which in peace times we limited to 175,000 men, and a temporary army to be enlisted for the period of one year only by voluntary enlistment, aggregating a total force not to exceed 509,000.

Mr. JONES. And this can be raised sufficiently to make it 500,000, regardless of whether or not the others are demobilized?

Mr. DENT. It could be.

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman think that many are necessary while the others are being demobilized?

Mr. DENT. I do not think they will ever get them. It is just a method we arrived at for the purpose of fixing the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman has stated the number of men that were in foreign service at the time of the armistice and also the number of those soldiers that have been returned. Will he please state the number of men who have been discharged from the camps in this country and, approximately, the number still in camps?

Mr. DENT. I am going to put those figures in the RECORD, if the members of the committee will give me time.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Just prior to the signing of the armistice we were sending our soldiers abroad at the rate of about 300,000 a month. Since the signing of the armistice, of course, we have not sent any abroad. But with the same amount of merchant shipping and all the naval ships released from patrol duty, can the gentleman explain why we have only been able to bring them back at the rate of 60,000 a month, or only about one-fifth the number we were sending abroad just before the signing of the armistice?

Mr. DENT. I can give the gentleman this one reason that has been given to the committee, and that is that the British loaned us a good deal of their transportation facilities in order to get the men over there, their army being already on French soil; but the English have had to bring their army back, too, and consequently they have not been able to loan us as many ships as they did prior to the signing of the armistice.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The bringing of the British troops home presented but a small problem, their country being but a few miles away.

Mr. DENT. But they have to use ships.

Mr. RAMSEYER. What proportion of our men were taken over on American bottoms?

Mr. GARNER. I understand between 40 and 50 per cent.

Mr. DENT. About 40 per cent.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Then why can we not bring back at least 40 per cent in any one month of the number that we sent over prior to the signing of the armistice?

Mr. DENT. I can not answer any further than I have already answered.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman has said twice that the British loaned us their ships. Does he mean that, or did Great Britain rent them to us?

Mr. DENT. The situation is this: We expect to pay the British for the use of their ships, but the amount that we are going to pay them has yet to be determined.

Mr. KEARNS. Then Great Britain did not in any wise loan us the ships?

Mr. DENT. If we pay for them, I reckon it would still be a loan in one sense.

Mr. KEARNS. We would hire them.

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to go ahead with my statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to ask the gentleman about some things in France, and I hope he will be patient with me. I would like to know if there is any provision in this bill, or if the War Department is now in possession of funds, to pay for damages resulting from the occupation of French territory by the American troops?

Mr. DENT. There is an appropriation made for that purpose; yes. You mean payment to private parties?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask the gentleman to be patient because the country wants to know about these things.

Mr. DENT. I am always patient.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman is; but up to the present time we have been very liberal with the Committee on Military Affairs. It has had all that it asked for at the request of the administration. I want to know whether the gentleman knows whether we of the United States are paying the French authorities for the occupation of the trenches used by the American troops?

Mr. DENT. That report has been circulated, and it is absolutely false. That question has been asked by the Committee on Military Affairs of the War Department, and they have denounced it as an absolute falsehood.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has been brought to me as a report——

Mr. DENT. The only property occupation expense that we are paying for over there is where we organize a training camp and use the property of a private person, just as we would occupy private property over in this country for training purposes. We have paid for that, but so far as the payment of rent for the occupation of trenches is concerned, that is said to be an absolute falsehood.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are we paying for the ground on which those trenches are dug?

Mr. DENT. We are not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are we paying for the use of the trenches in any way—rental or fee simple?

Mr. DENT. We are not, if you can rely on the absolute statement of the War Department.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield a moment——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to ask the gentleman a further question if the gentleman will yield a moment. Why, when we are trying to get at facts, must we be interrupted all the time by members of the committee who do not want us to know these things?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I want to challenge the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I have answered the gentleman's questions positively and emphatically.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to find out how our money is spent in France and under what auspices. To whom may I go to get that information but to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman will pardon me and not be quite so fast——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] has the floor——

Mr. McKENZIE. I might add, in connection with the statement as to training camps, that where we have training fields and have practice trenches we have paid rental for the ground and for those trenches, and we do that in this country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for that statement. Now, while we are paying the debt we owe to Lafayette——

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to permit the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make a speech in my time. I have yielded to the gentleman, but I decline to yield further.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am seeking information as to the waste of public moneys.

Mr. DENT. I decline to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then, when the time comes, I will make a speech in my own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is out of order. The gentleman from Alabama has the floor.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LUNN. I ask in behalf of the chairman of the committee that he be permitted to make his statement without interruption.

Mr. DENT. It is very difficult for me to decline an interruption when a gentleman asks me a gentlemanly question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The question I asked of the gentleman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama declines to yield.

Mr. DENT. Most of these questions will be answered in the course of the debate.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If it is ungentlemanly——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has the floor. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is out of order, because the gentleman from Alabama declines to yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the Chairman. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is always a gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That answers the query I have in mind. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the general policy or plan which the committee adopted relative to this bill, with the distinct understanding, I repeat, that this is not intended as permanent legislation or as any permanent military policy, but as the only practical way under the circumstances by which we can arrive at the sum of money which should be appropriated in order to carry on the Military Establishment during the next fiscal year.

We carry in the bill some legislative features in addition to this. One of them restores voluntary enlistments in the Army, and that provision is to become operative immediately upon the approval of the act. It was stated by the Secretary of War and by the General Staff that many men now in the service are anxious to reenlist and to continue therein, but under the law, while they would have the right to reenlist, the period of enlistment is limited to the present emergency. This law restores the enlistment period as it was in the act of June 3, 1916, so that we can organize a permanent Army under that act by voluntary enlistment, which in peace times is limited to 175,000 men, and the additional army is a mere temporary army, to be raised by voluntary enlistment for a period of one year. That, we think, will take care of the military situation until the close of the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will my friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Is it not contended by the military authorities that if they are given this provision for voluntary enlistment, it will enable them more speedily to demobilize the Army and let out of the service a number of men whom they can not now let out until they can get volunteers to take their places?

Mr. DENT. That is the contention of the War Department.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman permit one question there?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Do I understand that some enlistments in the Regular Army will be for the prescribed period?

Mr. DENT. For three years.

Mr. DYER. And that others will be accepted for one year?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. What percentage is for one year and what percentage is for three years?

Mr. DENT. There is no percentage fixed, except that under the act of June 3, 1916, known as the national-defense act, the peace limitation upon the Army is 175,000, but the war strength would be something like 275,000, about 100,000 more.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is not proposed under this bill to make the permanent military strength of this country 500,000?

Mr. DENT. It is not. It is intended by this bill to limit the permanent Military Establishment in peace times to what it is limited to under the national-defense act, 175,000 men.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. IGOE. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if his committee went into the question of how many enlisted men are retained now by the War Department in positions in this country that could very well be filled by civilians? For instance, in the matter of the transport corps, which has just recently been authorized, there are thousands of men who are being retained because the department say they will have to get some other people to take their places before they can let them go. How in the world are we ever going to let those men out unless we provide for the employment of civilians?

Mr. DENT. The committee asked questions about that. Has the gentleman any suggestions he can make that the Military Committee can act upon?

Mr. IGOE. Yes; I suggest that you authorize the Secretary of War to spend money to pay civilians to do the work which is now being done by men getting $30 a month, because there are thousands of people now who will do those things.

Mr. DENT. What is the practical suggestion that the gentleman urges to be put upon this bill?

Mr. IGOE. The practical suggestion that I offer is this: That if the committee has not already provided money that can be used to pay civilian employees the provision be put in this bill and that the War Department be prevented from keeping men in the Army as enlisted men whose work can as well be done by civilians without any detriment to the military service.

Mr. DENT. Of course, as far as any appropriations for that purpose are concerned, they have already been had. There is nothing in this particular bill that covers a case of that kind. The committee has provided in this bill for the repeal of the Overman Act, except in so far as it might maintain field and tactical units.

Mr. IGOE. The Overman Act has got nothing to do with what I am talking about.

Mr. DENT. The Transport Corps is organized under it.

Mr. IGOE. Under the Overman Act?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask my colleague a question upon that point?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. DYER. And I will ask it also of the chairman of the committee. Would it not be well, and I would be glad to know if the chairman of the committee would object to putting in the bill a provision that none of the money appropriated herein shall be used for the payment of men in the military service for doing purely clerical work if civilians can be found through the Civil Service or otherwise to do that work?

Mr. DENT. I shall be very glad to consider an amendment along that line.

Mr. DYER. I think we ought to do that.

Mr. DENT. I will be glad to consider it.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the gentleman think the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri is fraught with a great deal of danger? These men are doing work a great deal of which is of a confidential character, and, of course, you must have a man who is subject to military discipline if he gives publicity to what is told him confidentially.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman allege that to be the rule in peace times?

Mr. KAHN. In peace times the conditions are altogether different.

Mr. DYER. I will say to the gentleman that not one in a thousand of the men who are occupying these positions and drawing $30 a month, for doing the work that a man ought to be paid $100 or $125 for, is doing any confidential work whatever.

Mr. DENT. I am simply suggesting to the gentleman from Missouri that if he will draw an amendment we will consider it.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the gentleman know how many drafted men in the National Army are now being used to guard railroad property, bridges, and private property in the United States?

Mr. DENT. I do not. I supposed that that had all been eliminated, and that that was only during the period of the war.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman knows that there are thousands in the United States to-day doing nothing but guarding private property. If the gentleman rides on the railroads he will see them along the roads.

Mr. LOBECK. Railroad property now is under the charge of the Government.

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter of legislation to which I desire to call the attention of the committee, and that is the invalidation of the order of the War Department requiring men in this country and in the service to wear a silver chevron. The committee thought that while the decorations ought to be preserved for those who did fight over the seas, it was unfair and unjust to discriminate against the men in this country who did not go over by requiring them to wear a distinctive chevron. We have declared that to be invalid.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not grasp the reason why the committee decided not to allow a man who went over the seas and did service different from that of those in the cantonments to wear the distinctive chevron.

Mr. DENT. I stated that the committee has no objection to the man who did service over the seas, who actually fought, to wear his decorations, but it did not think that the man in this country ought to be singled out by requiring him to wear a particular chevron, indicating the fact that he stayed in this country or did not get a chance to go over the seas.

Mr. STAFFORD. The action of the committee does not prevent the man who went over the seas from wearing the gold bar?

Mr. DENT. No, it was not intended and it does not do it. The only other matter of legislation which I desire to call the attention of the committee to is the recommendation of the committee that all officers and enlisted men who are regularly recommended for promotion by their superior officers——

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will pardon me, my attention has been called to the paragraph which, as I read it, forbids the wearing by any person who has seen overseas duty of a distinctive badge. May I read the paragraph?

Mr. DENT. I prefer that the gentleman should wait. If the language does not carry out that idea, I am perfectly willing to accept an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the language is positive in forbidding the wearing of such badge.

Mr. DENT. I was proceeding to state that the last legislative feature of the bill to which I wish to call the attention of the committee is the recommendation of the committee that all officers and enlisted men who were recommended for promotion by their immediate superior officers, which was approved by competent military authority prior to the signing of the armistice, shall now be granted, and if they have been separated from the service they shall receive the promotion in the Reserve Corps.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In regard to the gentleman's last statement, how about those men who were recommended for promotion before it had become generally known that the Secretary of War had issued his order stopping promotion?

Mr. DENT. This applies to every recommendation prior to the 12th of November.

Mr. DUPRÉ. How about the man who was recommended, say on the 20th of November, before it became generally known that Secretary Baker had ordered all promotions stopped as of the date of the 11th of November?

Mr. DENT. It would not apply to any recommendations since the armistice was signed.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Although it might have been made in perfect good faith by a general who did not know of the order of Secretary Baker?

Mr. DENT. It is of that date; it may be that it ought to be corrected.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman said he was going to put some facts and figures in the RECORD.

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Is the gentleman going to put in facts in reference to the personal strength of the air service, the number of camps in the air service in this country, and how many enlisted men and officers there are in each of these camps, and what the cost to the Government is for the maintenance, approximately, of these camps?

Mr. DENT. These facts have already been put in the RECORD by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS], a member of the committee, furnished by the War Department.

Mr. DYER. I have in mind a camp in a Southern State where they have 200 enlisted men and perhaps half as many officers, which is costing the Government $30,000 a month, and yet the only work they are doing is looking after a few flying machines and some other Government property. That is my information. I do not know whether it is all true, but I want to find out about it.

Mr. GORDON. How does the committee know whether it is true or not?

Mr. DYER. If the committee does not know then it is pretty difficult for a Member of the House to get any information.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] put these facts in the RECORD, and I think the gentleman can find out from the gentleman from Kentucky what day he put them in the RECORD.

Mr. FIELDS. I put them in the RECORD of January 11, 1919.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman was speaking of taking care of the men recommended for promotion.

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Is the committee doing anything for the men who were in the training camps at the time the armistice was signed, and who were by their superior officers requested to complete the course, and who have since completed the course?

Mr. DENT. There is no legislation upon that subject.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does the gentleman know what the War Department intends to do for those men?

Mr. DENT. No.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The report of the committee and the statement of the chairman of the committee indicate that it is the purpose of the bill under these authorizations to maintain a standing Army during the next fiscal year of approximately 500,000 men.

Mr. DENT. No; I did not state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what I gathered from the gentleman's statement.

Mr. DENT. I expressly stated just the contrary, that it was not the purpose of the committee to maintain any particular sized standing Army, but that this was a method by which we arrived at the amount to be appropriated, that we would appropriate for an average Army during the period of demobilization of something like 500,000 men.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wanted to get a clear understanding, because I feel sure that Members are all interested in the permanent policy of the department.

Mr. DENT. I have stated two or three times that it is not the purpose of the committee to declare any permanent military policy by this legislation at all; that this was simply a method by which we arrived at the amount of money necessary to be appropriated, taking that as the average size that will probably be in existence during the period of demobilization.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The amount appropriated is based upon the estimate of maintaining during the next fiscal year a standing Army of 500,000 men.

Mr. DENT. It is paying for an Army during the period of demobilization that will average that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is on the assumption that you will have an Army of that size?

Mr. DENT. It will take that long, perhaps, to get rid of it.

Mr. WISE. I think there is some confusion on that point. It misleads me. The provision is that in addition to the Regular Army as now organized there shall be raised and organized an additional force of 500,000 men. In my judgment that is mandatory and calls upon the department to raise and organize an additional force of 500,000 men.

Mr. DENT. I do not agree with the gentleman from Georgia upon his construction of the language.

Mr. WISE. That is the language of the amendment.

Mr. DENT. I do not think that is the proper construction to give it.

Mr. WISE. It seems to me it should read that they are authorized to raise that many men, without saying that they shall, and that it is in addition to the Regular Army. The language of the provision is that in addition to the Regular Army as now organized under the act of June 3, 1916, there shall be raised and organized under the provisions of another act, which was the act of May 18, 1917, so many men.

Mr. DENT. But the gentleman should read it all—that it is not to exceed so many officers and men.

Mr. WISE. I am about to read it, if the gentleman will permit me:

That, in addition to the Regular Army as now organized under the provisions of "An act for making further and more efficient provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, there shall be raised and organized under the provisions of "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, as amended, a force sufficient to maintain an aggregate commissioned and enlisted strength of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men.

That is the language of the provision—that in addition to the Regular Army as now organized under the act of June 3, 1916, there shall be raised another army under another act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The purpose of my inquiry was to clear this up.

Mr. DENT. I know what the committee intended. We discussed that in the committee and we reached the conclusion that it did not mean that.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. STEAGALL. I do not read this to mean what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WISE] understands it to mean.

Mr. DENT. Nor I.

Mr. STEAGALL. It provides as follows:

That, in addition to the Regular Army as now organized under the provisions of "An act for making further and more efficient provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, there shall be raised and organized under the provisions of "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, as amended, a force sufficient to maintain an aggregate commissioned and enlisted strength of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men.

As I construe this language, coupled with the former language, it is designed and intended to create only an aggregate force of that many men.

Mr. DENT. That is the construction the committee put upon it.

Mr. STEAGALL. Under both acts an aggregate Army of that size.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I see by the bill that there is an appropriation for the construction and repair of hospitals. A very short time ago we passed a bill here authorizing $10,000,000 for the construction of hospitals, and I would inquire whether or not there is anything in the bill that aims to purchase the lands upon which the cantonments are constructed?

Mr. DENT. There is not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Was that brought before the committee?

Mr. DENT. The committee heard the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War on the question of the policy of the War Department as to whether or not they would purchase the land on which these cantonments are located, and the committee has declined to make any recommendations on the subject.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. So it is not in contemplation at the present time. I see this is for the repair and construction of hospitals. Do they expect to use the hospitals at these cantonments?

Mr. DENT. They do expect to use them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How many hospital beds is it thought would be required?

Mr. DENT. I have not those figures with me right now. I can give the figures to the gentleman when we get to that section of the bill, but I can not carry those things in my head.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Did the committee understand there are thousands of beds at the different cantonments around that are not occupied and that they have the nurses and the physicians and the complete service at these hospitals if they are needed?

Mr. DENT. I can give the gentleman full facts—and we went into a full investigation of that matter—when we reach that item in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The reason I inquired is that there is a very fine hospital in connection with Camp Custer in my district.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman want the Government to buy it?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should prefer to buy it rather than to build new buildings; anyone would do that as a business proposition.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. MASON. There have been some questions asked in regard to the return of soldiers from France, and I would like to ask the chairman whether there is any rule of the department, so far as he knows, in regard to what troops are to be used. I ask this question in good faith. Our colleague from Massachusetts returned the other day—I think he arrived about a week ago—and he stated here to many of us that the ship that he returned on had a large number of unoccupied rooms—I think he said rooms for a thousand more—that some staterooms had three beds and only one was occupied. I want to know if there is any rule of the department limiting the kind of ships that the boys are to be sent home on?

Mr. DENT. I do not know of any rule.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman does not know. Has the chairman of the committee any information which could be imparted to his colleagues with safety to the Government in regard to the plan of whether we will withdraw our troops from Russia or send more over for the defense of those who are already there?

Mr. DENT. No, sir; I have no information.

Mr. LOBECK. This bill provides for volunteer enlistment, does it not?

Mr. DENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOBECK. Did the committee have the approval of the National Security League? I just wanted to ask——

Mr. DENT. No. I understand, though, from the newspaper reports that Judge Parker repudiated his own baby yesterday before the committee. I do not know whether that is true or not.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman stated that at the time the armistice was signed we had approximately 1,700,000 men in the camps here? Is the gentleman prepared to state how many of that number have been discharged?

Mr. DENT. Yes; I am going to have that read into the RECORD right now.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And what policy obtains in reference to discharge of the others?

Mr. DENT. The policy is supposed to be to discharge them just as rapidly as practicable.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. DENT. All right.

Mr. LONDON. On page 58 is the provision for a new army which is to be raised and organized under the act approved May 18, 1917—that is, the draft act.

Mr. DENT. It is only to be raised by voluntary enlistment.

Mr. LONDON. Is it clear enough? Does the gentleman believe the subsequent provisions of the bill make it clear?

Mr. DENT. I think it does. That language was drafted by the Judge Advocate General of the Army in order to carry out the intention of the committee.

Mr. LONDON. What does this mean, that they shall be organized and raised under the provisions of the draft act?

Mr. DENT. That refers to the character and nature of the organization and the different units and the different kinds of organizations that were created by the act of May 18, 1917.

Mr. LONDON. Does the gentleman believe that the language should be made so clear and specific as to make no doubt about it?

Mr. DENT. I think it should be made so clear that he who runs may read; yes, sir.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I think the point in the mind of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is this, that the draft act provides for raising the Regular Army, that they shall be raised by voluntary enlistment, if they can, or by draft whenever the President decides he wants the men drafted. There is that alternative in the act of May 18, 1917, which the committee did not intend to carry in this bill.

Mr. DENT. The draft act?

Mr. GORDON. Yes. The question I suspect the gentleman from New York propounded is whether it is intended to confer upon the President the power, in case he can not raise by voluntary enlistment, to draft them.

Mr. DENT. It is not.

Mr. GORDON. Of course it is not.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am very much interested in the statement made by the gentleman from New York, because I have no doubt that not only the War Department, by this act, is authorized to raise an Army under the selective-draft act, but there would be another alternative. The language indicates that fact. Further, this is not to be a Regular Army.

Mr. DENT. No.

Mr. CARAWAY. You say all the enlisted force for the Regular Army shall be raised by voluntary enlistment, which differentiates the method by which you raise your Army of 509,000 men——

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. No; if the gentleman will look at——

Mr. CARAWAY. Pardon me; I am not asking the gentleman from Texas to correct me.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I beg the gentleman's pardon, of course——

Mr. CARAWAY. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I should not have answered that way; but does the committee intend that language to mean an alternative, that a certain Army shall be raised under the provisions of the act approved May 18, 1917, which was the so-called selective-draft act? Then you say your enlisted personnel of the Regular Army shall be by voluntary enlistment for a certain length of time.

Mr. DENT. We did not intend to do it——

Mr. CARAWAY. I wanted to be certain about that, because I am so satisfied it is the only interpretation that can be had.

Mr. DENT. If that is the way it is to be interpreted, I will insist upon an amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I call the chairman's attention to lines 13 and 14, on page 58, which read as follows:

And for the additional forces herein authorized by voluntary enlistments for the period of one year.

Mr. HOUSTON. That was the item to which I was going to call the gentleman's attention. That provides an additional force for the Regular Army by voluntary enlistment.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I have some figures which might be interesting to the House and which answer a great many questions that have been asked me; and if the committee wishes I would like to have them read from the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

Mr. DENT. Then I will reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Report from The Adjutant General, Feb. 11, 1919.

APPROXIMATELY CORRECT.

Number of officers in United States	48,676
Number of officers in insular possessions	1,638
Total	50,314
Number of enlisted men in United States	767,003
Number of enlisted men in insular possessions	45,478
Total	812,481
Number of officers, American Expeditionary Force, including Russia	64,270
In Siberia	296
Total	64,566
Number of enlisted men, American Expeditionary Force, including Russia	1,614,937
In Siberia	8,722
Total	1,623,659

RECAPITULATION.

Total officers in American Expeditionary Force, Russia, insular possessions, and Siberia	114,880
Total enlisted men in American Expeditionary Force, Russia, insular possessions, and Siberia	2,436,140
Grand total in all	2,551,020

Report of date of Feb. 7 of all reports received.

Discharged from the service since Nov. 11, 1918:	
Officers	67,038
Enlisted men	1,033,812
Total	1,090,850
Orders issued for discharges, but not yet effected, including officers and enlisted men	1,443,000
	2,533,850
Total officers and enlisted men in American Expeditionary Force, Russia, insular possessions, and Siberia	2,551,020
Discharges pending	1,443,000
Total in service	1,108,020

Cost of the war.

According to the latest statement furnished the Committee on Military Affairs on the cost of the war, most of the statement covering period up to December 1, 1918, contains the following totals:

Amount paid in United States	$10,190,566,755.10
American Expeditionary Force	1,210,239,246.66
Obligated	4,856,578,247.28
Grand total	16,257,384,249.04

Approximate estimates of stock on hand.

Quartermaster Corps	$1,650,000,000
Ordnance Department	600,000,000
Signal Corps	25,000,000
Air Service	500,000,000

Allotments and allowances to enlisted men only.

	Voluntary allotment.	Compulsory allotment.	Government allowance.	Total.
Payable to wife while husband is in active service:				
Wife alone		$15.00	$15.00	$30.00
Wife and one child		15.00	25.00	40.00
Wife and two children		15.00	32.50	47.50
Wife and three children		15.00	37.50	52.50
Wife and four children		15.00	42.50	57.50
Wife and five children		15.00	47.50	62.50
Wife and six or more children		15.00	50.00	65.00
Payable to or for children but no wife:				
One child		15.00	5.00	20.00
Two children		15.00	12.50	27.50
Three children		15.00	20.00	35.00
Four children		15.00	30.00	45.00
Five children		15.00	35.00	50.00
Six children		15.00	40.00	55.00
Seven children		15.00	45.00	60.00
Eight children		15.00	50.00	65.00
Man with parents, brothers, sisters or grandchildren:				
Man making no allotment to wife or children—				
One parent	$15.00		10.00	25.00
Two parents	15.00		20.00	35.00
Brother, sister, or grandchild	15.00		5.00	20.00
Man making an allotment to wife or children—				
One parent	5.00		10.00	15.00
Two parents	5.00		20.00	25.00
Brother, sister, or grandchild	5.00		5.00	10.00

Disability benefits under war-risk insurance for officers and enlisted men.

	Monthly.
Man with wife or with wife and children (allowance for nurse; monthly Government compensation):	
Wife alone	$65.00
Wife and one child	75.00
Wife and two children	85.00
Wife and three children	95.00
Payable for total disability but not permanent:	
One child	60.00
Two children	70.00
Three or more children	80.00
Man alone or with dependent parents:	
Man alone	50.00
Man with one parent	60.00
Man with two parents	70.00
Payable to man for total permanent disability (war-risk insurance; monthly Government compensation; allowance for nurse):	
Wife alone	122.50
Wife and one child	132.50
Wife and two children	142.50
Wife and three or more children	152.50
Payable to man with no wife, but children:	
One child	117.50
Two children	127.50
Three or more children	137.50
Payable to man or parents:	
Man alone	107.50
Man with one parent	117.50
Man with two parents	127.50

Nurse allowance in each case is $20 per month.

Application of war-risk insurance.

	Monthly.
Man with wife or with wife and children after death of husband:	
Wife alone—	
War-risk insurance	$57.50
Monthly Government compensation	25.00
Wife and one child	92.50
Wife and two children	100.00
Wife and three children	105.00
Wife and four or more children	110.00

Man with children and no wife after death of father:	
Children (war-risk insurance; monthly Government compensation)—	
One child	77.50
Two children	87.50
Three children	97.50
Four children	102.50
Five or more children	107.50
Man with parents, brothers, sisters, or grandchildren (war-risk insurance; monthly Government compensation):	
One parent	77.50
Two parents	87.00
Brother, sister, or grandchild (war-risk insurance)	57.50

Government compensation is payable to parents only in the event they are dependent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] occupied one hour and five minutes and reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE]. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to make the request before I begin my statement that I be permitted to make it without interruption, when I will be glad to answer any question that I am able to answer.

I want to say that the Committee on Military Affairs has been criticized somewhat for its delay in bringing in this bill, but I want to add very frankly that it has not been the fault of our committee or the members of the committee. We have been unable to get the estimates, and, in fact, we have not got all of the printed hearings yet that were held by our committee. But nevertheless we have gone ahead and have done the very best we could under the circumstances to agree on the appropriation, which in many cases is but a guess. Many of the appropriation items contained in this bill are simply guesses on the part of the committee as to the amount that will be necessary for the next fiscal year.

The large items in this bill, as you will find by looking at it, are the items of subsistence of the Army, pay of the Army, and transportation of the Army. The latter item is $449,000,000, an enormous one. But the committee did not feel that it would be wise to curtail it, inasmuch as it covers the bringing of the boys back from Europe, and the paying of the transportation in France, the ocean transportation, and the transportation of the boys to their homes in various parts of the country. So we felt that it would be wise to err on the side of liberality rather than otherwise, and not subject ourselves to the criticism of not making sufficient appropriation to bring the boys home from France. That item we left large.

There is another very large item in the bill which takes care of storage. Some of you will wonder why such a large appropriation is made, but you must bear in mind that we have thousands of carloads of material and equipment in France that will be transported back to our country; that we have tens of thousands of carloads of material in the various cantonments of the country that must be stored and preserved; and to get the storage space and pay for the carrying of that, and the storing of it, will cost a vast sum of money. However, we feel that it is economy to do it.

I want to call your attention to another item in this bill—the item of the Intelligence Department of the Army. They came before our committee and asked for an appropriation of $780,000 for this one particular branch of the service, for which in peace times we had appropriated the sum of $11,000 to care for. In peace times this department of the Army was practically carried on by one man, but when war came it was greatly enlarged, and they asked us in the reorganization scheme of the Army to grant them 77 officers and 254 men. Of course, you gentlemen understand the Intelligence Department of the Army means the secret-service department of the Army. We felt that in peace times no such an amount of money was necessary. Therefore we cut the appropriation to $200,000, which, in my judgment, is excessive in peace times; but inasmuch as we are now passing from war back to peace, it might be well for one more year to continue this activity to some extent. Therefore we made what I believe to be a fair and liberal appropriation.

Another appropriation which is very much increased over that of last year is the appropriation for the National Guard; and I am sure there is not a man in this House but will remember the terrific fight that we had in 1916 against those who formed the policy of the Continental Army and who were determined to destroy the National Guard, the only military organization that is as old as our country. But we succeeded in defeating them and writing into the law of 1916 a provision which would bring the National Guard up to a real fighting force. Is there a man in the United States to-day who does not read with pride and satisfaction the story of the Rainbow Division, of the New England Division, of the Wildcat Division, of the Sunset Division, and of the Thirty-third or Prairie Division from old Illinois and other National Guard Divisions? [Applause.] We are proud of the record made by these citizen soldiers on the battle fields of Europe, and I hope the day will never come, no matter what may be our military policy in the future, when the old National Guard system or militia, which has stood by us in every trial through all our history, will not be maintained. [Applause.] We have appropriated liberally for the National Guard, and I trust that it will meet with your approval.

Now, gentlemen, I am not going to take up very much time in discussing this bill, but I want to say a few words in connection with the legislation contained in it, and about which the chairman of the committee spoke while he was on the floor. Let us look into this for a moment.

What is the military policy of the United States and how is it provided for by law? The only law that we have providing for a permanent Military Establishment in this country is the law of June 3, 1916, known as the national-defense act. That provided for a permanent and fixed Military Establishment in this country. When war came on we enacted special legislation for the raising of larger armies to fight our battles in this war. We provided for conscription. We did many things that would enable us to enlarge our Army. But now that the war is approaching an end, with the prospect of peace ahead of us, it is necessary that we get back to some permanent military policy for the future. The General Staff of the Army prepared a plan. They came before our committee and asked us to adopt a policy that would provide permanently for 28,579 commissioned officers in the Regular Establishment and 509,000 men. We said to them very frankly, "Gentlemen, we can not pass any bill at this session of Congress providing for a permanent Military Establishment in this country." The Staff then sent over a rider containing this proposition, but, in fact, meaning about the same thing, because we fixed the permanent Army of 509,000 men and 28,579 officers and enact permanently the Overman Act so far as the powers of the General Staff are concerned and which have enabled the General Staff to wipe out of existence some of the most useful bureaus which have been a part in the Military Establishmnt of our country, and creating no end of corps such as the Construction Corps, the Tank Corps, and I do not know how many more, some of them very useful.

But it centralized the entire power in that establishment. We said, "We can not do that. We will not do that." Then Mr. KAHN and the other members of the committee began to work to find out what we could do to tide us over for the present, at least, until the people of this country shall have had an opportunity to study and determine what the character of the permanent Military Establishment of this country shall be, and the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] presented to the committee a rider, which provides for the commissioning of 28,579 officers—the same number as was suggested by the General Staff—and providing for an Army of 509,000 men, to be raised by voluntary enlistment of from one to three years; and it has written in language which provides that in addition to the force now authorized by the act of June 3, 1916, there shall be raised additional forces which shall bring the number up to 509,000 men.

Now, what does that mean? That simply means that we are to have a Regular Army as provided for in the national-defense act, at war strength, and in addition to that we are going to add a sufficient number of men to bring it up to 509,000.

Now, I want to say to you, gentlemen of the committee, that I think you know me well enough to know from my position in the past that I do not favor in time of peace a large standing army in a republic. [Applause.] I am unalterably opposed to fastening on the taxpayers of our country a large fixed and permanent regular Military Establishment. But I am perfectly willing to do anything that will protect the interests of our country while we are passing through these troublous days, getting back to substantial peace, and therefore I am willing that for the next fiscal year we may enlist, if we can get the men, 509,000 men temporarily, to serve until 1920. I am willing that they shall have sufficient officers to officer that Army. But I want to tell you, my friends, that we have undertaken to guard this rider in such a way that it will be impossible for the War Department to fasten that number of men and officers onto the country permanently.

I do not know whether we have used language that will protect us in that, and I ask and I request that every Member of this House take that provision of the bill and study it carefully, and if there is a weak spot in it, if there is a possible chance that that language will enable the War Department to commission permanently in the line and staff of the Army of the United States 28,579 officers, we had better put in language

about which there is no question, in order to be sure that we do not find ourselves with that large number of officers fastened onto us permanently.

There are now commissioned in the Regular Army of the United States a few over 10,000 officers. It is about 10,200, I think, and the Army that is provided for under the national-defense act is something like 300,000 at war strength. Now, to almost multiply that by three, giving us nearly 30,000 officers for an Army of 500,000 men, would be, to my mind, an unbalanced and top-heavy Military Establishment, even if we wanted one of that size. And I hope that if anyone in reading this can find a weak spot in it that will make it possible to add one single more officer to the line than the number provided for by the national-defense act he will assert himself and help us to write this law in such a way that when we finally arrive at the days of peace we will have the forces provided under our own national-defense act, the National Guard, and what other elements of national defense we may have, and will be able to sit down and think it over and determine whether or not we want to have a system of universal military training in this country; and if we do, God knows that I do not want a large, fixed, permanent Regular Army in our country.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will it interrupt the gentleman to yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under this provision authorizing the Army for the fiscal year for which we are appropriating to a strength of 500,000 men it provides that, in addition to the Regular Army, and so forth, under the national-defense act and under the selective-draft act of 1917, this force shall be maintained at approximately 500,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to ask the gentleman this question: It is conceivable that the existing emergency may end the 1st of July this year if we declare peace. That, under the operation of the selective-draft law, would terminate the service of all men taken in under that act, as I understand it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Suppose that all the men under the provisions of that act shall be entitled to discharge. How are you to raise this 500,000 men provided for in this act?

Mr. McKENZIE. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because we would find ourselves without an Army at all if we did not take some steps to raise an Army within four months after the treaty of peace has been signed, because the men are all entitled to discharge and, whether they are in the Regular Service or in other service—and there are, as I understand it, only about 30,000 men in the Regular Army whose time has not already expired, and they would be entitled to go out—we would find ourselves when that time comes without an Army.

Now, what are we hanging our hopes upon? Simply upon this provision in the bill which provides that we must enlist men from one to three years to make up an Army of 500,000. Can we get them? I asked the Secretary of War when he was before our committee if he did not believe it would be wise, if he wanted an Army of that size—and he said he did, and he wanted the officers permanently commissioned in the Regular Army—I asked him whether it would not be wise to put into the law a provision for the conscription of the men. He said, "No; I think we will get the men without any trouble at all. They will come in."

But I want to tell you, my fellow countrymen, that I doubt if there are 500,000 men in this country who will be willing to enlist in the Regular Army in time of peace, and one of the things that we provided for, or attempted to provide for, in this rider is that the officers shall be commissioned only as the men are enlisted, and if we get only 250,000 men under that enlistment they can not add a single officer to the permanent roll of this country. And that is as it should be.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question in regard to the rider he is discussing. It provides that this Army shall be maintained under the national-defense act and under the provisions of the act authorizing the President to increase the Military Establishment, which is the selective-draft law.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And it provides for—

a force sufficient to maintain an aggregate commissioned and enlisted strength of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men.

By implication would not that make new legislation on the selective-draft law, so as to compel the retention in the service of men under the selective-draft law despite this prior provision?

Mr. McKENZIE. No; I do not think so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Or authorize the drafting of new men under it?

Mr. McKENZIE. No; I do not think so. That language refers to that part of the law of 1917 which provided for the increase of the Army above the number provided for in the national-defense act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It says "under the provisions." It means all the provisions.

Mr. KAHN. It says they must be voluntary enlistments under that law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This section does not say that.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Where does it say so?

Mr. McKENZIE. Further on in the bill.

Mr. KAHN. Further down in the section. Now, the very proposition which the gentleman speaks about was called to the attention of the committee. We recognize the fact that if we keep these men in France beyond the period of the war or the emergency, we are practically redrafting them. The committee did not want to do that, and therefore they provided that men should be enlisted into this temporary army by volunteering.

Mr. CARAWAY. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. McKENZIE. I take pleasure in yielding to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not going to vote for any act that in time of peace is going to authorize the drafting of boys into the Army.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not blame you.

Mr. CARAWAY. Now, we know that no law should be written that requires construction. It ought to be clear and explicit.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. By reference to the act approved May 18, 1917, you reenact the provisions of that law that are applicable to this, do you not?

Mr. McKENZIE. Not necessarily; no.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then why refer to it at all?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is the only way in which we can enlarge the force above that provided for in the act of 1916.

Mr. CARAWAY. There is not a thing in the language in this act that says you are adopting only a part of the act approved May 18, 1917; but you say that they shall raise an Army under the provisions of the act authorizing the President temporarily to increase the Military Establishment of the United States, approved May 18, 1917. Now, in the language referred to below you say—

The enlisted force for the Regular Army shall be raised by voluntary enlistments for periods of three years and for the additional forces herein authorized by voluntary enlistments for the period of one year.

Now, that refers to the 500,000 men for the Regular Army. That is under the act of June 3, 1916. The language that has been referred to says that this is not to be a conscript army, but that—

The enlisted force for the Regular Army shall be raised by voluntary enlistments for periods of three years, and for the additional forces herein authorized by voluntary enlistments for the period of one year.

Now, it is the contention that this refers to this Army of 500,000 men.

Mr. McKENZIE. To the surplus; yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. But in construing a law I understand it is always the rule to construe it so that every provision of it may stand, if possible. Now, for the construction—

The enlisted force of the Regular Army shall be raised by voluntary enlistments for periods of three years.

That is, if you enlist in the Regular Army, you shall enlist for three years, but if you enlist in this additional temporary force you may enlist for one year.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. But it does not say that is the only way you can raise the Army. You can undertake to raise it by voluntary enlistment, which enlistment shall be for the period of one year; but if you do not get it, then, under the provisions of the act of May 8, 1917, which you incorporate by referring to it in this bill, you can raise an Army of 500,000 men, and therefore you will be in a position to raise it by the selective-draft act. That is the possible construction. That construction will make each provision of the bill stand; and we know that when the War Department undertakes to raise an Army of 500,000 men by voluntary enlistment in time of peace it will not get 500 men. I have not seen a boy yet who has come back

from the other side who would reenlist, and you have not seen one either.

Mr. PLATT. I have.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then they come from New York City and not from any other part of the country, and I would be willing to assert that the gentleman can not go out and raise a regiment in this country by paying a bonus for voluntary enlistment.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PLATT. The Secretary of the Navy says they are enlisting 1,600 men a week in the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. CARAWAY. I was not talking about the Marine Corps.

Mr. PLATT. That is the only place where they can enlist now.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Marine Corps has always been popular because it has always been sensibly administered, but nobody has heard of a boy coming back from the Regular Army who wanted to volunteer to get into the Regular Army again.

Mr. PLATT. He has not had a chance to.

Mr. CARAWAY. If he had a chance, you could not get him within a mile of the enlistment officer.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman from Arkansas is through, I will say to him that I have no quarrel with him. I think the language is plain enough that there can be no possible chance of conscription under it. But I want to say to him that if he has any doubt about it, if he will prepare an amendment I have no objection to it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Would the gentleman have any objection to putting in at the end of the sentence in line 8 "providing that the personnel shall be raised by voluntary enlistment only," and then there will be no question about it?

Mr. McKENZIE. I would have no objection, and I do not think the committee would, for we do not propose to raise them by conscription.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Suppose this legislation in this paragraph should not be enacted at all, what would be our situation in reference to the army in Europe?

Mr. McKENZIE. It would be unchanged.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. After the proclamation of peace all the boys who were inducted and all of those who enlisted in the Regular Army since the war began would be entitled to a discharge in four months?

Mr. McKENZIE. Four months after the treaty of peace—as soon as it is practicable to get them home.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That would make it necessary to bring the boys right home?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. And the Regular Army would consist of the men who had enlisted prior to our entrance into the war and such others as may now desire to enlist, and that law is on the statute books?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Then, may I ask what is the matter with that?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will state to the gentleman from Mississippi, as I understand the law, if we do not enact this legislation at all, but simply make an appropriation, we will find ourselves four months after the treaty of peace is announced with no Army that we have a right to hold. We will have, however, an organization of the Regular Army complete in its officer personnel. We will have a thousand and some odd officers commissioned in the Regular Army, making it complete from top to bottom, and the only thing we would lack would be men. [Laughter.] I mean enlisted men. If we would provide, however, in this law for the immediate enlistment of men in the Regular Army, we could enlist up to 175,000 men in the line, as provided in the national defense act.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Would it take new legislation to authorize that?

Mr. McKENZIE. It would take new legislation to authorize the enlistment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No; under the law as it stands now men can enlist in the Army up to 175,000 after peace has been declared. We would still have a Regular Army of 175,000 men if we put no legislation in the bill at all. Am I not correct?

Mr. McKENZIE. No; you are not. The Regular Army now in existence, with the exception of 20,000 men, would pass out.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. McKENZIE. Certainly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the fact that the national defense act specifically provides for enlistment in the Army during the war, terminating with the war, so that if you enlist men now you could only hold them until peace is declared. So you have to amend the enlistment law.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. After the proclamation of peace the men go out in four months.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. They go out immediately, and the four months is to get them back from Europe.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. We have four months to get them back home. They may all be back in four months after peace is declared. Then we have authority to hold those who enlisted prior to the entrance into the war, up to 175,000, without any further legislation. That is a consummation most devoutly to be wished.

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

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois five minutes more.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. This Army that you are trying to raise by virtue of the bill is an addition to the Regular Army; am I right?

Mr. McKENZIE. No.

Mr. KEARNS. Then, what do you mean, in line 21, by saying "in addition to the Regular Army"?

Mr. McKENZIE. That would mean the difference between the Regular Army and that provided in the national defense act.

Mr. KEARNS. But they all belong to the Regular Army.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; temporarily.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit me?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. There can be under existing law no personnel of the Regular Army except that laid down in the provisions of the national defense act of June 3, 1916, and amendments thereto. That is what we start with here, 175,000 men, going along to what is specifically prescribed as a temporary army, in the aggregate making 509,000 men.

Mr. IGOE. Will not the 509,000 men be an addition to the 179,000 men?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; what you start with is the Regular Army, and the difference between that and 509,000 men would be complete.

Mr. McKENZIE. If my colleague would permit, they would not be in or, rather, attached to it for a temporary period.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. They are called the temporary Army.

Mr. KEARNS. I want to know whether these 509,909 enlisted men, when enlisted, are going to be a part of the Regular Army?

Mr. KAHN. A portion of them are.

Mr. KEARNS. What portion?

Mr. KAHN. One hundred and seventy-five thousand as a maximum.

Mr. KEARNS. And the others are not going to be?

Mr. KAHN. No; they are in the temporary Army, enlisted for only one year by volunteering.

Mr. KEARNS. Then I want to call the gentleman's attention to line 11, which provides that the enlisted force of the Regular Army shall be raised by voluntary enlistments.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. And these others need not be raised by voluntary enlistment?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, the gentleman should read a little further.

Mr. KEARNS. I am reading what the bill says. The gentleman from California says a part of the 509,909 men will be a part of the Regular Establishment.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. In this bill you give the War Department authority to raise by voluntary enlistment those that belong to the Regular Army.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. But the bill says nothing about those men who are going to belong to the other portion.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; it does. It says that the temporary force shall be enlisted for the period of one year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that we would like to hear the reasons and the theory upon which the War Department and the General Staff predicated the necessity in time of peace for an army of 500,000 men, whether you call it a standing army or an emergency army.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman that they said—and I think it is their contention—that in a nation of

this size, with our many scattered possessions, an army of 509,909 men and 28,579 officers is not an army too large to properly care for our possessions in the United States and our insular possessions in time of peace; and they base their judgment, I presume, upon the experience of the past. Personally I do not agree, and I have not in the past agreed, with the judgment of the General Staff as to the size of the Regular Army in our country in time of peace. I feel this way about it: I have always conceded to the experts in our Military Establishment the regulation of all manner of things pertaining to organization and to the character of the Army that we are to have, but I do feel, and I always have felt, that it is the duty of the representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States to fix the size of the Army that we shall have. [Applause.]

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

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the gentleman from Illinois remember that the Secretary of War himself stated and restated frequently to the committee that this was not intended as a regular army, but as a "stop-gap" army. That was the expression he used.

Mr. McKENZIE. I know he did. I know he stated that, and I know he said it was only for temporary purposes in a sense. But I do know, and my colleague knows, that the General Staff's plan called for an Army of 509,909 men in time of peace, and if the gentleman will read on page 18 of the hearings he will find what the Secretary of War said. If I may have time, I just want to read that for the benefit of the House, so that we will know where we stand on this proposition. It should be borne in mind that we had the staff's plan before us at the time this testimony was given:

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). In other words, as I understand it, really this army of 500,000 is intended just for the transition period until we do come back to normal conditions?

Secretary BAKER. That is my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. Then why not make this legislation temporary instead of permanent?

Secretary BAKER. The only difficulty about that is that you have made temporary legislation which you are now having to recast. All legislation is temporary. Every Congress has the right to change the legislation passed by its predecessor, and the fact that this bill creates an Army of 500,000 men does not disable the Congress hereafter from making it 100,000, if they desire to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. It is very much easier to originate a bill than it is to pass it.

Mr. ANTHONY. On that point, Mr. Secretary, if you raise your Regular Army of 500,000 men, and officer it with the Regular Army officers, in the regular service, how are you going to reduce it after that?

Secretary BAKER. It would reduce itself.

Mr. ANTHONY. By eliminating your officers?

Secretary BAKER. By eliminating the officers as they eliminate themselves.

Mr. ANTHONY. Would that not be a difficult thing to do?

Secretary BAKER. I do not think so.

Mr. ANTHONY. After you have taken these officers into the Regular Establishment?

Secretary BAKER. I do not think so. They are in process of elimination.

Mr. ANTHONY. It would take quite a while to get them out?

Secretary BAKER. It would take some time.

My friends, you may be sure that it would take some time. [Laughter and applause.]

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

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the gentleman know, and is it not a fact that there was not a singe member of the Military Affairs Committee in favor of a standing army of 500,000 men in time of peace, and was not this legislation written to avoid anything of that kind?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; and I am glad that my colleague has stated that. I think it is to the everlasting credit of the Committee on Military Affairs that they did not stand for that proposition.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I want to add to what the gentleman has said in response to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], that part of the reason for appropriating for the maintenance of 500,000 men this year is that there would probably be an average of that many kept through the fiscal year, when you considered that you start the year with over 2,000,000 men. You can not demobilize at sufficient speed so that by the time you come to the end of this fiscal year you will not have had an average of about 500,000 men for the year, anyway. The second phase of the matter, which does not run to ratios or figures, but runs to public policies, was this, expressed concretely. It was thought to be, and I believe it is the opinion of this Congress, an unwise thing to put your hose up until you are sure the fire is out.

Mr. McKENZIE. I thank my colleague for that statement. I thought I had put myself in that position.

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

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the House as to how much of this force of 509,909 enlisted men is to be used as an army of occupation abroad, either in Germany, Russia, or Siberia?

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman that that matter did not come before us; it has not been considered. This is a proposition, supposed to be for an army of the United States and the insular possessions, although it has been stated that perhaps some of these men enlisted for the temporary army of one year might be sent to Europe to replace some of the boys who have been over there for a long time and let them come back.

But on that proposition I want to say this, that I think when the day comes, unless there is some other difficulty arising on the other side of the water, that if we load another regiment of American boys on a ship and start them across the water for Europe there is going to be something doing in this country. [Applause.] I do not believe it will be necessary, and I hope that these boys will be permitted to serve in this country. More than that, and I must conclude my statement because other members of the committee wish to speak——

Mr. KEARNS. I take it to be the hope of this committee, I know it is with the majority of the House, at least I think it is, to get away from conscription, and that is the object of this bill.

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; that is one of the objects.

Mr. KEARNS. And I doubt very seriously whether we do. Now let us read this:

The enlisted force of the Regular Army shall be raised by voluntary enlistments for periods of three years, and for the additional forces herein authorized by voluntary enlistments for the period of one year.

Now, I am afraid that is not clear, and I want to ask the chairman of the committee if he would not agree to an amendment of this kind:

The enlisted force of the Regular Army shall be raised by voluntary enlistments for periods of three years, and the additional forces herein authorized shall be raised by voluntary enlistments for the period of one year.

Mr. DENT. I will state to the gentleman that I am willing to accept any amendment that will make it absolutely clear and definite that all enlistments must be voluntary.

Mr. KEARNS. To my mind the language of the bill is not clear and definite, and the language which I would suggest is absolutely clear and definite.

Mr. DENT. I shall be very glad to consider the gentleman's amendment when we reach the reading of the bill on that point. I desire to make it clear, and that is the intention of the committee.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will permit, to get back to the question the gentleman was discussing 15 minutes ago when I first tried to attract his attention—that is, the necessary Army in time of peace on account of our possessions, and so forth—the gentleman remembers his statement, I want to know if I am correct in this information I have that prior to this war England with all of her possessions had a standing army of a little over 200,000 men?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is my understanding.

Mr. WINGO. Did not we get along with a standing Army of 100,000 prior to the war, and we have no additional possessions?

Mr. McKENZIE. We did fairly well.

Mr. WINGO. We did fairly well; yes. Now, what practical difficulty, or rather is there any practical difficulty that prevents our adopting the program of saying to England, France, and Italy, "We are going to bring every one of our boys home at once and you must furnish the troops to police your own territory of continental Europe." What practical difficulty is there in the United States adopting that policy?

Mr. McKENZIE. I would simply say to my good friend from Arkansas, in my judgment, that would be too much like the amendment we tried to beat yesterday providing for the authorization of more battleships in the future. What we are doing is satisfactory to me and it is serving notice on them——

Mr. WINGO. But what is the practical difficulty in doing it?

Mr. McKENZIE. There is no difficulty in doing it. We could say that if we wanted to——

Mr. WINGO. Then what is the practical difficulty?

Mr. McKENZIE. There is the question of wise action. We are bringing our boys back as fast as we can, I am advised, and certainly we have not yet been asked to leave a certain

number of our troops in Europe, and when the time comes we can settle that question.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman believe that or is he quoting the Chief of Staff?

Mr. WINGO. If we have got the shipping that they have contended in the last few days we have, we should be able to bring home most of our boys by the close of the fiscal year?

Mr. McKENZIE. Oh, no.

Mr. WINGO. Yes; they have more than a hundred vessels, if the public press is to be believed, and they can take those and if they will load them like they loaded the *Rochambeau*, putting on 810 men more than its capacity, what practical difficulty is there?

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to say to the gentleman from Arkansas, and every Member of this House, I think we ought to try to exercise at least some patience and some reason in connection with this matter.

Mr. WINGO. That is the reason why I am asking if there is any practical difficulty; if it is not practicable I would not insist on it.

Mr. McKENZIE. We should understand that over 50 per cent of our boys were carried to France in bottoms not carrying the American flag but in foreign ships which they voluntarily, freely, and gladly furnished to get our heroic boys over there to help them win the war when the war was on; but the war is over now. It took well over a year to get those men into France even with all that assistance, and it is certain that with our small number of vessels compared with the number we had given to us to get our boys over, that when it comes to bringing them back home it will require more time.

Mr. WINGO. Is that the only practical difficulty in the matter?

Mr. McKENZIE. And we are bringing them back as fast as possible.

Mr. WINGO. Is that the only practical difficulty—the lack of shipping?

Mr. McKENZIE. Well, no; there are many difficulties in the way.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McKENZIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas that the President of the United States is one of the plenipotentiaries in France at the present time.

Mr. WINGO. I had heard that; so the gentleman does not give me any information by that statement.

Mr. KAHN. And we do not know but what he will agree to some provision in the peace treaty whereby he will consent to keep a certain number of our men over there.

Mr. WINGO. My question is, Is there a practical difficulty?

Mr. KAHN. That is a practical difficulty.

Mr. WINGO. Not from our standpoint. We can refuse to provide for an army of occupation if we wish to do so.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas that it is not a matter to be settled in the discussion on this bill.

Mr. WINGO. I can not agree to that. I wanted to get the gentleman's idea of the practical difficulty.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman said that there were a hundred difficulties in bringing the boys back home. Will he please be specific and state what the difficulties are, in his judgment?

Mr. McKENZIE. I can not state all of them.

Mr. LAZARO. State what they are, in your judgment.

Mr. McKENZIE. I can understand that one of them is getting the troops even to the harbors of France and picking out the organizations that are to be sent home, the work of demobilizing them, and all that sort of thing. It is a great task to demobilize this army, and we simply can not do it by word of mouth or by our wish. God knows I would like to see them discharged.

Mr. EMERSON. Is this army of half a million men to be used in the United States? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. McKENZIE. Most of them; yes.

Mr. EMERSON. I have a notion on this military preparedness business, and I would like to ask why it would not be better to have this army of 200,000 men and spend the balance of the money in training the boys in the schools. That would give them physical development, develop them physically in a military way, and then we would be prepared; because if we need an army we would need a large army.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is a matter that can be determined when we fix the Military Establishment of the country.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman made a statement to the committee without limitation, as I understood it, to the effect that the War Department was bringing back to this country our troops in France as fast as they could. Now, does the gentleman desire that the committee is to understand that as a statement from him based upon facts, that he knows to be facts, or where did he get that information?

Mr. McKENZIE. That is my understanding.

Mr. DYER. Where did the gentleman get that information?

Mr. McKENZIE. From statements in the press and from statements before our committee.

Mr. DYER. Who made that statement before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not remember.

Mr. DENT. I will state that the officer of the War Department who appeared before the committee on this subject was Maj. Bettison.

Mr. DYER. And he is the only information we have on that proposition?

Mr. DENT. He has charge of the embarkation service under Gen. Goethals.

Mr. DYER. And we have nothing from Gen. Pershing upon the question, have we?

Mr. DENT. No.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him another question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman having yielded, he states that he has no information except the newspapers and something coming before the committee, which was added to by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] when he mentioned some major who brought this information. That is all the information that we have that we are bringing our troops back as fast as we can. Of course, I do not want to get into any argument over it, but I do not agree with the statement of the gentleman. That is, I do not believe they are telling the truth to the gentleman from Illinois or to the Congress and to the members of the committee. Does this bill that this committee has brought in provide for all of these officers with their uniforms, who are sitting around in the various departments here, doing no work, earning no money, and not giving over half an hour a day, on the average, to the service of the Government for the next year?

Mr. McKENZIE. They are not especially mentioned in this bill.

Mr. DYER. But they will be taken care of, instead of having men come in and do the work who know how to do it, and who will not wear uniforms.

Mr. KNUTSON. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not Maj. Bettison's information that we were bringing them back as fast as we can was given prior to the return of the steamer *George Washington*, which came back with 1,200 vacant berths?

Mr. McKENZIE. I can not do that.

Mr. DYER. What authority have you for it? What I say I said on my own responsibility, and if I can get some time I will state the facts.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. DYER. I have not the floor.

Mr. McKENZIE. Let me finish. I will simply say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] that we have given all the information we have, and when we have done that we can do no more.

Mr. LAZARO. What I wanted to ask the gentleman was this: What information has he when he says the department does not want to bring them back?

Mr. McKENZIE. I decline to go into that.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, whatever may be said about this proposed rider, it is simply intended to take care of our country for the next fiscal year and gives an opportunity in the next session of Congress, or in the next Congress, to consider fully the character of the permanent Military Establishment that we will have hereafter. And I want to say, for one, that I think it is wise, when we read the newspapers and see some of the dangerous signals that are showing up above the horizon in our country at this time, to keep at least a sufficient military force to maintain order in case disorder should come in our own country. [Applause.]

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

Mr. KAHN. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. McKENZIE. I realize, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, that the War Department has been guilty of many shortcomings. It has been deserving of much criticism in many lines. There has been waste without end, and there have been

many officers who have dishonored the uniforms they wore. But, after all, when you cast aside those who have been a discredit to this great Republic of ours, and when you realize that of the 200,000 or more officers that we have had in our Army, those who have proven unworthy are relatively few, and when we realize what has been achieved and accomplished we can in a moment of pride forget for the time being the man who would rob his country in the hour of its peril or the officer who would disgrace the uniform which he has upon him.

I hope that in the next Congress this House will have an organization of men who will have the courage to meet the many vexing and trying problems that are going to confront us in the next Congress, and that when they come up for settlement we will forget that some of us at times think too much of self, and that we will rise to that place where we will stand up with courage as real Representatives of the people and see that the future of our country is made more secure. For if we do not do that, gentlemen; if we go on in the mad way in which we have been going in the past few years, adding burden after burden to the taxpayers of this country, the day will come when we will not be fighting enemies outside our land but we will be facing revolution within our own land. And I hope that in the next Congress we will have the courage not only to curb Regular Army officers and the Navy, but all the other activities of this country that are seeking more than is necessary to protect us in time of peace. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] is recognized.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Porto Rico [Mr. DAVILA].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Porto Rico is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DÁVILA. Mr. Chairman, now that the American Nation, on account of the termination of the war, has to confront all the difficult problems that the great struggle has brought to the consideration of the American leaders, now that the American people, through their most eminent spokesmen, are advocating the liberty and freedom of the small countries, I want to present to your consideration the Porto Rican problem which, in my opinion, is one that ought to be decided in this psychological moment in which we are fighting for the sake of humanity with the purpose of establishing an enduring and everlasting peace. President Wilson has said that no peace can last or ought to last which does not recognize and accept that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed; that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property; that the world can be at peace only if its life is stable; and that there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is no tranquillity of spirit and a sense of justice, of freedom, and of right. No nation, adds the President, should seek to extend its polity over any other nation or people, but that every people should be let free to determine its own polity, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful. Porto Rico, as a small country under the American flag, is entitled to the benefit of these great principles to the same extent that any of the small foreign countries whose liberties have been advocated by the whole American Nation.

The island of Porto Rico has been placed under a very peculiar situation. Our status under the American sovereignty never has been definitely settled, and we know as much about our future destiny as we know about the past. On the 25th of July, 1899, the American Army, under the command of Gen. Nelson A. Miles, landed in Porto Rico and several months after took possession of the whole island. On this occasion Gen. Miles said:

> In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity its military forces have come to occupy the island of Porto Rico. They come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose, to seek the enemies of our country and yours and to destroy or capture all who are in armed resistance. They bring you the fostering arms of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in its justice and humanity to all those living within its fold.

The military occupation of the island ceased when, in the year 1900, Congress approved a law to "Provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico."

Section 7 of this law reads as follows:

> That all inhabitants continuing to reside therein who were Spanish subjects on the 11th day of April, 1899, and then resided in Porto Rico, and their children born subsequent thereto, shall be deemed and held to be citizens of Porto Rico, and as such entitled to the protection of the United States, except such as shall have elected to preserve their allegiance to the Crown of Spain on or before the 11th day of April, 1900, in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain entered into on the 11th day of April, 1899; and they, together with such citizens of the United States as may reside in Porto Rico, shall constitute a body politic under the name of the people of Porto Rico, with governmental powers as hereinafter conferred, and with power to sue and be sued as such.

Congress at that time did not think proper to grant American citizenship to the Porto Ricans and created a body politic under the name of the people of Porto Rico, to be composed of Porto Rican citizens and American citizens residing therein. The approval of this law brought about many important questions with regards to our political status. Then came the theory established by the Supreme Court of the United States classifying the Territories into incorporated and unincorporated, incorporated Territories being those which have become part of the United States proper, and not merely a part of its domain, and which are entitled to the benefits of the Constitution, and which are held to be as much a part of the United States as are the States of the Union; and unincorporated Territories being those which have not been made part of the United States and to which Federal legislation does not uniformly extend. Porto Rico has been classified as an unincorporated territory.

In the case of Downes *v.* Bidwell (182 U. S., 287) the court says:

> We are therefore of the opinion that the island of Porto Rico is a Territory appurtenant and belonging to the United States, but not a part of the United States within the revenue clauses of the Constitution.

Mr. Justice White, with whom concurred Mr. Justice Shiras and Mr. Justice McKenna uniting in the judgment of affirmance, says:

> It is then, as I think, indubitably settled by the principles of the law of nations, by the nature of the Government created under the Constitution, by the express and implied powers conferred upon that Government by the Constitution, by the mode in which those powers have been executed from the beginning, and by an unbroken line of decisions of this court, first announced by Marshall and followed and lucidly expounded by Taney, that the treaty-making power can not incorporate territory into the United States without the express or implied assent of Congress, that it may insert in a treaty conditions against immediate incorporation, and that, on the other hand, when it has expressed in the treaty the conditions favorable to incorporation, they will, if the treaty be not repudiated by Congress, have the force of the law of the land, and therefore by the fulfillment of such conditions cause an incorporation to result. It must follow, therefore, that where a treaty contains no conditions for incorporation, and, above all, where it not only has no such conditions but expressly provides to the contrary, incorporation does not arise until in the wisdom of Congress it is deemed that the acquired territory has reached that state where it is proper that it should enter into and form a part of the American family. * * * And in addition, to the provisions of the act by which the duty here in question was imposed, taken as a whole, seem to me plainly to manifest the intention of Congress that for the present at least Porto Rico is not to be incorporated into the United States.
>
> The result of what has been said is that whilst in an international sense Porto Rico was not a foreign country, since it was subject to the sovereignty of and was owned by the United States, it was foreign to the United States in a domestic sense, because the island had not been incorporated into the United States, but was merely appurtenant thereto as a possession.

In Kopel *v.* Bingham (211 U. S., 468) it was held that Porto Rico is a completely organized Territory, but not a Territory incorporated into the United States. This doctrine was reaffirmed in the cases of American Railroad Co. of Porto Rico *v.* Didricksen (227 U. S., 145) and Porto Rico *v.* Rosall (227 U. S., 270, 274).

These are the most important decisions of the United States Supreme Court construing the act of April 12, 1900, "temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico," known as the Foraker Act. The Boston court of appeals, sustaining the same doctrine in a recent decision, says:

> Porto Rico is at least a possession, and through its organized government and under the organic act of April 12, 1900, has many of the essentials of these political entities known as Territories, but, notwithstanding that, the substantial fact remains that it is an insular piece of ground, with a considerable population, many miles at sea and widely separated from the States and Territories of the Government which is charged with the responsibility of seeing that there is a civil government in the island. Therefore, without much regard to the refinement of the question as to which it is, it is the fact that it is an insular possession or an insular territory, whichever it is, far removed from physical relations with other Territories and possessions, and with no physical relation to any of the States. * * *

The Foraker Act was practically repealed by the act of Congress approved on March 2, 1917, "to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes." By this act American citizenship was granted to the citizens of Porto Rico. The provisions of this organic act to this effect read as follows:

> That all citizens of Porto Rico, as defined by section 7 of the act of April 12, 1900, "temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and all natives of Porto Rico who were temporarily absent from that island on April 11, 1899, and have since returned and are permanently residing in that island, and are not citizens of any foreign country, are hereby declared, and shall be deemed and held to be, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That any person hereinbefore described may retain his present political status by making a declaration under oath of his decision to do so within six months of the taking effect of this act before the district court in the district in which he resides.

On the approval of this law the question of the political status of Porto Rico came again under discussion. Carlos Tapia was

arrested charged with the crime of attempted murder. He applied for a writ of habeas corpus to the United States District Court for Porto Rico, alleging that Porto Rico being a Territory incorporated into the United States he could not be legally held for trial without the presentment or indictment of a grand jury. Tapia was represented by his lawyer, and the attorney general, an American who has the legal representation of the people of Porto Rico, appeared before the court, sustaining that the new organic law has shown a clear and affirmative intent not to incorporate Porto Rico as a Territory; and that the provisions, in connection with the granting of collective citizenship, that citizens of Porto Rico could retain their status as Porto Rican citizens and decline to accept American citizenship, makes the incorporation of Porto Rico as a Territory of the United States under the Jones Act impossible. The Federal court in an elaborate decision held that Porto Rico was incorporated into the United States by the new law. The Supreme Court of Porto Rico arrived to the same conclusion in a similar case. Both cases were brought to the consideration of the Supreme Court of the United States, and on January 17 and 21 of 1918 the Supreme Court reversed the judgments of the insular courts upon the authority of the cases decided in construction of the Foraker Act. No opinion was delivered in these cases.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DÁVILA. Certainly.

Mr. MASON. Then, as I understand your statement, under the act of Congress you are a citizen of the United States, the Porto Rican is a citizen of the United States, but under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States they decline to give you the constitutional right of a trial by jury or to defend against an indictment when no grand jury has been called?

Mr. DÁVILA. Yes, sir. That is the position we are in.

Mr. MASON. So that while you are a citizen of the United States, you have not the constitutional protection of a citizen of the United States?

Mr. DÁVILA. We have not the right in Porto Rico to be tried by a grand jury, because the Constitution of the United States, according to the Supreme Court, does not extend to Porto Rico.

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

Mr. DÁVILA. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Has the gentleman presented any bill so that Congress might legislate and recoup this error and do what I feel Congress intended to do originally?

Mr. DÁVILA. I will explain my view. My position is that the Congress of the United States must decide what the United States intends to do with the people of Porto Rico. We ought to know what our position is. I think we are entitled to know what will be the fate of the people of Porto Rico.

These decisions of the Supreme Court clearly show that the high tribunal considers the position of Porto Rico at present as it was under the Foraker Act, that no change has been operated in our status with the granting of the American citizenship to the citizens of Porto Rico, and that therefore we are yet an unincorporated territory. So, after 20 years of American domination, we have not been able to know what the Congress of the United States intends to do with us, and we are speculating about our future, some people advocating for independence, others for statehood, and others for self-government. We are not to be blamed for the different views that are striking our minds. It is not our fault. If there is any fault at all, that belongs exclusively to the doubtful position adopted by the Congress of the United States. According to the Supreme Court, we are an organized teritory, but not incorporated into the United States. The high tribunal has established a distinction between organization and incorporation. Our status, therefore, is extremely peculiar. Are we foreigners? No; because we are American citizens, and no citizen of the United States can be a foreigner within the boundaries of the Nation.

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

Mr. DÁVILA. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. Does the gentleman believe that the United States ever intended to make Porto Rico a part of the Union and place it in the position of a State?

Mr. DÁVILA. I do not know the intention of the United States, but I think the people of Porto Rico are entitled to know their fate. I think we are entitled to know your views, in order that our people may know what to expect of the American people and what course you are going to follow. [Applause.]

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DÁVILA. Yes.

Mr. CURRY of California. I think the American people did intend to make Porto Rico a part of the United States, as far as the Territory is concerned, and I would suggest to the gentleman that in drawing up an organic act it would be well to follow along the lines of the act creating Alaska and the Sandwich Islands; and if he introduces such a bill in this House it would undoubtedly be passed by the Congress and signed by the President, and it would relieve the situation entirely.

Mr. DÁVILA. I see the point of the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Porto Rico has expired.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. DÁVILA. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Would the gentleman desire 5 minutes or 10 minutes?

Mr. DÁVILA. I would be glad to have 10 minutes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Porto Rico is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. DÁVILA. Are we a part of the Union? No; because we are an unincorporated Territory under the rulings of the Supreme Court. Can you find a proper definition for this organized and yet unincorporated Territory, for this piece of ground belonging to but not forming part of the United States? Under the ruling of the courts of justice we are neither a part nor a whole. We are nothing, and it seems to me, without criticizing the wisdom of this policy, that if we are not allowed to be a part of your organization we must be allowed to be a whole, with our own government and our own flag. [Applause.]

Our position is entirely different to that of the Philippine Islands. You have not granted to these people the American citizenship, and they have your promise, the solemn and reliable promise of the people of the United States of recognizing their independence in a reasonable period of time. They know what their future is; they see a definite solution as to the permanent status of their islands, and we are ignorant of our fate and placed blindfolded in the path of our destiny; and we are entitled to know what will be the fate of the people of Porto Rico. We are asking for a definite solution, and the Congress of the United States must satisfy our wishes as soon as possible, because the policy of the past is inconsistent with the American principles and with the views expounded by the great leaders of the Nation in the present crisis of the world.

The two great political parties of Porto Rico are divided in their views. The Republican Party claims for statehood and the Unionist Party, which is the majority party, claims for full self-government in the present and independence for the future. Now, if it is your intention to decide the future of Porto Rico without taking into consideration the opinion of the inhabitants of the island, you must express your views, to the end that the people of Porto Rico may know the course you are going to take and what to expect in regard to our future political welfare. In my judgment the fate of a country ought not be decided without a proper consultation with the people affected by the decision, in accordance with the right of self-determination, about which so much has been said. You may submit to a plebescite or referendum the question of our political status if you think that our country is entitled to express its opinion in a matter which has for us an extraordinary importance, because it carries with it the decision of our fate. I expect that the people of Porto Rico will not be deprived of this right, and I am sure that this Congress and this Nation will receive with the greatest respect the opinion of our country, very small in territorial extension and population, but as great in justice and humanity as the most powerful country on earth. [Applause.]

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

Mr. DÁVILA. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. What is the public opinion in the island of Porto Rico? Do the people want to be made a State, or do they want to set up an independent government of their own?

Mr. DÁVILA. Opinion is divided. The Republican Party favors statehood. The Unionist Party, which is the majority party, demands self-government at the present and independence in the future, when the people of the United States will think that it is proper to grant independence to the people of Porto Rico. But really I can not say what is the opinion of a majority of the people of the island. I can not say whether a majority of the people is in favor of statehood or in favor of independence. It may be that statehood will carry, or it may be that independence will carry the country. I do not want to advance any opinion, although I presume the results.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the United States to-day exercise the same control over Porto Rico as it does over Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. DÁVILA. There is this difference, that Alaska is a part of the United States, and we are not a part of the United States.

Mr. MASON. The Constitution is in Alaska.

Mr. DAVILA. The Constitution of the United States is in force in Alaska, and the Constitution of the United States is not in force in Porto Rico.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman state if he knows how many white people there are living in Porto Rico to-day?

Mr. DÁVILA. We have more white people than you have in the city of Washington—two-thirds white people and one-third negro people.

You may be sure that we will not take any steps in conflict with the American interest. We love this Nation, we love your institutions and your ideals, and know, that whatever would be the definite status of Porto Rico, whether statehood, independence, or self-government, we are forever united to your people by the ties of common affection which are more powerful and stronger than the ties of force.

There is a strong sentiment in favor of independence in the island. In spite of this, however, we have refrained ourselves from expressing this sentiment during the war, devoting our time entirely with all our resources to help the United States in the great struggle against the central empires. The American administration in Porto Rico seems not to understand our position and refuses to recognize the right of the natives to defend our ideals, believing that he who advocates for the entire liberty of his native country is a traitor to the United States. There is a great distinction between the Americans who live in this country and the Americans residing in Porto Rico. The people here, unselfish and humane, receive our views with sympathy, but the most part of the continental Americans residing in Porto Rico, thinking perhaps that every right granted to the native is a privilege lost by them, are enemies of our liberties and desire to keep control of the public affairs. The island of Porto Rico has always being loyal to the United States and in the present crisis the entire population, whether favoring statehood, independence, or self-government, has been so enthusiastic in behalf of our cause that I dare to say that no State of the Union has been more patriotic and loyal to the United States than the people of Porto Rico. [Applause.] The continental Americans there think that because we are American citizens we can not defend our independence without being guilty of the crime of treason. I want to quote the language of Mr. Barcelo, president of the Unionist Party, in a statement made by him to a reporter of the newspaper La Democracia. Relating to the meaning of the American citizenship in Porto Rico, Mr. Barcelo says:

> It has for us the same meaning that it has for a citizen of New York or of Kentucky. It means that we Porto Ricans are joined individually and collectively to the destiny of the American Nation; that it is our duty to respect its sovereignty and to glorify its flag through all its evolutions; to acknowledge and respect its authority in international life, and at all times and places to defend as our own the honor of the United States of America. It also implies our right to demand for ourselves all the consideration, all the respect, all the justice, and all the liberty which belong to an American citizen.

This is our duty while we are American citizens, but as we are not incorporated into the United States and the right of self-determination has not been taken away from us, it is not treason at all for a native of Porto Rico to defend the independence of his country. The American citizenship is for us a privilege of which we feel very proud, but I want to state here that if this Congress arrives at the conclusion that the independence of Porto Rico is the only practical solution in the interest of the Nation and of the island of Porto Rico, our people will be as loyal to the United States as they are at present, ready always to do their bit in favor of the American principles and of the American Nation. Our sentiments have not been understood by the Americans residing in the island. I am going to offer you an example of the attitude taken by the administration there. Some time ago a number of students of the University of Porto Rico sent a petition to the House of Representatives requesting the approval of a resolution asking independence for the people of Porto Rico.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DÁVILA. I should like to have five minutes more, because what I am going to say is very important.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. DÁVILA. The commissioner of education, Dr. Paul G. Miller, an American born in the State of Wisconsin, when informed of the attitude of the students, wrote the following letter to the dean of the university:

> CHARLES W. ST. JOHN,
> *Dean University of Porto Rico, Rio Pedras, Porto Rico.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. ST. JOHN: Sometime ago my attention was called to the fact that certain students of the university had sent a petition to the House of Representatives formally requesting that a certain resolution be changed so as to make a definite demand for the independence of Porto Rico.
>
> Since this request is made by persons who are American citizens, and at the time when the Nation is being exceedingly careful to scrutinize the loyalty of all its citizens, you are hereby directed to furnish me with a list of any members of the graduating class of the normal school who may desire to enter the teaching service. I shall not appoint or approve the nomination by school board of persons concerning whose loyalty to the United States of America there may be any doubt. Please let me have the list.

As you see, this American, born in the continent, thinks that it is a crime for a Porto Rican to defend the independence of his island, and, acting as the Kaiser of Germany, has destroyed the careers of the members of the graduating class who signed the petition. These young men have devoted the most precious time of their lives to their education, and when they expected to receive the reward of the efforts made in the school the commissioner of education asks for the list of their names, with the purpose of depriving the students of the right of serving their own country as school teachers. The punishment imposed by Dr. Miller upon these students is entirely unjustified. They have not done anything to deserve it. They have merely asked the insular legislature to send a petition to the Congress of the United States for the independence of their native country.

"Let me have the list," says Dr. Miller in his ukase to the dean of the university; and I should say that the proper thing to do is to send to the President a list with the name of Dr. Miller and all American officials who have acted in the same way, to the end that they be immediately removed from the positions they hold against the will of the Porto Rican people.

Dr. Miller has been strongly criticized for his undiplomatic attitude toward our people in the past, but in spite of this criticism I had considered him as a good commissioner of education. I am sorry that his present attitude compels me to change my mind. He has acted in this matter as a true autocrat, forgetting that there is a flag in Porto Rico which protects our rights, and that under its shade it is entirely impossible to sow the doctrines of kaiserism. He believes that because we are American citizens we have been deprived of the right to defend the liberty of our country, and I think that a man who does not believe in freedom and justice and who does not advocate the independence of his country is utterly unfit to be an American citizen. In this connection I want to quote the remarks of Senator VARDAMAN when the Senate was discussing our present organic law. On that occasion Senator VARDAMAN said:

> There were some eloquent statements made before the committee. One young man appeared before the committee, with whom I was greatly impressed, who pleaded for the independence of Porto Rico, for the right to govern their own country, for the sanctity of their home that had been invaded and the sovereignty over which had been taken from them; but, recognizing the fact which any well-informed man who understands the Anglo-Saxon disposition in dealing with subject Provinces will recognize, that independence is impossible, and since independence is not going to be given them the majority of them expressed a desire to come in under the terms of this bill.
>
> If the question of independence were submitted to them to choose between being a dependency of the United States or having their independence, I do not believe 1 per cent of them would vote to become a part of the United States. If they should do otherwise, they would prove themselves utterly unfit for citizenship in a free country, for a man who does not desire to be free and independent has not the elements in him essential to the making of a desirable citizen of this Republic.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if it is a crime to defend the independence of our native country, I confess myself guilty of such a crime, because I have that ideal in my heart, and if I sacrifice it for the present it is only for the welfare of my country and because of the confidence that I have in the justice and humanity of the people of the United States.

I want to present to you another example of the attitude of the administration in Porto Rico, or, rather, of some people connected with the Government. Some days ago the Navy censor in Washington received a copy of a message sent to a member of the British Parliament by the Porto Rican Independence Association. This copy was forwarded to Washington by the wireless station of Porto Rico, and reads as follows:

> From: Radio, San Juan.
> To: Nav. cen., Washington.
>
> Referred from San Juan, P. R., January 24, to Sir James Brown Chavez, member British Parliament, London, England:
>
> "Porto Ricans wishing independence being great majority in this country agreed in mass meeting to cable you our gratitude for your noble petition to Premier Lloyd George to consent to the right that assists Porto Rico in accordance with the principle maintained by the great Wilson to have a place among the free countries of the world."
>
> (Signed) PORTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE ASSOCIATION.
> By V. M. ALCARAZ.

This is the message received by the Navy censor, but as a corollary to it comes a report from the radio station, which reads as follows:

Alcaraz is the secretary of this association which has wide membership in Porto Rico and which is spreading revolutionary propaganda and is active in creating anti-American feeling among Porto Ricans.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphatically deny that there is any kind of revolutionary propaganda in the island. Porto Rico is the most peaceable country in the world. We have never had a revolution in our country, even in the times of the Spanish Government under which we suffered so many injustices. We need not appeal to violence or disorder to defend our ideals, because under the American institution all changes in the system of government can be brought about in an orderly and lawful way. I have not any information about this association which has just come into existence, but if either Mr. Alcaraz or his associates try to create anti-American feeling among Porto Ricans they will lose their time, because the people of Porto Rico have sufficient common sense to reject any suggestion which is calculated to create antagonism between Americans and Porto Ricans, between this Nation and our people, whose love to this country is beyond question.

If there is any Porto Rican capable to entertain any anti-American feeling, leave him alone with all the responsibility of his acts, because he who hates this Nation does not love his own country, does not work for our welfare, since our happiness largely depends on the cordial relations and mutual understanding between the two countries, and does not deserve either the respect of Porto Rico or of the American Nation. It would be an ingratitude on our part to sanction with our approval a policy of hate and discontent against the American people, and the natives of Porto Rico are not ungrateful. Our loyalty to this Nation is a sufficient answer to this report, which has the sinister purpose of casting suspicion upon the people of Porto Rico.

I sent a cable to Mr. Barcelo, president of our senate, asking information about this association, and in reply he says that there does not exist in Porto Rico any anti-American feeling.

The report from the radio station says that this Independence Association has a wide membership in the island. This statement is entirely untrue. Although the sentiment for independence in Porto Rico is strong, no political association outside of the political parties has wide membership in the country, and neither the Republican Party, which is fighting for statehood, nor the majority party, which is fighting for complete self-government at present and independence as a definite solution, will authorize any movement which may interfere with the friendly relations existing between the two countries or which may diminish the affection that the people of Porto Rico feel for the United States.

I do not indorse the attitude of this Independence Association in the message sent to a member of the British Parliament. We do not want to complicate our problem with international intervention. We realize that we do not need to appeal to France or to England or to any organized power in order to obtain liberties for our own country. The peace conference is a great tribunal, indeed, but there is no greater tribunal in the world for the adjustment of our rights than the American Congress, and it is here in this place, before the Representatives of the Nation, where we must come with our case, in the entire confidence that justice will be done to the people of Porto Rico. I am grateful to Sir James Brown Chavez for his petition in favor of our liberty, but my gratitude does not go so far as to encourage him in his efforts to obtain a place for Porto Rico among the free countries of the world. This is a matter which belongs exclusively to the American Congress, and the people of Porto Rico, with full confidence in your wisdom and straightforwardness, place in your hands the solution of their destiny.

I want to make a personal statement, expressing my own views, and although I am not sure of the indorsement of the political parties organized in the island, it seems to me that the majority of the people of Porto Rico will agree with my statement. If it is not your intention to make of Porto Rico a State of the Union, if you think as the Boston Court of Appeals that we are an insular piece of ground, with a considerable population, far removed from any physical relation with the States and Territories; if you think that on account of our differences in language, ethnology, and habits we can never form a part of the American federation; if we can not be a star in that glorious heaven of blue with its stripes of red and white; if we can not be a vital living part of the Nation we love and want to serve; if that concession can not be granted to us by the land that is always the friend of the helpless and small, then we must demand that the American people give us the freedom that is our God-given right. You have but two alternatives—statehood or independence. It is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion under the American Government. Here you have the Porto Rican flag [showing the flag] with only one star, made, by the way, by an American girl who has three brothers in the service in France. Were I to see this star forming part of the American constellation, with the same dignity and greatness as the 48 stars of the American States, I would feel very proud in considering my island a part of the Union. [Applause.] But if this star can not be associated to yours in this beautiful and glorious emblem [pointing to the American flag], then leave it alone in the Porto Rican flag and let me love my own emblem with the same pride that you love your Star-Spangled Banner. I hoist it on the floor of the House before the representatives of the American people. And when it will be raised on the public buildings of Porto Rico this flag will have for us the honor and privilege of having been hoisted for the first time in the American Congress, which is the highest peak of human justice. Quoting the language of Representative MASON, I should say that the American flag is the most beautiful emblem in the world, but that it will never look so beautiful as the day in which it comes down to make room in the Porto Rican sky for the Porto Rican flag. If that day comes I am sure that our relations will be still more friendly than they are to-day. The American flag may come down from our public buildings, but it will live forever in our hearts, and it will have our affection and devotion, because we need and want to live under your protection, and for this and for your sense of justice you are enttiled to our love and gratitude. [Applause.]

As Mr. MASON said in his speech on the floor of this House on January 17, the great hindrance to civilization has been the ungodly desire of one man to govern another man without his consent, the ungodly desire of one people to govern another people without their consent. If you want to follow these principles and give full recognition to the right of self-determination, you must consult the people of Porto Rico before adopting any definite solution; but if you think that this consultation will not be of value at all and that on account of the conditions I have stated the concession of statehood is impracticable, although it may be asked by a portion of the people of Porto Rico, then the only practical solution is the ultimate independence of the island, granting in the meantime full self-government powers to the people of Porto Rico. [Applause.]

Under the authority granted me to extend my remarks I want to print in the RECORD the following article of the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin of New York of January 29, 1919:

WHERE DOES PORTO RICO STAND IN UNITED STATES?—ISLANDERS PROTEST BEING TREATED AS FOREIGNERS—CLAIM THEY HAVE BEEN TREATED AS ALIENS UNDER THE WAR REGULATIONS AND WANT THEIR RIGHTS AS AMERICANS DEFINED.

"Is Porto Rico a part of the United States? Such is the issue being raised by many of the inhabitants, as well as Americans interested in trading with the islanders, and a survey of the situation appears to leave considerable basis for complaint on the part of the territorials. One of the plainest spoken champions of the island is Salvador Ferrer, of this city, who feels that the American Government is playing an especially double-faced part toward Porto Rico.

"Now that the political rights of small peoples are being so freely discussed, it is quite petrinent to examine the case of Porto Rico," he said.

"What is the political status of Porto Rico after 20 years of American domination? Is the island a part of the United States; good enough United States territory to apply to it our tariff, income tax, and navigation laws, and all the very important laws enacted by the Congress during the recent European war, or foreign territory whenever official Washington so chooses to rule?

"Let us look into the treatment that is being accorded to Porto Rico, two decades after we wrested it from Spain. The following are some facts about a few of the recent regulations in our relations with Porto Rico, borne patiently during the fighting in Europe, but which should call forth energetic protest now that hostilities have ceased:

"The food-conservation law is in force in Porto Rico, but when, faced by a 'bone-dry' prohibition law that went into effect last March, Porto Rico tried to send here distilled spirits imported or manufactured before September 8, 1917 (just as Boston or Chicago might have done), and the Attorney General of the United States gave us a sample of legislation by administrative interpretation, ruling that Porto Rico was to be considered foreign in this instance, and shipments were not allowed to be made.

"Censorship of mails, cables, etc., between the United States and foreign countries was established by virtue of the trading-with-the-enemy act. In other words, under the assumed authority of a law Porto Rico has been treated, as regards cable censorship, precisely as if it were a foreign country. This unjust procedure compels the use of a few general cable codes and means an increase of four or five times the prewar cost of cabling, which is at the enormous rate of 50 cents per word. It would be idle to attempt to estimate the heavy losses occasioned by the long delays, amounting sometimes to one and two weeks in the receipt of cables, as well as by the absolute nondelivery of many messages sent from here and from Porto Rico, even from a loyal and respectable American house to another. And when complaint about it has been made, a curt answer that 'no information is available' is all that has been vouchsafed; and senders lose the cost of transmitting a message never put on the cables.

"In the meantime cable letters from Cuba, not a possession of the United States, costing only about 4 cents a word from Habana and about 8 cents a word from other places, have frequently come through

in less than 24 hours, simply because they were given immediate attention, whilst Porto Rico messages, being in code, had to wait days, until it was found convenient to decode them.

"Furthermore, during the entire war there has been no restriction to telegraphic or postal correspondence with the Dominion of Canada, and even messages by wire about sailings of ships from here and from Canada, with names, dates, destination, etc., passed freely, not excepting the period of the piratical Hun visitation of undersea boats last summer. Can we be expected to believe that Congress intended that Porto Rico should be treated as foreign soil and Canada domestic in these matters?

"The War Department's reports show that when the armistice was signed Porto Rico troops were in the fighting line with those from Florida, South and North Carolina, yet in the casualty list of our Army abroad, classified with those from British West Indies, Canada, England, France, Italy, etc., we read: 'Men of foreign countries—Porto Rico: Sergt. Santiago Cintron, Cayey, died of wounds.'

"The consumption of refined sugar in Porto Rico has not yet warranted the heavy investment in a sugar refinery, hence they must bring the refined product from here. Nevertheless, several weeks ago, when removing all restrictions in the sale of refined sugar to manufacturers here, the Food Administration specifically excepted Porto Rico.

"What is to be the answer to these questions? That human nature will continue to be the same everywhere? That the strong will continue to take advantage of the weak? Unless our officials promptly adopt a very different attitude toward the people of Porto Rico, forgetting that we are big and they are small, there can not exist much faith in our oft-expressed solicitude for the preservation of the political rights of humanity."

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO] to use some of his time.

Mr. CRAGO. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY].

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman is granted.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, during the closing days of the Sixty-fifth Congress both Houses are working day and night under the administration whip to put through the great appropriation bills for the support and maintenance of the Government, the building up of the greatest Navy in the world, the preparation for a great standing Army of 500,000 men.

In addition to this, there is proposed the enactment of many laws to provide for the Government control of the railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, as well as Government ownership of everything in general. There is pressed for consideration with great haste, to avoid a special session, bills appropriating vast sums of money for world charity; and on the heels of this come from nearly every department a multitude of schemes, plans, and projects purporting to be in the interest of the returning soldiers.

One department has a scheme involving billions of dollars for buying up the swamp lands of the South and the arid desert lands of the West, to drain the one and to irrigate the other, and out of them to create farms and build houses and barns, as well as provide farm machinery, and then mortgage and turn these all over to the returning soldier—who never farmed in his life—as a reward for his services in France.

Another scheme would build highways across the Nation at great expense of labor and materials in order to give employment to the soldiers, who do not care to work upon the highways. Others would meet the returning soldiers with a little purse of the Government of some six months' pay and build a triumphant arch at the Capitol and allow them to keep and wear the old clothes they wore in the trenches.

Those of us who have talked with the soldiers who have returned from France and the battle fields and who have seen real service there understand at once that he does not ask for nor desire the charity of the Government; he does not ask nor expect the treatment accorded a pauper or a mendicant. He wants no farms or rewards because he fought for his country and his flag, but he does desire, and he demands at the hands of the Congress, justice for the wrongs that have been heaped upon him during the past war. I say wrongs, for the greater portion of the soldiers and officers of the National Guard in the American Expeditionary Force in Europe that went upon the battle fields and through the hell of battle and won the world war have been wronged more than any other soldier since the days of Rome.

Those of you who listened to or read the speeches of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] made upon the floor of the House on January 13 and February 1 must have been stirred to the quick by his eloquent recital of the wrongs done by the War Department to the officers of the National Guard, and especially to those who belonged to the Twenty-sixth Division, from New England. And what was true of New England was true of the whole Nation. The wrongs committed against the Twenty-sixth Division have been committed against all the officers of the National Guard that won immortal and imperishable glory for American arms.

I want for a few minutes to call your attention further to this great injustice by way of supplement to the eloquent speeches of the gentleman from Massachusetts. When the armistice was signed November 11, 1918, we had in France under arms something over 2,000,000 men. About one-half of these, or more than a million, were on the fighting line in the trenches and on the battle fields contesting every inch of ground of the enemy. The other million was in reserve. They had never been in the fight and were waiting to be called, but the call never came. The million men who were in the fight and in the great battles that commenced in June, 1918, and continued until November were made up largely of the National Guard units of the Nation. In direct command on the field of battle, without scarcely an exception, were the officers of the National Guard. They had been educated in the National Guard organizations of their own States, served in the Spanish-American War, and had seen service also on the Mexican border, and were prepared when the call came from Gen. Pershing: "For God's sake, send us men!"

Among the million men in reserve of the American Expeditionary Forces were another class of officers called the "Regulars." They had been educated at West Point and in training camps and military schools of the Nation. They had never seen real war service. They had had no experience in battle and they did not desire any real service. They had secured through influence noncombative positions in the commissary and other departments of the service, where they would be safe in place and position, where they could only be exposed to danger in case there arose such an emergency as would call out every resource. They were diligent and faithful in watching the progress of our fighting troops. Day after day they closely watched those brave boys "on the fighting line" push back the Huns toward the Rhine. They knew long before the people of this Nation knew that the war had been won. They knew along in the first days of November that there was to be very shortly an armistice and that the war was about to close, when suddenly there came a radical change of officers all along the line.

Officers of the National Guard, from generals down to lieutenants, were demoted and removed from their commands only a few days before the armistice was signed. They were sent back far in the rear to Blois, a town called the "canning factory," in France, and their places were filled by these "Regulars," who had never seen real service, whose motto was "Safety first," and who had received commissions not for service but by reason of a pull. They, of course, wanted the position after the battle had been fought, and obtained it that they might return at the head of the victorious troops to this country and be received under triumphant arches as the heroes of the war, leading and commanding the boys who had won these battles under the leadership of the National Guard officers, who had now been demoted, discharged, and disgraced.

The war correspondent of the Washington Post, George Rothwell Brown, one of the most reliable correspondents of a great daily, in the issue of January 27, 1919, explains this great injustice to the officers of the National Guard in the following language:

In the little town of Blois, halfway between Bordeaux and Paris, in one of the loveliest parts of France, is the "canning factory" of the American Expeditionary Forces, the place of heartaches and tears.

They don't "can" tomato soup here, but officers of the overseas army who have been tried and found wanting. A large percentage of the 100,000 American officers in the Expeditionary Forces, considering that we had not been long in the war, passed through the ordeal prepared for them at this place and came out broken, sullen, and sometimes resentful.

It was here that the system was operated whereby the Army was rid of officers who had not made good or who were charged with not having made good. While the war was on there was no more dreaded place than this in all France, no more bitter fate for officers at the front or in important posts in the "S. O. S." than to be "ordered down to Blois."

It was through this place that the National Guard officers, who were relieved of their commands, were obliged to pass. It is a place of hated memory.

* * * * * * *

Courageous men who led their soldiers in battle against the Huns have emerged from this inquisitorial chamber shattered wrecks, in tears, crushed, humiliated, and broken in spirit. Others have come out like roaring lions, swearing vengeance.

Officers who were ordered before the board of Blois and who were found incompetent and recommended for discharge were discharged in France, and returned to the United States without any military status. When they stepped foot in America they were not soldiers, but civilians. This was cleverly conceived, to prevent these officers from having their cases reopened, through political influence or otherwise, in Washington. This is one reason why the "canning factory" system has been so effectually bottled up. It has been frankly admitted to me that some officers—the kind who might show fight—were deliberately kept in France, although not needed there, to prevent them from "starting something" prematurely.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSEY. I can not yield at present.

Mr. Chairman, the many officers of the National Guard who were removed under these peculiar circumstances were dumbfounded and amazed by this strange treatment. The minor officers were disregarded and discharged and allowed to find

their way home as best they could with scars and wounds and broken bodies, and, worse than all, disgraced and humiliated.

A few of the higher officers in the ranks demanded to know the reasons for their removal, and some of them were given what purported to be the reasons for their discharge. The charges were all the same, from the generals down, as follows:

1. His qualifications as a soldier are poor.
2. Lack of force and aggressiveness.
3. He permitted the members of his regiment to fraternize with the enemy.
4. It is not known that he ever performed any military service well.

Gen. Cole, of Massachusetts, of the National Guard, was demoted with the rest. He was a man of great political influence in his State and Nation. He had recently been candidate for governor in his own State and had many powerful friends at court. He was able to get his record up to Gen. Pershing, and the general at once wrote the following decision:

FRANCE, *November 30, 1918.*

From: Adjutant General, American Expeditionary Forces.
To: Brig. Gen. Charles H. Cole, Center of Information, American Post Office 714, American Expeditionary Forces.
Subject: Relief from Fifty-second Infantry Brigade.

1. I am directed by the commander in chief to inform you that upon his personal examination of the papers representing the facts incident to your relief from command of the Fifty-second Brigade, he is of the opinion that the facts did not warrant your relief, and that you be reinstated to your former brigade.
2. Accordingly orders will be issued in the near future.

By command of Gen. Pershing.

ROBERT C. DAVIS,
Adjutant General.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, in due consideration of the House, I do not feel that the gentleman is discussing any issue before the House or any part of this bill, and I therefore make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that under general debate the gentleman is not required to discuss the bill.

Mr. LARSEN. I did not understand that the rule so provided.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chair that it does.

Mr. LARSEN. If the rules of the House so provide——

The CHAIRMAN. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. LARSEN. Does the Chair rule that the rules so provide?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the gentleman from Maine will proceed.

Mr. HERSEY. The minor National Guard officers were disgraced and discharged and allowed to find their way home as best they could. Many thousands of the officers of the National Guard who had been demoted and discharged at the close of the war found it was impossible to get their appeals to Gen. Pershing. Gen. Leonard Wood, a prominent officer of the National Guard, had long before this returned to this country to give place, as his friends believe, to an officer of the Regular Army in France. Gen. Edwards, a brave and most efficient officer of the National Guard, in command of the Twenty-sixth Division, had been removed after he had been through all the battles and he has returned to his home in New England. Col. Logan, who commanded the One hundred and fourth United States Infantry, and Col. Hume, who was in command of the One hundred and third United States Infantry, bold splendid soldiers and efficient officers of the National Guard, and who had led their men successfully through all the battles, were removed a few days before the signing of the armistice and sent to the "canning factory" at Blois, and there they were not able to get their record up to Gen. Pershing for review.

I desire at this time to call your attention to the case of one National Guard officer who was removed and demoted on the 6th day of November last, the armistice being signed on the 11th. This case is not much different from the rest; and while I speak of him more particularly, as he is my neighbor and friend and I know about his life and his work, I am speaking for the thousands of other officers who have been demoted and disgraced under the same circumstances.

Col. Frank M. Hume, of my home town, is in the prime of life, well educated, earnest, aggressive, honest, brave, every inch a soldier. For 25 years he was an officer of the National Guard of my State. In 1898 he was in command of the First Maine Heavy Battery in Cuba in the War with Spain, was recommended as captain of the United States Volunteers for service in the Philippine Islands after the War with Spain, but was unable to go on account of sickness.

From July 4 to October 20, 1916, he was colonel of his regiment, located on the Mexican border on a front of 100 miles, and made there a splendid record, as appears in the reports of his superior officers.

April 15, 1917, a few days after we declared war against Germany, his regiment was called to guard railways and bridges, tunnels, and terminals in the State of Maine, where he performed valuable service until August, 1917, when he was placed in command of the One hundred and third United States Infantry, made up of New England men, largely of the National Guard, and went overseas and to the front, where from June until November 6 of last year he was constantly on the battle line, gassed and wounded, but persisted in remaining at the head of his command, leading his soldiers through every battle, his record all these times being marked "excellent," and three times he was recommended for promotion to the rank of brigadier general by his commanding officers.

I will not encumber the RECORD by the many honors that he has received from his superior officers during these battles, but I wish to insert in the RECORD this one general order:

[Eighth Army, 32d Army Corps Staff, 3d Bureau, No. 3,094. General Order No. 131.]

HEADQUARTERS, *June 18, 1918.*

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 Twenty-sixth 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 one officer.

This brilliant action does the greatest honor to the Twenty-sixth Division, and particularly to the One hundred and third 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.

Gen. PASSAGA,
Commanding the Thirty-second Army Corps.

Official:
Agd. MANGIN,
The Chief of Staff.

To be read to companies.

On November 6, when the battles had all been won and everyone was rejoicing that peace had come, Col. Hume was suddenly removed from his command by these foolish and senseless charges filed by a regular officer who had never met him, an officer who had been to the front less than 24 hours, who had seen no service and knew nothing about the charges that he filed, except that they were the "usual ones."

Gen. Pershing has found these charges unfounded and he has restored Col. Hume to his command, and he will return home with the boys that love him and trust him and honor him. He will return to a people that believe in him and who will see to it that every wrong against his record is righted.

That this injustice to the National Guard officers of our armies might be without a parallel when they were removed an order was at once issued that there should be no more promotions, so as to deprive the National Guard officers who had been removed from being promoted by reason of the record they made on the battle field.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSEY. No; I can not yield at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HERSEY. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] has called the attention of the House to these things in two splendid speeches. He told the truth. No Republican could have presented the matter before this House without being accused of politics. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. He has performed a great service to his party and to his country. Neither I nor any other Republican could get the papers and records up to Gen. Pershing. The remarks of Mr. GALLIVAN in this House on these two occasions have resulted in the sending of the papers in many cases up to Gen. Pershing; and so Col. Logan, Mr. GALLIVAN's neighbor and friend, has been reinstated. Gen. Edwards has been reinstated. My friend, Col. Hume, has now been reinstated; but there are thousands of officers who have left the "canning factory" and returned home in disgrace because they would not wait; and the papers can not go up to Gen. Pershing unless the Congress takes the matter in hand.

The people of this country demanded that such an unjust order be changed, and it was changed by the Secretary of War in this way, that promotions could be made hereafter, but such promotions should not be made "merely as a reward for past services."

Another order has been made that no soldier returning from France should be allowed to wear his medals given him by a foreign power; and so these National Guard officers returning from France, broken in spirit, wounded, gassed, disgraced, with medals given them by France for bravery on the battle field, can not wear them here. They can not be promoted, because there will be no more promotion "merely as a reward for past services."

I wish to say this in conclusion: I plead for the boys over there in the Twenty-sixth Division and for the boys of the National Guard all over the United States that keenly feel the disgrace and humiliation that has come to our Armies by having the National Guard officers demoted and relieved of their commands without cause. I am pleading to Congress to right this awful wrong. There are thousands and tens of thousands of the brave boys from the National Guard "over there," dead on "Flanders Field." Their silent and voiceless lips are pleading to you to right this great wrong. Every grave is calling to us:

Take up our quarrel with the foe!
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If you break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow,
In Flanders fields.

[Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLNEY].

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, in these days of caustic criticism, when we are criticizing even the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, the War Department, the War Risk Insurance Bureau, it is time to contemplate that there is one subject upon which we can all agree. We all place our stamp of approval upon the humanitarian work of the American Red Cross Association. [Applause.] I am going to ask the patience and indulgence of the House—and I wish there were more Members present—while I diverge from the topic under discussion and give you some facts which were given to me through the courtesy of Mr. Fitzgerald, of the American Red Cross Association.

When Mabel Boardman was before our Military Affairs Committee early in 1916 she announced that there were 27,000 members only in the American Red Cross Association, and she pointed out to us at that time—March, 1916—that Great Britain had 750,000 members in its Red Cross Association; Austria, about 1,000,000; Germany, 900,000; and even Japan with a membership of 1,000,000. An appeal was made to the United States to increase the membership to a million, and the drive was then and there begun. The membership of the Red Cross to-day, according to the latest returns, is approximately 20,000,000 loyal Americans, not including several million school children, members of the junior organization.

I recall that three years ago I became a life member in this association by paying $25. I invite all Members of the House to become life members of the American Red Cross Association.

The personnel of the Red Cross shows that there are about 17,000 persons employed in national, divisional, and foreign headquarters, of which about 13,000 are paid workers and 4,000 volunteer; and of the total number, about 9,000 were engaged in Red Cross service overseas. These figures do not include the great army of volunteer women workers employed in Red Cross chapter rooms throughout the country during the war; their number has been estimated at 8,000,000.

From the beginning of the world war the American Red Cross extended relief, but participation in war activities in a big way dates from May 10, 1917. When President Wilson appointed a Red Cross war council of seven members, headed by Henry P. Davison, of New York, to direct the relief work, the council's first task was to secure an adequate war fund, and the week beginning June 18 and ending June 25 was set aside by the Red Cross for the collecting of the $100,000,000 war fund, which was oversubscribed by $12,000,000. A Christmas membership drive in December of that year netted $24,500,000 and a second war fund of $100,000,000, asked in May, 1918, was oversubscribed by $76,000,000.

The Red Cross mission sailed for France June 2, 1917, and the relief work among those who had been holding back the German hordes for so long was organized and the groundwork laid for helping the American soldiers soon to be pouring across the Atlantic. In this country men and women from all walks of life volunteered for Red Cross work of all kinds, from knitting garments for the soldiers to nursing at the front.

Great camps and cantonments were springing up throughout the United States, and in all of these, as soon as mobilization began, the Red Cross was at work ministering to the wants of the soldiers. It is conservatively estimated that while America was engaged in the war, about a year and a half, 10,000,000 Americans were knitting various kinds of articles for the soldiers and sailors; that about a year's supply of the American wool market was consumed, or about 130,000,000 pounds of wool. And it is further estimated that the gratuity furnished by American men and women for the prosecution of the war, and materials furnished, amounted to $2,500,000,000. As America's participation in the war increased the field organization of the American Red Cross, its work expanded in proportion, as may be judged from the fact that in France alone over $22,000,000 was expended by July 1 last, not including $13,000,000 of supplies then on hand for future use, while over $25,000,000 was appropriated for the ensuing six months. But the work was by no means confined to France, for expenditures and appropriations up to January 1, 1919, in other countries were as follows: Italy, about $17,000,000; England, $11,000,000; Belgium, $3,400,000; Switzerland, $2,300,000; Russia and Siberia, $8,500,000; Serbia, Greece, Roumania, and Palestine, about $10,000,000. The American Red Cross campaign to enlist nurses, which has entailed expenditures and appropriations of $2,400,000, is one of the brightest chapters in the history of the organization's war work. Up to October 1, 1918, 30,000 nurses were enrolled in the Army and Naval Nurse Corps Reserves, of which over 17,000 are caring for soldiers and sailors. Among the Red Cross activities that have proven of the utmost value in maintaining the morale of both the soldiers and their families are those of the bureau of communication and home service. Through the bureau of communication 20,000 families have been kept in weekly communication with relatives overseas and at least 10,000 weekly have been kept informed of the condition and whereabouts of soldiers while in this country. [Applause.]

The work increased greatly with the signing of the armistice, the number of letters handled weekly by the bureau reaching almost 100,000 at the present time. Through this bureau also was carried on correspondence with the American prisoners in Germany.

More than $6,000,000 has been spent or appropriated for camp service, whereby several hundred canteens have been established in camps, on railway lines, and at embarkation points, in addition to numerous other means of providing comforts for the soldiers, over 50,000 women volunteers being engaged in this work alone. In conjunction with this work, the department of military relief of the Red Cross rendered signal service when the influenza epidemic hit the great Army camps and cantonments last fall, providing medical and other supplies. The important services rendered by the American Red Cross in that emergency has been officially recognized as having saved the lives of many men. Throughout the country, since the United States entered the war, there have been formed units of women volunteer motor corps, composed of public-spirited women owning or able to drive automobiles, who have performed noteworthy service of many kinds. At all hours of the day and night they have cheerfully responded to calls, transporting sick and wounded and Red Cross workers in ambulances and in their own machines.

To-day the war work of the American Red Cross is far from complete, although hostilities have long ceased. Until demobilization is complete the organization will continue to minister to American soldiers and sailors, at home and abroad. Nor is this all, for it has played an active part in reestablishing the soldier in life, assisting in the reconstruction of the maimed, the reeducation and suitable callings for those whose injuries unfit them to take up their old vocations.

Maj. Gen. M. W. Ireland, Surgeon General, United States Army, says that victory in the great world war was largely due to the American Red Cross Association.

The American Red Cross knows no creed, color, or race, and all loyal Americans are eligible to membership. Miss Clara Barton, a native of Massachusetts, Red Cross nurse during the Civil War, administered to the sick, suffering, and wounded on both sides, and she became the first president, prior to an act in 1882 through the United States Senate which ratified the Red Cross Society and gave official status to the American association.

Our association has been asked to become guardian of the 100,000 Russian prisoners still in Germany, and it has cheerfully accepted the task imposed upon it. Red Cross activities and assistance were continued effectively in civilian disaster during the world war.

From national headquarters there were distributed $125,000 for the Halifax disaster, $100,000 for Minnesota forest fire sufferers, $500,000 for the influenza epidemic, and a half million dollars more for other exigencies.

In these days of criticism it is most gratifying to observe, and we can all agree, that the machinery of the American Red Cross is well oiled and is running smoothly and without a hitch night and day. We can not pay too high a tribute to the Red Cross for what it has done, is doing to-day, and in its plans for the future.

Fair and just criticism of the usual peace-time methods of the War Department impelled it to summon to its assistance many of the big business men of the Nation, including Baruch, Schwab,

Eidlitz, Hurley, Taft, Hughes, Thorne, and others too numerous to mention.

The dilatoriness in settling allotment cases has been corrected to a remarkable degree under the able supervision of Col. Henry D. Lindsley, Chief of the War Risk Bureau. When will the daily publication of our casualty list come to an end, is a question often put. I submitted such a query to the Secretary of War a month ago and he then said, "About two days longer." The lists have been published ever since and the end is not yet in sight, some days with a column of names and other days nearly or a full page in the daily newspapers.

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

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Nebraska to yield me a little more time.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. OLNEY. It is needless to say that I shall support the Army appropriation bill providing for an Army of 29,579 officers and about 510,000 enlisted men, which seems necessary during the period of demobilization, which legislation is temporary, and which provides for a Regular Army of 250,000 and 250,000 under the volunteer system, with optional enlistments of from one to three years.

Continuation of the increased war pay for enlisted men and provision for the promotion of officers and men for meritorious conduct recommended for such before the signing of the armistice are important features in this bill which should meet with the unanimous approval of the Members. I can not conclude my remarks without referring to the splendid heroism and gallantry of the New England division known as the Twenty-sixth, which distinguished itself in most of the important battles of the great war in the spring, summer, and autumn of 1918; and the names of Maj. Gen. Edwards, Brig. Gens. Cole and Sherburne, and Col. Logan are officers whose names are household words throughout New England; and while this division will return to America with regiments sadly depleted, companies skeletonized, the people of New England are looking forward to the day when the fighting Twenty-sixth will disembark in Boston Harbor.

For the information of the New England Members who may be present, I may say that proceedings have been started to bring the Twenty-sixth Division back to New England. There are three processes. The first starts from the point where the soldiers are. Then there is the order of priority, and then there is the convoy from the port of embarkation. The first procedure might be classed as preparation, and the Twenty-sixth Division has already begun preparations to leave France, and should land in New England or in New York at the port of disembarkation within two months.

The whole Nation is clamoring for the immediate return of our boys in France, and let us hope they will be allowed to come back as expeditiously as possible and in conformity to the status of the world peace.

Our committee builded wisely in providing for an Army of 550,000 officers and men, so that a sufficiently large force can exchange places with our soldiers who have borne the brunt of the fighting since the United States became an active participant in the great conflict.

I do not believe that we will get so many men to volunteer as we provide for in this bill, but I am entirely satisfied myself with an Army of practically skeleton strength, an Army of 150,000 men, as I see a chance in a small Regular Army to secure for this country some day universal military training of which I have been an advocate for three years in this House.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes left.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have heard it said, and it has been carefully estimated, that it costs to run Congress $20 a minute, and in order to save the time of this Congress I am going to yield back $60 to the chairman of the committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HUMPHREYS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15140) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior years, and for other purposes.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER].

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take any of the time of the committee in the consideration of this bill, but some questions and points have been raised that I thought I would like to express my views upon. I have been upon this committee now for four years, and it is interesting to recall that the first appropriation bill I helped frame four years ago carried $100,000,000. The appropriation of two years ago, before we entered into the war, had increased to $267,000,000. Those were both peace-time appropriations, showing the tendency to increased appropriations for the Army, even in time of peace. Now we are coming before this Congress and asking for a peace-time appropriation of $1,100,000,000. There is no contention, nor was it stated to your committee, that this money had been estimated to take care of the Army in Europe. On the contrary, it was constantly stated to the committee that the estimates were based on an Army to be maintained in the United States; and the action of the committee in reporting the amounts carried in this bill was based upon the idea that we did not believe, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has just stated, that we could raise 500,000 men by voluntary enlistment for a peace-time Army. We do know that we are confronted with the fact that there will be a considerable Army remaining of those raised to fight this war after the 1st day of July. So as the basis for appropriations, and not with the idea that we were fixing any definite policy, we finally agreed to appropriate the money that the War Department asked us for; and yet I think it is fair to state to the House that the War Department did ask us for this money in this bill to pay for an organization that was hereafter to be an Army for use in the United States. The issue, as I view it, is this: We know that we have to appropriate this money, and I want to say that I have no illusions that this money is all that we are going to appropriate for military purposes during the next fiscal year. I think that we will have to have a very large deficiency appropriation in addition to this to take care of the Army that will be on our hands before the end of the next fiscal year, but the committee attempted to draft a rider on this bill that would provide for a temporary Army only; and I am not sure that the committee drafted the kind of legislation that this Congress wants to adopt. My judgment all the time has been that all this Congress ought to do is to reenact a provision for the enlistment of men voluntarily in the Regular Army, which was done away with during the war, and allow this Army to be recruited by voluntary enlistment, and appropriate the amount of money asked for in this bill; and we would then give them legislation to build the standing Army in conformity with requirements and provide for the immediate demobilization of the Army that we have raised to fight this war.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will.

Mr. GARNER. Glancing at the provisions of this bill and the provision for the organization of an army by enlistment for three years under the act of 1916, which is 175,000 men——

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Then the bill provides for 500,000 men—or, rather, putting the two enlistments together, 500,000. Now, if you leave out the second provision, what would be the effect of that?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The effect would be that we would endeavor to raise a standing army of something like 175,000 men. That would be provided for under the Hay bill, and the organization of that army would be in conformity with the act of June 3, 1916.

Mr. GARNER. Now, can the gentleman tell us exactly how many troops would be in the Regular Army after the Army was demobilized from war strength?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The Hay bill—that is, the existing law for the Regular Army—contemplates in peace times an organization of about 175,000 men, and in time of war it is provided that those units shall be expanded to war strength, which would provide something like 250,000 men.

Mr. GARNER. Then, for instance, four months after peace is declared by the proclamation of the President all troops go out except certain who are obligated to serve under their enlistment in the Regular Army. Now, how many troops will there be——

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. We were told something like 40,000 or 50,000 would remain.

Mr. GARNER. So we have got this kind of a state of affairs, that you can leave out the provision of this bill, as referred to the last provision, and when you demobilize the Army four months after the proclamation of peace we would have between 40,000 and 50,000 men in the Regular Army. Then you would have under the standing law authorization for the enlistment up to 175,000 men?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Not under the present law. The present law by special act provides that enlistments since the declaration of war should be for the period of the war only. Now, we ought, in my judgment, to enact a law that would provide for reenlistments as contained in the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], for three years, so as to enable them to raise a standing army of the full number provided for under existing law.

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman. Now, let me get this pretty well in my mind. If you demobilize the Army after four months' period there would then remain between 40,000 and 50,000 in the Regular Army?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Unless we have some legislation.

Mr. GARNER. If some legislation is not had at that time, would not they still have authority to go on and enlist men up to the 175,000?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. But when peace is declared these men are immediately discharged.

Mr. GARNER. After their discharge when you have no legislation, has not the War Department authority under the Hay Act to enlist men up to 175,000?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It was the statement of the best legal authority we could get in the Judge Advocate General's Office that that would not be the fact.

Mr. GARNER. Then we must have law?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. To authorize again three-year enlistments.

Mr. GARNER. If you will put the first provision in your bill and leave off the one-year enlistment, will you have authority to bring it up to the 175,000 men?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say to the gentleman I prepared an amendment, in face of the possibility that this proposed legislation might go out, to provide for the reenlistment of men voluntarily for the three-year period exactly as provided for in this act and to enact that into legislation and no more, so far as the Army for the United States is concerned.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will.

Mr. GARNER. I asked the gentleman from Alabama what this money was to be used for we propose to appropriate in this bill, whether it was to be used to pay troops in France, and he said it was. Now, from reading the bill, I have not had time to go through it thoroughly, but from a reading of this bill I do not believe you have authority to pay troops in France out of that money appropriated in this bill. They are to be paid now out of the lump sum, are they not?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. They are to be paid for out of the Army appropriations.

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will yield, they are paid out of the Army appropriation bill of last year, which provided for the pay of the Army. This bill likewise provides for the pay of the Army but for the fiscal year 1920. There is no such thing as a lump-sum appropriation. The military appropriation bill fixes the pay.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Of course.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman from California think that we carry sufficient appropriations in this bill to pay the Army in France and in this country for the fiscal year 1920?

Mr. KAHN. I think we do; yes. I think that was the purpose of the committee. It was certainly the purpose of every member of the committee to appropriate enough money to pay for the running of the Army for one year, and one year only. Of course, that is all we could do under the Constitution; but the committee apportioned the money in such a way that we believe the entire Army that will have to be carried until the end of the next fiscal year can be paid out of the appropriations carried in this bill.

Mr. GARNER. You do not anticipate any deficiencies, then, to take care of the Regular Army in 1920?

Mr. KAHN. I do not.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman from California and myself disagree on that proposition. I agree with him that so far as the committee is concerned it had in view exactly the state of affairs which he suggests. But I do insist that the estimates, so far as the committee is concerned, submitted to us by the department were not for the support of an army in France, but for an army in the United States.

Mr. GARNER. Your understanding is that the appropriation made in this bill is to take care of the army in the United States?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. If they can raise it.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. How would you pay the army in France if you did not pay it out of the money appropriated in this bill?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say to the gentleman that we appropriate to pay the Army, but I still insist it is my deliberate judgment that we have not enough pay in this bill to pay the Army the United States will have to pay in the next fiscal year.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the gentleman recognize the fact that the 500,000 men provided for in this bill are to be in France, or part of them are to be in France, during the next fiscal year?

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

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I would like to have the gentleman yield to me about 10 minutes more.

Mr. FIELDS. I yield to the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I wanted to touch upon another subject, and that is the constant criticism that has been made on this floor of the conduct of our Army and those in charge of our Army in France. Speeches and statements have been made here on this floor, I am sorry to say, that amount to assaults upon our Army in France, either directly or by innuendo and implication. The charge has been made that cliques and favoritism are rampant in our Army overseas. I know that when we began this war we were without experience in a conflict of the kind that confronted the world. We had no generals who had had training in great wars. The President of the United States, in his judgment, chose a man to lead the armies of the United States in Europe. I know that the President himself has stated that he realized that we had no commander who had ever fought a great battle; that it had to be a matter of judgment and trial and experiment who should be selected to lead. He chose the man that he believed, from all the reports brought to him, was the man best fitted to command our Army. He gave him absolute power, as a military commander, and sent him to France. He went there with a very small Army, for the first four or five months only a single division—a mere handful. That man was upon trial. We never had been able in former wars to choose a man as leader of our forces at the outset and have him prove by experience that we had chosen the right man at the first trial. There has not been a nation engaged in this war that was able at the beginning to choose as its commander a man that could stand the trial of the battle field, the one final test of a military commander, except the Government of the United States. Germany had the nephew of her former great marshal, von Moltke, as her first leader. He failed and died in disgrace. And then came Falkenhayn, and after him Hindenburg, and they were found wanting before the end, and finally Ludendorff was defeated and fled, a failure and a fugitive.

The British tried one commander after another, belted earls and titled lords, men of great position and reputation were placed at the head of that army. One after another they were removed from supreme command. They were tried in the balance and in the judgment of those in authority were found wanting. France tried one leader after another and they failed, and other men were put in their places. But the United States still has in command of her armies the man that our President chose when we commenced the conflict. Politics has always been rife in military matters in all of our prior wars. President Wilson has not permitted it to weaken or interfere with our great military effort in France. Gen. Pershing was one of the newest major generals in the Army. We sent the Chief of Staff and other generals who outranked him over there to judge of what he was doing. Congressmen visited the battle front, men of every station in life went there to view the work of the Army. And every returning visitor from general to private citizen has said that our Army was a marvel of efficiency and success.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman has reference to Gen. Pershing?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. There has been some discussion or doubt as to who has been responsible for the conduct of the war in France; that is to say, after the troops landed in France under whose jurisdiction and under whose organization, and who got up that organization, and who is responsible for the whole thing in France.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say that Gen. John J. Pershing, the commander in chief of the United States Army there, is responsible for it. And he has performed his duty in a way that has won the admiration of the world, so far as that is concerned. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Now, then, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY] was indicting the so-called "canning factory" in France. Gen. Pershing is responsible for that?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I do not think there was any "canning factory."

Mr. GARNER. That is what they termed it.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is the newspaper talk.

Mr. GARNER. The newspaper criticisms of the Army in France must finally go back to Gen. Pershing. Is not that true?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will come to that in a little while. I was saying that the Commander in Chief of the Army had to build up his Army from the ground up. Just as the President of the United States had to choose a commander in chief, Gen. Pershing had to choose his officers for important posts and try them out. Those men who are said to have been demoted, who have been referred to on the floor here, were largely men of the Regular Army. Gen. Edwards was referred to by the gentleman from Maine. In his speech the other day the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] put in the RECORD a statement from Gen. Edwards, which I consider a splendid definition of the proper procedure for officering an army in time of war. Gen. Edwards said:

> 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 no 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.

In my judgment politics and prejudice were eliminated from the conduct of our Army in France, but I am afraid we are trying to get politics and prejudice into it over here.

Mr. GARNER. One word. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] said the troops were paid in France out of the appropriations made. They were paid out of a lump sum.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I hope the gentleman will permit me to finish, and then I will let the gentleman occupy his time. I know that there is a great disposition to find fault and to bring in here stories of those who feel that they have been neglected or badly treated and abused, and things of that sort. But war is a terrible thing, and the men who have conducted our war over there have fought it out upon principles that are supremely American and with officers along the lines laid down in Gen. Edwards's statement. Unless those intrusted with authority had had the courage to displace men who ought to have been retired, not only because of lack of courage but for physical reasons and temperamental reasons in some cases, we would have failed, and Gen. Pershing would have failed as a military commander if he had not exercised that authority.

I know, gentlemen, how easy it is for men to complain after the war is over.

If I had a boy who was in that Army, I would not like to hear him complain because in the terrible struggle the bread cart or pay wagon had not always kept up with the advancing lines. Even if he had marched through mud and mire to get to the battle field, marched at night because it was death to the command to march in the daytime, and after struggling through mud and mire over the most difficult terrain in all the battle line in France, and finally at midnight had to take his place on the firing line, and at daybreak next morning to go over the top, I would not want him to come back and tell me how bad the road was or short the food or irregular the pay. I would expect him to say, "It was war; it was hell." "Hell"; and repeat, as Sherman said. "The German Army was tough meat, but we ate 'em up; we ate 'em alive." [Applause.]

When Gen. Pershing landed in France it was asserted that this Hun army was invincible. That was the statement we heard constantly repeated when Gen. Pershing went over there. He said from the first the Hun army was not invincible, it could be defeated, and he proved it. He was the first commander of a great army who said frankly, "I am ready to take orders from the commander in chief of the allied army." When he said to Gen. Foch, "I offer for your command all my forces, and will go wherever you tell me to go," he brought unity of command to the allied army, and that brought final victory to our forces. [Applause.]

They told us the Hindenburg line could not be broken through. But finally, in July, we got about 200,000 men on the fighting line, and those men showed at Chateau-Thierry and all the way to the Ainse what our Army could do in battle. Finally, at St. Mihiel, in September, we got an American Army at the front, commanded and directed throughout by Americans, and in three days' time they wiped out that St. Mihiel salient, which had stood there for four years like a Gibraltar in the German lines, and sent the Germans back to their last line of defense. [Applause.]

It was said we could not get through the Hindenburg line or get around it, because one flank of it rested on Switzerland and the other on the North Sea. The cry was, "You will have to fly over it or dig under it; you can not go through." But these men who are being criticized here did not go under it or over it or around it, but they went through it. [Applause.] For four years the German military engineers had been building an impregnable fortress in the Argonne Forest, but in four weeks' fighting our army under Pershing destroyed that obstacle. They went right through, and they won the war. [Applause.]

It is true a lot of brave men died, but in my opinion we saved a million lives by winning this war a year sooner than it would have been won without an American Army under the leadership of our great commander. [Applause.]

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

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will not want all the five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I only want time enough to say that I think the American Army in this war has achieved the most marvelous record of any army that ever fought in the whole tide of time. American democracy was on trial in the final arbitrament of nations. The world was the stage. All the other combatants staggered and halted in the fray. America's Army under Pershing made good, and democracy triumphed. I was somewhat humiliated the other day when I read in the public press an item to the effect that a Member of Congress had sent a cablegram to Gen. Pershing and had said in that message something like this: "Some one in Washington is criticizing you," and asking him if he did not want to have an investigation made into his conduct of the war. That would be like investigating the Duke of Wellington after the Battle of Waterloo or Bonaparte following Austerlitz.

The American people are mighty proud of our Army in France and the matchless record it has made. I do not think America wants her honor and her flag to be besmirched now by having investigations or complaints made for political or partisan advantage, and I protest against it here to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska yields back his unused time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, during the statement made by the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico [Mr. DAVILA] I was moved to make a few suggestions. I now ask the privilege to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune in another chamber to have something to do with the organic law of Porto Rico. That organic law was drawn by the late Senator from Ohio, Mr. Foraker, whom I considered one of the greatest constructive law writers or statesmen I ever knew, and I pay that tribute to him now.

What we have seen here to-day is what will always occur when we try to make other people happy our way. In our declaration of war against Spain we promised to take no territory. We passed what was known as the Teller amendment, which promised to give Cuba back to the inhabitants of that island, and we have kept our word. If anyone had thought of the geography of the case, the sentiment of the people was such that they would have amended that declaration to include the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, or any other territory then under the dominion of the Spanish Government. But after that hundred-day war the desire for a carpetbag government overcame our people. I had the pleasure of sitting for four hours and hearing the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the insular cases, and the absolute absurdity of the situation shown here to-day is the natural result of the decision of that court, which ruled that a ship going to Porto Rico with a cargo was foreign trade and coming back with the same cargo was coastwise. To-day in Porto Rico you have this situation: You have passed a law making Porto Ricans American citizens. You remember the decision in the insular cases, which held that the Constitution did not follow the flag. The eloquent statement made here to-day by Mr. DAVILA, if I understood him aright, and I think I did, for I have heard something of it before, was that when a man who is a citizen of the United States residing in Porto Rico applies for a writ of

habeas corpus, demanding either a jury trial or indictment by a grand jury, the Supreme Court of the United States, following its old decision that the Constitution was not there, denies to the Porto Rican, who is made an American citizen by your act of Congress, the right of trial by jury or any other of the guaranties of the Constitution of the United States.

I simply wish to say in passing that this is what many of us suspected would come. Whenever we start in the wrong way, whenever we start to establish a government over people without their consent, something of this kind is likely to happen. It is said that Porto Rico accepted our sovereignty. Yes; so she did, at the point of a gun. But if you will read the statement that Gen. Miles made on the day the people of Porto Rico accepted our sovereignty you will see that therein was the same promise that was made by Dewey to the Philippine Islanders when we took possession of that country.

I simply rose to say that this man who speaks for the Porto Rican government to-day [Mr. DAVILA] asks simple justice. He says they love this country. They have raised armies, they have volunteered to fight in this war. He wants his Porto Rico to take a place as one of the stars of our flag; but if you are going to refuse him that you ought at least to give to the people of the island a star of their own. You have made them citizens, subject to the laws and hard rules of the common law and to the rules of the act of Congress, and by the same act you have deprived them of those natural, inalienable rights guaranteed by the Constitution. I simply rose to voice myself in favor of letting the people there say. The gentleman from Porto Rico [Mr. DAVILA] says, "Give us statehood; give us something that will bring to us the Constitution, or else give us independence." I think it is the duty of this Congress to consider that seriously and grant what he asks, and let us get away from this doctrine that we can make other people happy our way. We have tried it in the Philippine Islands. We have spent millions and billions of dollars. We have lost 25,000 lives. To the poor, downtrodden Filipinos we said: "We want you to be happy. Go to our church. Let us have a carpetbag government over there and appoint people in the United States to go over there and govern you." It has cost us, as I tell you, 25,000 lives; and it is due to the President of the United States to say that in all these years that he has been President he has made an effort to relieve the American people of the stain of political slavery and to relieve those people over there, so they may have a chance to govern themselves.

The Porto Rican case is before you. The gentleman from Porto Rico [Mr. DAVILA] has made his statement. His native language is different from ours. All this state of affairs shows the danger and the absurdity and the wickedness, if you please, of trying to make people happy our way. Why, Cuba offered us every man, every woman and child. The moment we declared war against Germany the little people of Cuba jumped to their feet and said: "Here, Uncle Sam, here are our men, here is our money, here is everything we have; and we declare war with you against Germany."

The Cubans are our friends. We have not made them friends by keeping a gun at their heads or a knife at their throats. We want the friendship of the Porto Ricans, and if there is anything in self-determination we ought to let them say or, at least, be consulted about what sort or form of government they shall have.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I want to say to the gentleman that besides the 25,000 lives it has cost, the estimate of the money cost of the Philippines to the United States three years ago was a thousand millions of dollars.

Mr. MASON. Yes; I have no doubt of it. Three years ago we had spent at least a thousand million dollars, all because we are trying to imitate royalty. We want to govern somebody, we want to have something to say about somebody else's government. Some of us wanted to change their religion. We wanted to give them the Christian religion with 13-inch guns. Some of us wanted to fix it over there so that they would wear the same kind of clothes that we wore. Some wanted one thing and some another, but everybody in this country who wanted to do something over there expected to get something for nothing.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Does the gentleman recall the fact that this country had to send its Army into Cuba to make the people down there behave themselves, at an expense to the taxpayers of this country of $7,000,000?

Mr. MASON. Yes; I do remember that; but it was not the Cubans that were making the trouble. We spent more time and more money when we drove the Spaniards out of Cuba than we did after that, and in my humble opinion that revolution and that trouble came about because of this ungodly desire to hold onto the government of Cuba. We passed in the Senate what was known as the Platt amendment, so that the moment they had a little shindig of their own and began killing a few people, as we did in the Civil War, then we put our Constitution and our flag over them and went down there and took the burden. We made them put the Platt amendment into the constitution of Cuba, and if they had not had it there we would not have had to go back and subject ourselves to the cost and expense.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you again and again—I am getting a little old and perhaps garrulous—I want you to remember one thing: No question is ever settled until settled right. No man ever had a slave that was free himself. No nation can be republican, no nation can be a democracy, that has a carpetbag government traveling around the world governing people in foreign lands by force without their consent. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to call the attention of the committee to the service of the Forty-second—the "Rainbow"—Division in the war.

THE "RAINBOW" DIVISION.

On Wednesday, August 15, 1917, the War Department announced the formation of a new division, to be composed of National Guard units from 27 States and to be designated the Forty-second Division. This division has since become known as the "Rainbow" Division, so named by Gen. MacArthur because it was made up of units from all parts of the country.

It was composed as follows:

Forty-second Divisional Headquarters Troop, formerly First Separate Troop, Louisiana Cavalry.

Eighty-third Infantry Brigade, composed of the One hundred and sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment, formerly the Sixty-Ninth New York Infantry; the One hundred and sixty-sixth Infantry Regiment, formerly the Fourth Ohio Infantry; and the One hundred and fiftieth Machine Gun Battalion, formerly Companies E, F, and G, Second Wisconsin Infantry.

Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade, composed of the One hundred and sixty-seventh Infantry Regiment, formerly the Fourth Alabama Infantry; the One hundred and sixty-eighth Infantry Regiment, formerly the Third Iowa Infantry; and the One hundred and fifty-first Machine Gun Battalion, formerly Companies B, C, and F, Second Georgia Infantry.

Sixty-seventh Field Artillery Brigade, composed of the One hundred and forty-ninth Field Artillery Regiment, formerly the First Illinois Field Artillery; the One hundred and fiftieth Field Artillery Regiment, formerly the First Indiana Field Artillery; the One hundred and fifty-first Field Artillery Regiment, formerly the First Minnesota Field Artillery; and the One hundred and seventeenth Trench Mortar Battery, formerly the Third and Fourth Maryland Coast Artillery Corps.

One hunded and forty-ninth Machine Gun Battalion, formerly the Third Battalion, Fourth Pennsylvania Infantry.

One hundred and seventeenth Engineer Regiment, formerly the Separate Battalion, South Carolina Engineers; Separate Battalion, California Engineers.

One hundred and seventeenth Field Signal Battalion, formerly the First Battalion, Missouri Signal Corps.

One hundred and seventeenth Headquarters and Military Police, formerly the First and Second Virginia Coast Artillery Corps.

One hundred and seventeenth Ammunition Train, formerly the First Kansas Ammunition Train.

One hundred and seventeenth Supply Train, formerly the Texas Supply Train.

One hundred and seventeenth Engineer Train, formerly the North Carolina Engineer Train.

One hundred and seventeenth Sanitary Train, formerly the First Michigan Ambulance Company, First New Jersey Ambulance Company, First Tennessee Ambulance Company, and First Oklahoma Ambulance Company; also the First District of Columbia Field Hospital, First Nebraska Field Hospital, First Oregon Field Hospital, and First Colorado Field Hospital.

When our troops were ordered to France Gen. Pershing took with him such Regular Army units as could most quickly be made ready for service. The first National Guard division organized was the "Rainbow" Division. It was made up of those units of the National Guard throughout the country which were considered best fitted for immediate service.

The mobilization of the division was completed September 13, 1917, at Camp Mills, Mineola, Long Island, near New York City. The division embarked the latter part of October, spent one week in England, and began active training in France November 30, 1917. It arrived at its training stations in the worst part of the

winter and suffered much from the cold and the constant rains. Their food was poor, and most of the men were billeted in barns and outbuildings. They were sent to the Lorraine sector February 17, 1918.

ON THE LORRAINE FRONT.

The troops of the "Rainbow" Division were sent into the trenches February 24, four days after their arrival. The "Rainbow" was the first American division, either Regular or National Guard, to be intrusted with a divisional sector. The sector assigned to them was located east of Toul, west of Strassburg, and near Luneville. It was supposed to be a quiet sector, and so it was until the Germans knew the Americans occupied it. When once that fact was known, activity was apparent behind the German lines. They began to concentrate their artillery, and from about 150 shells a day they increased their bombardment of the American position to over a thousand. Their airplanes flew almost continuously over the American trenches dropping bombs.

It was not long before the Americans who had been vigilant on the defensive became aggressive in attack. Our artillery was soon able to send as many shells into the enemy lines as the enemy gave us. Maj. Frederick Palmer says that raids became almost as popular as going to a country post office for the mail.

"They're telling us," said a New York Irishman, "that when we're out in front and we're attacked to fall back on points of resistance. Well, orders is orders, I suppose, but to my mind that's only another word for retreating, and I don't believe in it." That was the fighting spirit early developed by the division. Always to take the aggressive when possible and never to retreat when attacked was their inclination and became their habit. "I reckon folks will learn, seh, that we aint scairt of the Hun," said a man from the Georgia mountains. And so folks did learn. Beginning with this early service in the Lorraine, the boys of the "Rainbow" Division never were "scairt of the Hun," but again and again on his own ground and behind his own defenses compelled him to yield and surrender. They have the enviable record of never yielding and never retreating throughout their entire service. [Applause.]

On the night of March 4 the Germans made an attack in force on the American lines. The attack was preceded by an unusually heavy bombardment, which almost destroyed the American trenches. The burden of the attack was borne by the One hundred and sixty-eighth (Iowa) Infantry. Three assaults were made, two frontal and one flank. All three were repulsed. Twice the Germans gained a footing in the American trenches, and were only driven out by determined counterattacks and the fiercest hand-to-hand fighting. Almost surrounded at one time, the Americans had no thought of surrender, and extricated themselves without leaving a single prisoner in German hands. The toll of dead and wounded, however, was large.

An official report of the French officer under whose command the Americans were then operating stated that the Americans showed a rare quality of courage, self-possession, and calm bravery. Clemenceau, the French Premier, was enthusiastic in his praise. Asked if he thought the Americans in action were promising, he said: "Promising? That's no word. They have arrived. Why, the Americans were attacked on three sides. They were told to stand, and they did. The result was the Germans retired with heavy loss and their attack failed." [Applause.]

IN THE CHAMPAGNE.

Early in July the Forty-second Division was sent to the Champagne front to assist the French in holding back the impending German offensive toward Paris. They went at the request of the French staff officers, who had heard of their fighting qualities as shown in the Lorraine sector.

In order to reach the Champagne front a forced march of 125 miles was required. The division traversed that distance in five days, marching steadily with full kits from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m., with stops of only 10 minutes each hour.

The boys of the "Rainbow" had little rest after their long march. The division was needed at once, and at once took its place. As an indication of their trustworthiness, the French command gave orders that if the Germans broke through that sector, Gen. Menoher, commanding the Forty-second, was to take command of both American and French Infantry and Artillery. To realize their responsibility it should be remembered that in each of the great offensives preceding this one the Germans had overwhelmed nearly all the front-line positions attacked. In the March offensive against Amiens the Germans swept every first-line defense of both French and English and practically annihilated the Fifth British Army. These considerations did not for a moment depress the boys of the Forty-second. They had met the boche in the Lorraine, and they were not afraid of him in the Champagne.

The attack started July 14 along a 50-mile front. The preliminary bombardment was up to this time the heaviest of the war. The Germans had been concentrating their artillery for weeks, and shelled the French and American trenches for 10 hours with their heaviest guns and gas. Their aeroplanes swept low, dropping bombs and raking the Americans with machine-gun fire. The bombardment was so fierce and overwhelming that the French and Americans lost heavily. Many were killed where they lay, and in places the trenches and dugouts were filled with the dead and wounded. All the artillery horses were killed. All supplies were destroyed. Many of the men were days without food.

After this terrific bombardment the Germans came over the top, confident and determined, in long, recurring waves. Part of the line gave way, but the men of the "Rainbow" Division held their positions without a break against repeated and desperate German attacks. One of our battalions broke six successive assaults with steady rifle and machine-gun fire. Throughout the whole battle there was no flinching among our men, no signs of disorder, only steady, determined, efficient fighting. Every officer and soldier seemed to realize his individual responsibility and did his part and took his chance without surprise and without complaint in the most trying of battle experiences.

The French, too, met the onset bravely and effectively, with the result that the German offensive in the Champagne was stopped, the triumphant march to Paris interrupted, and the anticipated victory turned into defeat.

There was no lack of appreciation by the French of the service rendered by the Americans in this battle.

On July 20 Gen. Naulin, the French officer in command of the corps to which was attached the Rainbow Division, issued a general order:

At the moment when the Forty-second American Division is on the point of leaving the Twenty-first Army Corps, I desire to express my keen satisfaction and my sincere thanks for the services which it has rendered under all conditions. By its valor, ardor, and its spirit, it very particularly distinguished itself on July 15–16 in the course of the great battle, when the Fourth Army broke the German offensive on the Champagne front. I am proud to have had it under my orders during this period. My prayers accompany it in the great struggle engaged in for the liberty of the world.

CHATEAU-THIERRY.

July 15, 1918, the Germans launched their fifth and evidently their most stupendous offensive. Ludendorff, having been disappointed in his Champagne attempt, confidently hoped that an offensive from the Chateau-Thierry salient, which was within sight and hearing of Paris, would reach the French capital and end the war with a glorious victory. So, with 70 divisions, massed for an overwhelming assault, such as had crushed the English in the Amiens drive, on a 60-mile battle line, the advance was ordered.

The Chateau-Thierry salient may be described as an obtuse triangle, with Soissons and Rheims as the extremes of its base line and Chateau-Thierry at its apex nearest Paris. The side lines and the point of the triangle constituted the battle front. The line was held principally by the French and American forces. To force the attack the Germans had to cross the Marne. On July 15 a crack German guard division, with about 15,000 men, forced a passage near Mezy and advanced against the Americans. The Americans not only held their ground, but almost immediately counterattacked and practically destroyed the guard division. Other attacks failed. Everywhere the French and American lines held. For three days the Germans continued their vain endeavors to break through. In the meantime Foch had determined on a counteroffensive all along the line. Masses of troops were rushed to the front; the reserves were hurried to position; guns, tanks, ammunition, and supplies were gathered. And then, on July 18, the counteroffensive was launched. In front, at Chateau-Thierry, on both sides of the triangle from Chateau-Thierry to Rheims and from Chateau-Thierry to Soissons, the French and American attacked suddenly, vigorously, triumphantly.

All the world knows the story of the proud days that followed. From victory to victory the allies pressed on. From the Marne to the Ourcq, and from the Ourcq to the Vesle the Germans retreated, stubbornly fighting. The Americans covered themselves with imperishable glory by their magnificent daring, endurance, and heroic bravery. Gen. Pershing in his official report says that every available American division was hurried to the front. The First and Second Divisions were directed to make the first attack. They did so, he says, against stubborn resistance, but with constant success. That but half tells the story. The American Regulars and the Marines which composed these divisions fought that battle in a way that won the praise of all the allied commanders and excited the wonder of the Germans, who thought the Americans untrained and weak.

On the 24th the "Rainbow" Division was sent in to relieve the Twenty-sixth. Gen. Pershing in his report says that it fought its way through the Foret de Fere and cleared the way to the River Ourcq. Gen. March said, "In eight days of battle the Forty-second Division has forced a passage of the Ourcq, taken prisoners from six divisions, met, routed, and decimated a crack division of the Prussian Guards, a Bavarian division, and one other division, and driven back the enemy's lines for 16 kilometers." After crossing the Ourcq, the Forty-second pressed on, captured Hill 212, Seringes, Nesles, and Sergy, and, with the Thirty-second Division, drove the Germans to the Vesle.

The announcement by the American Chief of Staff that the "Rainbow" Division had met and defeated the celebrated Fourth Division of the Prussian Guards, never before vanquished in battle, sent a thrill of pride to every loyal American. [Applause.]

When Foch not only stopped the well-conceived offensive of the Germans, which was to be their final and triumphant march on Paris, but immediately launched a counteroffensive with what seemed reckless abandon against the German lines he met with unexpected success. By hard and well-directed fighting he forced the Germans to retire on both sides of the triangle. So rapidly was the assault pressed that the Germans, in danger of a disastrous rout, called into action their strongest reserves. It was then that the Germans determined to send the invincible Prussian Guards against the advance. It was the "Rainbow" Division that met this onset of the Prussian Guards.

The Prussian Guards have been regarded by the German people for more than a century as the ideal of the German Army. They have been considered not only as the best that German military science could produce but vastly superior to any other military organization in the world. They were not called into action except upon extraordinary occasions. They were sent against the Americans to demolish them, to put them to shame, to show their lack of training and incompetency. The Fourth, their crack division, the best of the best, hitherto undefeated, led the attack. The Guards charged in due form, but, strange to say, the Americans refused to yield. The "Rainbow" boys met the onset calmly and resolutely, and with such a well-directed storm of rifle and machine-gun fire that it blinded and stunned and finally stopped the fierce assault. And then the boys from Camp Creek and Smoky Hollow countercharged with a swiftness and ferocity that took the breath away from the wondering Guards. The Americans simply went through the front ranks of the invincible Guards as if it were an everyday diversion. Time and again the officers of the Guards rallied the men to stop the American onset. Some say four times, some six, and others say nine times the Guards tried to re-form and reattack, but the Americans pressed them so hard they could not find a chance. The Americans pressed them not only in front but soon attacked their flanks. The Germans were in danger of being surrounded, and so there was nothing to do but retreat in order to prevent surrender or destruction. This they did, with difficulty preserving their organization. It was a glorious victory for the Forty-second Division. [Applause.] It was a terrible defeat for the Guards. It gave confidence to the allies all along the line. It did more to break the morale of the Germans than any other single action.

It was the One hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment, the old Third Iowa, that bore the brunt of the Guards' assault. This regiment was in action continuously from July 24 to August 3. During eight days of fighting the regiment lost 1,400 officers and men—50 per cent of its combatant strength. It should be remembered that this loss occurred not in a desperate last stand but in almost continual offensive, and that the advance was not retarded for a single hour by the terrible losses incurred.

Gen. Pershing reports that the Forty-second, with the Thirty-second, drove the Germans from the Ourcq to the Vesle, where the work of reducing the Chateau-Thierry salient was finished. It was the turning point of the war. Foch ordered advances on every front. The German armies were placed permanently on the defensive. They were continuously attacked and continuously defeated. Steadily and stubbornly they retreated until they reached the Rhine and sued for peace. The American officers had urged this policy. When it was adopted they took their part of the work not only with resolute determination but with joyous exultation. [Applause.]

It was a glorious part. It brought not only fame and honor to our boys in the field, but it gave our country a stronger place and added dignity in the eyes of the world. Back of our resources and wealth, back of our liberty and justice, back of our idealism and humanity, it has become known that there are 20,000,000 of fighting men as brave, as strong, as efficient as any the world has ever known, ready and willing and even glad to give their lives, if need be, for their country and a righteous cause.

ST. MIHIEL.

The next major service assigned to the Rainbow Division was in the St. Mihiel offensive. The weeks that followed the victory of Chateau-Thierry were devoted by Gen. Pershing to the organization of the first independent American army. The organization took place in the Lorraine, and to that point came units of American soldiers from all parts of France. As soon as the gaps in the ranks of the veteran divisions were filled and a short period of intensive training was given to the new men, these forces were quietly sent to their places on the St. Mihiel front.

The St. Mihiel salient was located southeast of Verdun and southwest of Metz. It, like the Chateau-Thierry salient, was a triangle, with its base line extending from Fresnes to Pont-a-Mousson and its side lines meeting in a point at St. Mihiel. It was a spearhead thrust at the heart of France. Four years ago the Germans had taken and thereafter held this triangular, daggerlike indentation. The French attempted its reduction, but failed. In the preceding July Gen. Pershing made up his mind to reduce this salient as his first offensive. It was a remarkably strong position. One side of the triangle was a range of hills and the other was a river. The interior plain was dominated by Mont Sec, from which every approach was visible. Mont Sec itself was a natural fortress strongly fortified, whose capture seemed almost impossible. Every hill along the line was fortified. Every depression, every grove, every natural obstacle concealed machine-gun nests.

September 12, at 5 a. m., after four hours of artillery preparation, the seven divisions which were to take part in the initial assault advanced. Preceded by a rolling barrage, followed by wire cutters, they went through the successive entanglements, through the front lines and support trenches in irresistible waves, exactly as scheduled. Breaking down all defenses, out of the fog which hung heavy over the battle field, suddenly appeared the Americans advancing with bayonets fixed. The Germans in most cases either surrendered or ran. The advance of the Americans was so well conceived, their attack so fierce and determined, and their concentrations so overwhelming that resistance was brief and futile. In two days' time the salient was cleared and a new line formed straight across the base of the triangle. With small loss a commanding position was taken, an important line of communication was cleared, and Verdun was no longer in danger. Sixteen thousand prisoners, 443 big guns, and a great quantity of material fell into our hands.

The signal success of the Americans in their first major offensive was of great importance. The allies gained confidence in the strength and effectiveness of the American forces, and the Germans learned that a new and dangerous enemy had been added to her foes. As a piece of military strategy it was not surpassed by any operation of the war. It worked out exactly as planned. Successful resistance was prevented, and a complete victory won with comparatively slight losses. It won Gen. Pershing instant recognition as an able and successful commander, and the conduct of our troops was lavishly praised.

The "Rainbow" Division again distinguished itself. The One hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment led the attack and pushed the Germans back 12 kilometers the first day. A Red Cross helper writing of the battle says:

> I am glad to tell you that I saw the first all-American engagement. And your boys from Iowa fought like hell-cats, hand to hand, hour after hour. All that we like to think of for American manhood and fighting was offered here to be blazoned most gloriously in our history. You Iowans may hold your head higher than ever in pride for your particular part of the country. Nothing can be said too highly of the courage, the fortitude, and the determination of those children.

ARGONNE.

Gen. Pershing in his official report says that on the day after taking the St. Mihiel salient the Americans were on their way to the area between the Meuse River and the Argonne Forest. It was supposed that after the Americans had won the St. Mihiel victory they would be sent to reduce the fortifications of Metz. But Marshal Foch assigned them a more important and difficult task. If the Argonne Forest could be cleared and Sedan captured the vital railroad communication of the German armies in southern Belgium and northern France would be cut. The Germans must hold that line open or the withdrawal of their forces would be seriously imperiled. The German general staff was fully aware of the consequences of allied success on this line and was prepared to throw all its power into its defense.

Gen. Pershing divides the Argonne offensive into three phases. The first began on September 26 when the Americans mastered all the first-line defenses in a brilliant and determined general attack. On that day, and on the 27th and 28th, they penetrated the enemy's lines from 3 to 7 miles over a 20-mile front. By this initial operation, carried out with splendid spirit, Gen. Pershing took 10,000 prisoners and forced the Germans out of a large part of their strongly protected positions. From September 28 until October 4 was largely occupied in clearing the lower portion of the Argonne Forest.

The second phase of the offensive began October 1, when the attack was renewed all along the 20-mile front. In the meantime the Germans had strongly reinforced their lines with fresh divisions of their best troops. Every advance of the Americans was met with determined resistance, and strong counterattacks were constant. Every foot of ground was gained only after the most desperate fighting. By October 10 the forest was cleared, and on the 16th the Americans occupied the important strategic point of Grand Pré, on the northern bank of the Aire, at the vertex of the Argonne Forest. The way was now cleared for the last phase of the offensive which involved the capture of Sedan and the closing of the German lines of communication.

In all, 40 divisions had been used by the Germans in this battle. The Americans employed 21 of their divisions, several of which were engaged for the first time. Gen. Pershing in his report of these said, "They soon became equal to the best." The veteran divisions remained for days in the line, and eight were in the line twice. Among these was the Forty-second.

The Argonne Forest, which gives its name to this great battle, is about 50 kilometers long and about 10 kilometers wide. It had been in possession of the Germans since their first grand offensive in 1914. In 1915 the French made a desperate endeavor to retake it but failed. Since then the Germans had used the forest as a rest area for their war-worn troops. They had fortified it with every imaginable defense. It was crossed and recrossed with hundreds of miles of barbed wire, which ran in every direction and often was hidden in the underbrush. Every depression and cover was a machine-gun nest. The trenches were made of cement, with connecting trenches in many cases entirely covered. The underground works were on a most elaborate scale. Officers' quarters were subterranean palaces, with electric lights and hotel ranges. One of these had an elaborate brownstone front, with carved pillars at its opening on a hillside. It contained 10 large rooms lined with concrete, with wooden floors, mahogany furniture, electric lights, and almost every modern convenience.

It is impossible to exaggerate the difficulty of clearing the Argonne Forest. The Germans had thousands of steel and concrete positions bristling with machine guns. They had devised funnel-shaped traps, in which an enemy force advancing would be unconsciously concentrated until it could be exterminated with a storm of machine-gun fire from concealed emplacements.

In order to understand what fighting in the Argonne meant it should be remembered that for days the struggle continued night and day. During much of the time a cold rain was falling. The men were without shelter of any kind. If they snatched a few minutes' sleep they must lie in the mud. Nothing but utter exhaustion would allow sleep under such circumstances. In the forest they fought in inky darkness against concealed foes who were behind the strongest defenses. All the time the Germans were shelling heavily the American advance and pouring gas into all the valleys and depressions. The Americans were frequently compelled to sling their rifles and use their pliers to cut the wire entanglements that crossed their advance. This made them targets, even in the darkness, for enemy machine-gun fire.

It takes stout hearts and iron nerves to stand the strain of such fighting for days and nights in succession. But it was over this kind of terrain, it was with this kind of fighting, that the Americans tore their way through the Argonne forest. It is not too much to say that never in the history of warfare, ancient or modern, was greater courage, endurance, and individual heroism shown than in this great battle of the Argonne.

The Prussians were dismayed and astounded at the way the National Guardsmen, drawn from all parts of the United States only a year before, stormed through the most cunningly devised defenses Gen. von Marwitz could establish. They threaded the forests, scaled the wooded hills, smothered innumerable machine-gun nests, traversed guarded ravines, faced rifle fire and artillery barrages, and waded through the darkness in the rain through flooded areas of mud and water.

In the Argonne offensive one of the most difficult tasks assigned the Forty-second Division was the taking of Hill 288. The "Rainbow" boys first attacked it frontally. The attack failed. They made four more vain attempts to storm the hill. One rainy morning the One hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment, supported by a New York regiment, started on the sixth trial. With our artillery dropping shells on the crest, and the New York troops spreading machine-gun fire on all the slopes, the Iowa boys just at daylight, in a cold rain, again started up the hill. Through the barbed wire, over the trenches, driving the gunners from hundreds of machine-gun nests, they went at the Germans with bayonets set. There were hundreds of hand-to-hand conflicts on the slippery hillside. Captains fell and lieutenants commanded; lieutenants fell and sergeants commanded. One platoon, without even a corporal to command, was led over the top by a private. For six hours the struggle continued before the top was reached and the victory won. When the Germans surrendered there were only 107 left, the rest had been killed or wounded.

One of the finest operations of the American forces in France was the capture of the Cote de Chatillon. The hill is 820 feet high, and dominated a vital part of the Kreimhilde-Stellung defense. It was very strongly fortified and was defended with stubborn bravery. For 40 hours the Forty-second Division, which led the assault, was exposed to a merciless rain of lead poured into them from every side. Slowly the Americans crawled to the objective. Day and night they pressed forward and upward. Through barbed-wire entanglements, in the face of the massed fire of machine guns, in a veritable hail of shrapnel and hand grenades, they made their way to the top. Then out came the bayonet, and with a wild hurrah the Americans fell upon the enemy and captured the position. It was a hard fight and a glorious victory. These instances but illustrate the character of the great battle of the Argonne.

SEDAN.

When Ludendorff retired from his defeats in the battles of Chateau-Thierry and St. Mihiel he took his position at the Hindenburg line in what was considered by military experts to be the most intricate and elaborate system of defensive works ever fashioned by the ingenuity of man. The Germans believed them impregnable. The allied commanders considered their reduction the work of months at least.

What was known as the Hindenburg line was rather a zone than a line. In some places it was 12 miles across. When possible it followed the line of natural defenses, in some places following the lines of rivers and canals, in others the lines of hills and ridges. The defenses were of every kind known to military science, with trenches, big-gun emplacements, every point of vantage utilized, and every conceivable defensive position strengthened. These defenses had been four years in building, and they were commanded by nearly 2,000,000 trained soldiers under the command of able and confident commanders.

In six weeks time the Ludendorff forces were defeated, the Hindenburg line was broken, the invincible Germans in ignominious flight, and their impregnable defenses utterly destroyed. This great movement began September 26 when Marshal Foch opened the Battle of the Argonne by throwing the American troops against the German defenses, with a final objective at Sedan. For this third and last phase of the offensive Gen. Pershing made careful preparation. Tired troops were rested, fresh divisions were brought forward. The artillery was strengthened.

November 1 the final advance was ordered. It became almost from the start an impetuous onslaught which overwhelmed every effort at resistance. Sweeping northward our troops did not pause until on the 6th they reached the outskirts of Sedan, 25 miles from their line of departure. It had been a continuous battle, which lasted 40 days. Against the best German troops, fighting with desperation to save their line of withdrawal, the Americans had won a continuous series of brilliant victories. They took in all over 26,000 prisoners, over 500 big guns, and, best of all, the control of the Metz-Meziers-Sedan railroad lines. But these results were not achieved without severe losses. It is not known what the total casualties of this last offensive were, but the losses of the Rainbow Division alone were 50 per cent of their effectives.

In the advance on Sedan Pershing's forces traversed 40 kilometers in six days. From November 1 to November 6 the Germans threw 22 divisions against the Americans, but failed to check their progress. It was the First Regulars and the Forty-second—"Rainbow"—Divisions which led the advance and made the final whirlwind dash into Sedan. The Germans planned to make a final stand at Sedan, the place of their great and culminating victory in the war of 1870, but the rapidity of the American advance and the vigor and valor of our forces spread despair among their men and they were compelled to evacuate their defenses at the last almost without a struggle.

It was fitting that this great and final victory should occur on the spot where Germany inflicted upon France the humiliating defeat of 1870. When Pershing with the vanguard of American troops stood at the grave of Lafayette he uttered those simple and memorable words which the world will never let die: "Lafayette, we are here." It was dramatic and perfect justice that the Americans, having come, should have been able to drive the German forces in disaster and disgrace from the historic battle field that marked the French defeat. To them the surrender of their Emperor at Sedan was not a mere defeat; it was the downfall of France. What more fitting than that the Americans should return Sedan for Yorktown? If it had not been for the French, there would have been no Yorktown. If it had not been for the Americans, there would have been no second Sedan.

The German high command laughed derisively when the Americans began to send troops across the seas. Such a movement of untrained men could not count in the titanic struggle they were waging. But the Americans in a few brief months turned their derision into disaster, and on the historic battle field of Sedan wiped out for all time the French defeat of 1870 and transformed it into a triumph so glorious that Frenchmen now can think of Sedan with exultation instead of shame.

It was a graceful courtesy that the Americans extended in yielding the honor of entering and occupying Sedan to a French division which had followed closely the American advance. So the flag of France displaced the German emblem and was hoisted over that historic spot, never again to be lowered by German command.

THE "RAINBOW" BOYS.

In all the important battles in which the Americans were engaged, from Lorraine to Sedan, the "Rainbow" Division bore a conspicuous part. From February 17, 1918, to November 11, when the armistice was signed, a period of about 225 days, the "Rainbow" boys were under fire 180 days. During this period it fought 26 enemy divisions, including 3 divisions of the Prussian Guards. It took prisoners from 19 German divisions.

It was considered a shock division almost from the start, and was in the front lines longer than any other American division, either Regular or National Guard. It was the first division to which was assigned an entire divisional sector, which it held for 13 weeks. At Chateau-Thierry it distinguished itself in first crossing the Ourcq River, capturing Sergy, Seringes, Villiers, Sen-Fere, and Nesles. It drove the Germans from the Ourcq to the Vesle, penetrating the enemy's territory 15 kilometers. In the Argonne offensive it was assigned the most difficult tasks, piercing the Kriemhilde-Stellung line, taking the Cote de Chatillon, and Hill No. 288. In this operation it penetrated enemy territory 19 kilometers, took over 1,200 prisoners, and recovered 150 square miles of French territory.

During all this time the Rainbow Division was allowed very few and very brief periods of rest. Even after the severe fighting of July and August they were denied even the expected seven days' leave. Very little complaint was made. Their baggage was far behind. Even the commissariat was distanced. Food was irregular and often insufficient and poor in quality. Yet through it all the spirit of the officers and men was superb. They were proud that they were selected for such distinguished service, proud that they were trusted with such responsibility, and so, whatever the conditions and whatever the task assigned, they were always ardently brave and always calmly resourceful. [Applause.]

They were proud of their name, the "Rainbow" Division. This is shown in a boy's letter to his parents describing an incident in the battle of the Argonne. He said:

> We had been fighting so long we were all worn out and could hardly take another step. Our officers said we must take the next hill. We started, but our officers, seeing how tired we were, ordered us to lie down and rest. Just then the clouds broke and a beautiful rainbow appeared in the sky. That was enough. The "Rainbow" boys forgot they were tired out, jumped to their feet with a hurrah, and, needless to say, took the hill with a rush.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

One of the four Infantry regiments of the Rainbow Division was formerly the Third Iowa National Guard. It was originally recruited from southern Iowa. During the Spanish-American War it served as the Fifty-first Iowa Infantry from May 30, 1898, until November 2, 1899, and saw active service in the Philippines. After its return and demobilization the regiment was reorganized as the Fifty-fifth Iowa Infantry, and in July, 1915, it again reorganized as the Third Infantry, Iowa National Guard. Under this designation it served on the Mexican border in 1916.

When the order was issued for the mobilization of the National Guard, the Third Iowa assembled at Camp Dodge, where it was mustered into the service as the One hundred and sixty-eighth Infantry. There were about 2,000 men in the original Third, and the regiment was raised to war strength by 1,600 additions, mostly from the First and Second Iowa National Guard. It left Des Moines September 10, and arrived at Camp Mills September 13, where it became part of the Forty-second Division, and soon thereafter embarked for France.

The service of the One hundred and sixty-eighth, with the Forty-second Division, has been given with the account of the service of the Rainbow Division, of which they were a part. Particular reference to this regiment is justified because of its long and exceptional service. Wherever the fighting was hardest and the responsibility greatest, there the One hundred and sixty-eighth was sent. In whatever duty assigned, no matter what dangers were incident or what losses were inevitable, the regiment braved the dangers and suffered the losses without complaint and without protest. Throughout their service they endured privations and faced the hazards of battle with indomitable fortitude and invincible heroism. Col. Bennett, who commanded them for a long period of their service, said of them:

> I only wish that I had the power to express the character of the work performed by these men. It is wonderful and deserving of the highest praise.

Col. Brown, of the General Staff, said:

> They are a wonderful fighting unit.

Capt. Leon Bentz, of the French staff, said:

> It is the best regiment I ever saw. The men are too brave, too courageous.

Gen. Douglas McArthur, chief of staff, said:

> You can tell the people of Iowa that this regiment ranks 100 per cent.

The war correspondents repeatedly singled it out for special praise. As one of them reported:

> The One hundred and Sixty-eighth has earned the name of the most famous American regiment. The French cheer whenever it passes. The English have marked it for special praise. The Australians, the Canadians, and other colonials, considered the best fighters among the allies, claim the troops of the One hundred and Sixty-eighth as their brothers.

A Member of Congress, visiting the battle fronts, said that the names of two American regiments were on every tongue, that of the One hundred and sixty-eighth Iowa and the One hundred and sixty-seventh Alabama. These two regiments constituted the Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade and fought side by side throughout almost their entire service. Representing the blue and the gray, together they gave new luster to the flag they carried on many a foreign battle field, and vied in affectionate rivalry in service and devotion to each other and to the cause for which they fought.

While praise and honors and citations and decorations were lavishly given the gallant boys who composed the One hundred and sixty-eighth, they were dearly bought. In the fight of July 25 to obtain the heights beyond the Ourcq River, Maj. Stanley's battalion lost over 50 per cent of its enlisted men and 20 out of 26 officers. In the Chateau-Thierry drive Maj. Worthington's battalion, in 10 days' fighting, was reduced from 1,200 to 200 men. In one action Company A lost all its commissioned officers and went out in command of a sergeant. In another engagement Company F went into action with 250 men and 6 officers. The next morning only 27 men and 1 officer reported for duty. Of the 250 men of Company M who went into the service, only 27 escaped. Two hundred and twenty-three were killed or wounded. Such was the price paid to vindicate American rights and save the civilization of the world.

THE FINAL VICTORY.

The coming of the Americans to the help of the allies was most opportune. It was their good fortune to take the field as an effective force when it was possible to change defeats into victories, and when after a short but mighty struggle the German terror collapsed. Until July 18, 1918, the allies had been fighting on the defensive, many times with their backs against the wall. Against the most powerful armies ever mobilized for war they had for four years maintained a desperate and heroic struggle. In the campaigns of 1918 it was the purpose of Ludendorff by mighty offensives to crush the English or French, or both, and break through to the Channel, to Paris, or to both, and thus end the war.

Ludendorff's first blow on March 21 was one of the most perfectly planned, as it was one of the most skillfully executed offensives ever launched. It came very nearly being a complete success. The British were everywhere overcome by the superior forces massed in overwhelming numbers against them. Fighting desperately, they were forced continuously to retire but still heroically held their line from breaking, although sometimes near extermination. At the end of a week of deadly fighting the victorious German army was compelled to stop from sheer exhaustion; it had outrun its guns, its ammunition, and its supplies. There was just time for the French to arrive,

and almost miraculously the drive was stopped within sight of Paris.

In April following Ludendorff sprung another offensive, this time in the north, against the British. Again he was successful at first, and for a time it seemed as if he would have an open road to the Channel. But again the French arrived in time to support the British, and again the German assault was repulsed.

Ludendorff knew the Americans were coming in ever-increasing numbers and realized that he must win a decisive victory soon or give up hope of final success. For more than a month he gathered his forces for another attack. The new offensive was again a brilliant success. It swept over Chemin des Dames, across the Vesle, over the Ourcq, and reached the Marne at Chateau-Thierry, again within sight of Paris. The thunder of the German guns was heard daily in the French capital, and raids by airplanes and shells from long-range guns were nightly terrorizing the Parisians. But again the Germans had outrun their support and supplies, and were compelled to stop to strengthen their communications and concentrate their forces.

Within the Chateau-Thierry sector Ludendorff prepared for his final offensive against Paris. He believed, as did most of the German staff, that from so near an attacking point another great drive would certainly reach Paris. The offensive was launched July 15. But it never made progress. It was stopped almost as soon as it began, and three days later Marshal Foch ordered the counteroffensive which ended the war.

As a military achievement this counteroffensive has never been surpassed in all the history of warfare. Within four months a victorious army of nearly two millions of trained veterans, commanded by the most thoroughly trained officers in the world, behind the strongest defenses military science and experience could construct, was defeated and compelled to sue for peace. No military commander ever achieved a greater victory or ever conceived and carried out a more wonderful strategic campaign. Marshal Foch organized and ordered his counteroffensive not alone on the Marne but over a battle front 300 miles long. Along this far-flung battle line he sent the soldiers of 10 nations to their places, each command being given the work it could best accomplish, with coordination everywhere. So perfect were these plans, so complete the accomplishment, that the result was the greatest and most decisive victory history records.

September 26 Foch threw Pershing and Gouraud against the Germans near the south end of the line. September 27 he threw the Belgians and Plumer's British Army against the Germans on the north end of the line. On the same day he threw Horne's and Byng's British Armies against the Germans on the Scheldt Canal. September 30 he launched Berthelot's French Army against the Germans between the Vesle and the Aisne.

As a result, the whole German line from the Channel to the Meuse was set rocking. Both at the north and south ends the German lines were completely broken. So vigorous were these offensives all along the line that for the first time in all the four years of warfare the Germans were unable to concentrate against so many attacks. From November 1 the story is one of swift and relentless pursuit: By the British down the valley of the Sambre, through Maubeuge, until they reached Mons; by the French to and across the Belgian frontier; by the Americans through the Argonne to Sedan. With the British at Mons, the Americans and French at Sedan, and the Belgians nearing Antwerp and Brussels, there was nothing for the Germans to do but to sue for peace.

We in America have a just right to be proud of our part in this great struggle and this great victory. While neither in point of time of service nor in numbers was our contribution so great as that of other nations, ours was the final reenforcement which, flung in the decisive campaigns, brought final success. If our boys came late, they came in time. If their numbers were not so great, they brought to the war-wearied veterans who held the line that vigor, that intrepid spirit, that indomitable energy which demanded victory and would not be denied, which put new life into the long line from the Channel to the Alps, which stirred it to a new enthusiasm and a new hope, which changed four years of defensive to four months of offensive warfare, and thus brought victory swift and sure.

In this proud and high achievement the Forty-second, the Rainbow Division, bore a conspicuous part, and for its service and its sacrifice merits and will receive both the praise and honor of the world and the gratitude and love of the Nation under whose flag it served so well. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the first thing that attracts my attention regarding the bill now under consideration is the statement in the report that the estimate originally as submitted by the department was $1,916,905,572.16.

The revised estimate by the department reduced that over $700,000. The reported bill carries $1,117,289,488.56, being a very substantial reduction from the amount at first requested. I surmise it rarely happens that a committee finds it necessary to raise departments' estimates.

Ever since I have been a Member of this House we have been indulging in appropriations in large sums. I have tried to form some standard by which I might comprehend what a billion means, that I might get some conception of the total that we have appropriated. From the present moment backward in the calendar of time to the hour of the Nativity there have been 1,008,608,400 minutes; from this fact we get some sort of a standard enabling us to realize what a billion is. This bill provides that we increase our indebtedness $1 per minute from the dawn of the Christian era until the present time.

I do not know what the sum total of all our appropriations and indebtedness amount to. I have been unable to ascertain it. I have asked many, I have sought information, I have heard the questions asked upon the floor of this House, and I have got no satisfactory answer. I have been told that with what we have incurred and what is now in sight it will aggregate $57,000,000,000. If that be true, it means that we have gone in debt $57 a minute since Christ was born, and if we keep on at that rate the taxpayers, before they can be relieved of their burdens, will have to wait until His second coming. [Laughter.] In any event the total is staggering in amount and paralyzing in effect.

In Pennsylvania, wherever a railroad crosses a highway at grade, there is a sign placed which reads, "Stop, look, and listen." I think it would be a good idea if a similar sign were put in front of the Speaker's desk, so that we might observe its mandatory admonition.

I did not, however, rise to comment or discuss this bill so much as some other matters which have been called to my attention, and to present some facts in the nature of cumulative evidence of a lamentable condition of affairs. I think while we are now appropriating money, spending our time in doing it, we might devote a little of our efforts to seeing that the money we have already appropriated reaches the people for whom it is intended.

Presumably every Member of this House has received a score or more of complaints relating to the nonpayment of money long overdue to men in the service and of allotments and allowances provided and intended for the monthly and needed relief of their dependents.

The total of such complaints must aggregate a very large number, and when they are given publicity on the floor of this House and in other ways there occasionally follows soon thereafter a statement from high official sources that there is not any foundation in fact for them; that the conditions of deferred payments and nonpayments do not exist. You know and I know that they do.

A circular issued by the department having these matters in charge, and entitled "What the United States Government does for its fighting men and their families," in describing the same contains this statement:

> By this system of allotments and allowances the enlisted man and the Government together make provision for the loved ones left behind.

And, again, commenting on the measure providing for allotments, allowances, compensation, and insurance, it is set forth that this system—

> safeguards the families left behind and by its broad and generous provisions it takes from war its chief terror—fear for the future.

Beautiful in sentiment, disappointing in results, though accurate in statement, for in truth a great many of these "loved ones" have been left behind, though in destitute circumstances.

And the men in service are disheartened, broken in spirit, justly indignant over the treatment of themselves and their families. What will be the attitude of mind of the returning soldier toward the lawmakers, toward those who have in charge the administrative duties of the law which we have enacted, toward the Government, and the administration? It will not be in praise of what we have done, but in bitter condemnation of failure to intelligently, expeditiously, and patriotically execute the law and apply its provisions as intended.

A few illustrations of different kinds will be enough for the present.

I have been trying since last June to secure relief in one particular instance. Under date of June 21, 1918, I received a letter in part as follows:

> I have been advised to write you in regards to my allotment. My husband left here on October 7, 1917, for Camp Lee, Va., and in November made out allotment papers for me to receive half of his pay

and the Government was to pay me $15 a month also, and it is now June 21, 1918, and as yet have not even heard from the Government and have written Washington several times with no reply, and I have been ill since the 10th of February and, of course, have no parents or anyone that I could turn to for help, and my husband is now in France in reserve camp at the front, so won't you please look this up for me as I have my hospital bill and doctor to pay, also rent and gas.

Again, under date of September 21, 1918, this woman writes as follows:

I am sincerely sorry that I have to keep writing you, in fact I think it annoys you, but I have written so many times to the Treasury Department without even getting an answer. If I were not ill I would not bother, but, Mr. CLARK, picture a woman ill for eight long months with her husband in France. I haven't anyone I could go to until I get better. You must remember I am all alone. My milkman quit leaving milk, my grocer has refused to send down any more groceries as I owe him $47.50. And, oh, God, it is so hard. I have tried to work and worked two weeks and have been confined to my bed for a week, at that rate I won't be able to hold a position nowhere. * * *

So, Mr. CLARK, won't you please try and have them do something for me. If they doubt my statement as to illness they can write my doctor.

Again, under date of October 10, 1918:

Pardon me, Mr. CLARK, for annoying you again, but it seems that writing to the War Risk Department they don't seem to pay much attention and this is one more favor that I am going to ask of you. Mr. CLARK, will you tell them that the allotment is due me from November, 1917, as it was then that my husband had made out allotment papers.

Again, under date of October 29, 1918—

Why is it that I have to go through all this red tape before I can get what allotment is due me? The papers I had registered a week ago are what they asked me to send; now they write and say they must hear from the commanding officer of my husband's company—as if they doubted my statement. Now, perhaps, I haven't any patience left, but I have been ill a long time, and when you are alone it is so much harder to get along. And I feel this way—I have done my part, and have done it willingly. * * *

You see, Mr. CLARK, I am utterly discouraged, and I must have the help that is due me. So, thanking you for past favors and thanking you again * * *

P. S.—Mr. CLARK, I can send a statement from my doctor that I am not able to work, but I am trying hard to.

Again, under date of December 21, 1918—

Each time that I write I always say it will be the last, because I know just how it is to be annoyed with other people's troubles; but each time that I write the War Risk Insurance in regard to my allotment they take forever and a day to answer. But I am without money and can not even get trusted, as I owe a grocery account, and I will not ask anyone for 12 cents to buy bread with. Now, I am without money and haven't either coffee or bread in the house, so will await a reply by the first of the week; then whatever I see fit to do with myself will do so. I know, Mr. CLARK, it is not using common sense to write this way, but I am utterly discouraged and can not help it. The War Risk has not even kept its word and sent me $30 a month, as it has promised to.

Again, under date of January 29, 1919—

In reply will state as yet I have not received my check, and the gas company has shut off my gas. They did this yesterday, and I am without fuel or food. I am not begging anyone for anything. * * * I gave up everything I had in this world, and then in return what do I get? I haven't heard from [my husband]—it's four months and two weeks. Now, Mr. CLARK, please advise me what to do; you know, it is not very nice staying in a cold house without food.

Again, under date of February 4, 1919:

Won't you ask them to find out where my husband is, as it is four months and three weeks to-day since I last head from him?

In 16 months this woman has received only three payments of $30 each.

This is a fine picture for us to view. A woman without parents; no wealthy relatives; alone in her home, cheerless, cold, penniless, destitute, sick, and hungry, and she the wife of a soldier in the service overseas.

Here is another case of a soldier leaving for overseas service in the early part of September last. He made an allotment to his mother of $15, but she has not received anything; and according to the last communication, which arrived at his home on December 24, 1918, he had not received any pay since he entered the service. This young man contributed to the support of his father and mother, when he was at home, $50 per month. They have not received a dollar from the Government. I saw this man's parents, who stated the facts to me.

Another case of one who went into the service July 15, 1917; did his part in France; was wounded seven times, and had a rib taken away. He has not received any money from the Government since April. This is not an imaginary case. I saw the man myself and heard the story from his own lips.

I have a complaint of another kind. A letter written by a soldier to his mother, whom I know, is in part as follows:

Send me some of my money. I haven't got paid for December yet, and I haven't told you that I buy my meals all the time or I would starve to death. I don't believe some of these "wops" around here could live on the meals that we get.

Last Friday we had fried (rotten) fish for dinner. Nobody would take it, and made soup out of it for supper; and everybody took it and threw it away so we wouldn't get it some other way again. It has been that way ever since we came here.

And yet there is given $100,000,000 to the alleged hungry of other foreign nationalities.

Under date of February 6, 1919, I received a letter from the mother of a lieutenant in Siberia, who inclosed a field-service post card from her son, who says that he has not received any mail, and I am requested to find out the proper address.

The post card reads as follows:

VLADIVOSTOK, 1-8-19.

Am well—feeling fine—don't worry.

Am in the hospital—sick—slightly wounded—seriously wounded—am now recovering rapidly.

Have—have not—received mail from you.

(Signed) ——— ———.

(Draw a line through any of the above not applicable. All field-service post cards with unauthorized additions or changes will be destroyed.)

This is all that is given on a small postal card made for the use of soldiers in the United States Army and sent from Siberia by a lieutenant in the service to his mother, who has sent him several important business letters which he has not received.

I have drawn a line through parts of the card, as he did.

The name I have, for obvious reasons, omitted.

I am acquainted with a young woman from the city of Erie who is doing her part in one of the hospitals in New York. She has written a letter descriptive of her work and the conditions there existing. It has appeared in the public press. I quote briefly:

Many of the boys can not write, so we do it for them. If they want to send telegram and have no money, the Red Cross pays for them. I am going to write to some of the girls at home and ask them if they will send small stamp books to the boys who are down and out, as many of them haven't had pay for five or six months, and haven't a cent to their names. I already have loads of letters to mail that are not stamped.

And yet the Post Office Department is on a paying basis. Daily we hear the praises of those boys, but that does not give them their overdue pay.

Not long since I personally visited a hospital not very far from the city of Washington and I conversed with a number of men there, and I learned that they had not received their pay for some months, although the day before I was there they had signed some papers by which they were to receive from the Government casualty pay of $7.50 per month, or amounts approximating this.

It would seem to the ordinary person that the basis upon which this casualty pay could be made would be sufficient to warrant the payment in full of all that was their just dues.

Such illustrations as these arouse our indignation, and I think that we could spend a little of our time most profitably and patriotically to do that which we ought to do. I understand from a gentleman, Mr. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, who addressed this House a few days ago, that he felt the same way, and that he made inquiries to see how many bills had been introduced for this purpose. He found 15 of them. If there are 15 bills of this nature resting in the committees it is time some of them were brought into the House, and those who are responsible for introducing legislation of that kind and bringing it before this House ought, in my opinion, to take action at once to relieve the conditions, of which I have many complaints. [Applause.]

From all that I gather from various sources and from what has been presented upon the floor of the House immediate relief is imperative. The families of our soldiers are fed, in many instances, with broken promises, and we are binding up the wounds of our boys with red tape. It is high time that the slumbering resentment and indignation of the membership of this House expressed itself in some constructive and mandatory legislation which will eliminate chaos and substitute system for confusion worse confounded. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER].

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to discuss some features of the bill, but some of the data that I had hoped to get by this time I have not acquired, so instead thereof I am going to take a few minutes of the time allotted to me to get into the RECORD a brief that I prepared three or four weeks ago and have been carrying in my pocket ever since, on the right of public officials to receive gifts from foreign governments. The thing that prompted me to look up this question was an inquiry from one of my constitutents, based upon a news item similar to the one which appeared in the Washington Post here on Sunday, December 29, 1918. The news item is vouched for by the Associated Pess and is headed "King sends Wilson fine set of books as birthday gift." It is dated London, December 28, and states that President Wilson celebrated that day, his

sixty-second birthday, by a round of social activities, and that King George presented him with a magnificent set of books, and at the same time gave gifts to every member of the President's official party. Dispatches following that also gave out the news that the President accepted gifts given to him by other potentates and high dignitaries, including the Pope. The constitutional provision on that is very plain. It is so clear that any man who runs may read. The wayfaring man, even though he be a President or other high official, can not err therein. It is the eighth paragraph of the ninth section of Article I, and reads as follows:

No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States.

The second clause, to which I wish especially to call attention, is the provision:

And no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.

That was incorporated in the Constitution by the fathers who made up the constitutional convention, and it was no passing whim of the framers of the Constitution, because this provision appeared in the Articles of Confederation substantially as we find it in the Constitution. Mr. Pinckney, a member of that convention, moved the adoption of this provision as a part of the Constitution and it was carried unanimously after full understanding of its importance, and the reason that he urged therefor was the necessity of preserving foreign ministers and other officers of the United States independent of external influence. Now, for a public official to accept a present from any king, prince, or foreign State is not only a violation of the Constitution, but is in violation of an act of Congress passed in 1881, two sections of which I will incorporate in my remarks. Section 2 of the act provides:

That no decoration or other thing, the acceptance of which is authorized by this act, and no decoration heretofore accepted, or which may hereafter be accepted, by consent of Congress by any officer of the United States from any foreign Government shall be publicly shown or exposed upon the person of the officer so receiving the same.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. For a question.

Mr. LONDON. I understand the custom is that a gift that is received by the President from a foreign power is deposited in the State Department and is turned over to him when he becomes a private citizen. I understand that is how they have been getting around that constitutional provision.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Well, I do not know what the custom is—and here let me state that I never heard of a President violating this constitutional provision before—but the law is that no person while holding a public office can in any wise receive a gift from any prince, king, or foreign State, and the statute here provides that the officials can not take the gift and then come to Congress and ask Congress to give consent.

Section 3 provides:

That hereafter any present, decoration, or other thing which shall be conferred or presented by any foreign government to any officer of the United States—civil, naval, or military—shall be tendered through the Department of State and not to the individual in person; but such present, decoration, or other thing shall not be delivered by the Department of State unless so authorized by act of Congress.

As a matter of fact, Congress has in but very few cases acted favorably in giving consent to permit a public official to accept a gift or decoration since 1881.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. RAKER. Has the section of the Constitution to which the gentleman referred and the act—has either of them been violated lately, within the last six months? If so, who is the one who violated it?

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman is listening, and I have not tried to cover up anything. I read this press dispatch from London, where the President of the United States accepted a gift from the King of England. I wish to inform the gentleman that I am not discussing this violation of the Constitution and statutes because of any hostility to the President or to embarrass him in his work over there, because I am in sympathy with nearly everything he says he is trying to accomplish. This is a domestic question, not a foreign one.

Mr. RAKER. Is it the gentleman's contention that the provision of the Constitution stated has been violated by the President?

Mr. RAMSEYER. If the press dispatch quoted by me is correct, there is no question about the violation.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I will.

Mr. RANDALL. Does the gentleman disapprove of the decorations some foreign governments have conferred upon the officers and soldiers of our Army for distinguished services?

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is not the question that I am undertaking to discuss. The thing I am attempting to show in this brief to which I have referred is the constitutional and statutory provisions touching the President's right to accept gifts from kings and princes, and also what construction the constitutional writers and Attorneys General have placed upon this constitutional provision and what Secretaries of State had to say in regard thereto in their instructions and letters to ministers of ours serving abroad.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Always to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. As to the soldiers and sailors, the gentleman will recall that in our military appropriation bill of 1918 express authority was given those to accept such decorations.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Of course, I am not objecting to that. I am not discussing that; that does not come in this discussion at all.

Mr. CURRY of California. If the gentleman will yield further, the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman's contention is that the President has a right to accept any gift from any foreign State or king or prince because of that statutory provision? I doubt that very much. I do not recall the provisions of that statute now——

Mr. CURRY of California. Pershing, who is chief——

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will yield, the law provides that they may receive military decorations and that our Government in return can present to the officers and men of the foreign armies that cooperated with us such military decorations as we bestow.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I thank the gentleman for that explanation and that distinction. The costly gifts the President has been accepting can hardly be classed as military decorations.

Mr. McCULLOCH. If the gentleman will permit, I think the gentleman has opened up a very interesting question, and I would like to ask whether his brief brings up the question whether or not Congress has the power under the constitutional provision to enact such a law.

Mr. MASON. Yes; the Constitution provides for that.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Of course, Congress can give consent in particular cases. Now, the question the gentleman asks is whether Congress can by general statute give consent before the king, prince, or foreign state offers the gift?

Mr. McCULLOCH. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I have not investigated that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Does the gentleman want more time?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. KAHN. I yield five minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am very much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman has not answered my question. Have you made the distinction?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I did not look into that phase of it. I thought I had answered you.

Mr. McCULLOCH. It is a very interesting subject.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I shall print this brief in the extension of my remarks. It will give you the opinions of constitutional writers, United States Attorneys General, and Secretaries of State. Rawle in his work, "The Constitution," gives a reason for this constitutional inhibition. He says:

There can not be too much jealousy in respect to foreign influence. The treasures of Persia were successfully distributed in Athens; and it is now known that in England a profligate prince and many of his venal courtiers were bribed into measures injurious to the nation by the gold of Louis XIV.

And Watson, another eminent writer on the Constitution, cites the incident when Prince Henry of Prussia was here in 1902 and presented portraits to the Navy Department and to the academies at West Point and Annapolis, and also gave photographs to military and civil officers of the United States. These, however, according to the statute of 1881, were deposited with the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of State wrote a letter to the Attorney General and asked him whether it would be proper to turn these gifts over to the institutions and officers for whom the gifts were intended by Prince Henry. The Attorney General held that the Navy Department and these academies could accept them, because the constitutional inhibition did not apply to governmental institutions. But he said, as to these photographs, that the military and civil officers could not receive them. And the Attorney General calls special attention to the fact that Prince Henry of Prussia was only a titular prince and was not a sovereign exercising any power whatever. The Constitution prohibits the acceptance of a gift of any kind whatever from any prince or any king or any foreign State.

This same ruling has been followed by Attorney General Wickersham as applying to a postal clerk of the fourth class down here in the Post Office Department, whom the Emperor of Germany offered to decorate, and the question was raised in the case of a field assistant here in the Geological Survey, a Prof. Udden, who was decorated by the King of Sweden with the Order of the Knighthood of the North Star. In this case Prof. Udden was permitted to receive the decoration, for the simple reason that he was only working for the Geological Survey by the day, had never taken an oath of office, and was not held to be an officer of the United States.

Wharton on International Law goes on and discusses the same proposition. And I want to tell you, also, besides the Attorneys General of the United States always construing these provisions strictly, so also has every Secretary of State. I here call your attention to a quotation from John Quincy Adams, in his instructions, as Secretary of State, to our minister in Great Britain, where he says:

It is expected by the President that every offer of such present which may in future be made to any public minister or other officer of this Government abroad will be respectfully but decisively declined.

Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State, writing to Mr. Cushing, who was at that time minister to China, said:

The Chinese are apt to speak of persons coming into the Empire from other nations as tribute bearers to the Emperor. This idea has been fostered, perhaps, by the costly parade embassies of England. All ideas of this kind respecting your mission must, should they arise, be immediately met by a declaration, not made ostentatiously or in a manner reproachful toward others, that you are no tribute bearer; that your Government pays tribute to none and expects tribute from none; and that even as to presents your Government neither makes nor accepts presents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

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

Mr. RAMSEYER. The following is the brief to which I have referred:

PRESENTS TO PUBLIC OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Washington Post of Sunday, December 29, 1918, carried the following news item on the front page:

"KING SENDS WILSON FINE SET OF BOOKS AS BIRTHDAY GIFT.

[By the Associated Press.]

"LONDON, *December* 28.

"President Wilson celebrated to-day his sixty-second birthday by a round of official activities. King George presented him with a magnificent set of books, and at the same time gave gifts to every member of the President's official party."

This present from King George to President Wilson is in plain violation of Article I, section 9, paragraph 8, of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

"No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no person holding any office of trust or profit under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state."

The reference to this paragraph of the Constitution in Madison's Constitutional Convention is found in volume 2, pages 234 and 235, and is as follows:

"Mr. Pinckney urged the necessity of preserving foreign ministers and other officers of the United States independent of external influence and moved to insert after Article VII, section 7, the clause following: 'No person holding any office of profit or trust under the United States shall, without the consent of the legislature, accept any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state which passed nem: contrad:'"

The only comment made in Hamilton's Federalist on this paragraph is found on page 274, as follows:

"The prohibition with respect to titles of nobility is copied from the Articles of Confederation, and needs no comment."

Rawle, in his work, The Constitution, pages 119 and 120, makes the following comment:

"'No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States or by any individual State.' Of this there could have been but little danger. The independent spirit of republicans leads them to contemn the vanity of hereditary distinctions, but the residue of the clause is more important. 'No person holding any office of trust or profit under the United States shall, without the consent of Congress, accept any present, emolument, office, or title of any kind whatever from any king, prince, or foreign State.'

"There can not be too much jealousy in respect to foreign influence. The treasures of Persia were successfully distributed in Athens; and it is now known that in England a profligate prince and many of his venal courtiers were bribed into measures injurious to the nation by the gold of Louis XIV."

Story, in his work on Constitutional Law, section 1352, has this to say on the last part of this paragraph:

"The other clause, as to acceptance of any emolument, title, or office from foreign governments is founded in a just jealousy of foreign influence of every sort. * * * A patriot will not likely be seduced from his duties to his country by the acceptance of any title or present from a foreign power. * * * Still, however, the provision is highly important, as it puts out of the power of any officer of the Government to wear borrowed honors, which shall enhance his supposed importance abroad by a titular dignity at home."

Watson on the Constitution. Vol. I, page 760.

"When Prince Henry of Prussia visited the United States, in 1902, he made presents of portraits to the Navy Department and Military and Naval Academies, and of photographs to several civil and military officers of the United States. Prince Henry was not occupying a throne, but was a titular prince. The question was submitted by an officer of the Government to the Attorney General whether the constitutional prohibition prevented the acceptance of these presents. The Acting Attorney General held that, although Prince Henry was only a titular prince, an acceptance of a present from him would come within the prohibition; he also held that, as the Constitution forbids any person holding any office under the United States from accepting any present, emolument, office, or title, the prohibition did not apply to a department of the Government nor to governmental institutions. The opinion went further and held that even a simple remembrance of courtesy, which from motives of delicacy recognizes our policy, like the photographs in this case, falls under the inclusion of any present of any kind whatever."

See also 24, Op. A. G., 117–118. Acting Attorney General Henry M. Hoyt.

In 1909 the Secretary of State received an insignia of the third class of the Order of the Red Eagle, conferred by the German Emperor to deliver to a clerk of class 4 in the Post Office Department. Attorney General George W. Wickersham in an opinion held (27 Op. A. G., 219–21):

"That the Secretary of State would not be justified, without authority of Congress therefor, in delivering an insignia which had been conferred upon this officer of the United States by the German Emperor. The opinion is clear that a present can not be made to any officer of the United States, 'unless authority be first obtained by act of Congress.'"

In 1911 the question arose whether Prof. Udden, a field assistant in the United States Geological Survey, could accept from the King of Sweden the order of the Knighthood of the North Star, which that sovereign had conferred upon him, in view of Article I, section 9, paragraph 8 of the United States Constitution. Attorney General Wickersham (28 Op. A. G., 298) held that as his duties were not continuous, being employed by the day, only occasional work, and no oath of office was taken by him, "there is nothing in the Constitution or laws to prevent the acceptance by Prof. Udden of the order conferred upon him by the King of Sweden."

Wharton's International Law Digest, Volume I, has the following:

1. Daniel Webster, Secretary of State, to Mr. Cushing, May 8, 1843, pages 446–447:

"The Chinese are apt to speak of persons coming into the Empire from other nations as tribute bearers to the Emperor. This idea has been fostered perhaps by the costly parade embassies of England. All ideas of this kind respecting your mission must, should they arise, be immediately met by a declaration, not made ostentatiously or in a manner reproachful toward others, that you are no tribute bearer; that your Government pays tribute to none and expects tribute from none; and that even as to presents, your Government neither makes nor accepts presents."

2. J. Q. Adams, Secretary of State, to Mr. Rush, November 6, 1917, page 757:

"It is expected by the President that every offer of such present which may in future be made to any public minister or other officer of this Government abroad will be respectfully but decisively declined."

3. Mr. McLane, Secretary of State, circular, January 6, 1834, page 757:

"I am directed by the President to instruct the ministers, consuls, and other diplomatic and commercial agents of the United States that it is required of them that in future they will not, unless the consent of Congress shall have been previously obtained, accept, under any circumstances, presents of any kind whatever from any king, prince, or foreign State."

4. Other Secretaries of State give similar opinions on pages 758 and 759.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON].

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, for many years South Dakota has maintained a board of railroad commissioners. These commissioners are elected by the people, they are responsible to the people, and the people of our State have absolute confidence in their efficiency and integrity. These commissioners have for many years been instrumental in securing for the people of our State a reduction in freight, passenger, and express rates. Recently the Director General of Railroads promulgated a new schedule of express rates as applied to interstate shipments. This new schedule interferes with the intrastate express rates of my State. When this schedule was about to go into effect, the railroad commissioners of my State brought suit against the officials and sought to enjoin them from putting into effect this new schedule, which would interfere with the intrastate rates in South Dakota.

When the case came on for trial there appeared in a luxurious, specially equipped, private car three attorneys representing the Public Service Corporation, who sought to impress their argument on the court that these intrastate rates could be set aside. They thus interfered with the domestic affairs of our State. To show the extent that our people resented this interference in our internal affairs and the extravagance in the use of private cars, the legislature of the State, being in session, passed a resolution condemning the action of these paid attorneys, coming there under the circumstances in an equipped, luxurious car as a wanton waste of expenditure of public money, and condemned their activities in interfering with the affairs of our State.

As a part of my remarks, I desire to have read in my time the resolution so passed by the legislature.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the paper referred to will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

I, C. A. Burkhart, secretary of state, do hereby certify that the annexed concurrent resolution was duly passed by the sixteenth session of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, January 31, 1919.

[SEAL.] C. A. BURKHART,
Secretary of State.

Hon. C. A. BURKHART,
Secretary of State:

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the senate and concurred in by the house of representatives:

Concurrent resolution.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):

Whereas the Government of the United States as a war-emergency measure took over the control of several great public-service corporations, including the railroads and express companies of our country, and placed them in charge of a Director General of Railroads; and

Whereas our Government did at the same time urge upon our people the great necessity of saving and conserving in private and business affairs, and asked our people, even the widows and orphans, to save their mite to buy liberty bonds and war-saving stamps for the support of the Government and its different departments in its conduct of the war, including the railroads and express companies; and

Whereas our people have generously responded to every request made, and whereas it has now come to the attention of our people that three paid representatives of one of the said great public-service corporations have come to the city of Pierre in a luxuriously equipped private car at a great and unnecessary expense for the express purpose of opposing in our courts the action of our board of railroad commissioners wherein they are representing the interests of our people in seeking to prevent what appears to be an unwarranted, unlawful, and unjust raise in express rates, which are sought to be put into effect under the guise of Government control and with the apparent approval of the Director General of Railroads: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do condemn such unwarranted extravagance as unpatriotic, disloyal, and undemocratic, and that we do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such laws as will effectually and permanently protect the American people from unfair and extortionate rates, whether imposed upon them by private corporations owning and operating such public utilities or under Government management and control of the same, thereby rendering to the people that reasonable and efficient service to which they are rightfully entitled, free alike from unreasonable governmental control or from corporate or individual oppression.

For the Senate:

C. S. AMSDEN,
President pro tempore.
A. B. BLAKE,
Secretary.

For the House:

LEWIS BENSON,
Speaker.
WRIGHT TARBELL,
Chief Clerk.

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 28th day of January, A. D. 1919.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, on February 5 I made some remarks concerning conditions found at Newport News and vicinity and referred to corrals in which several thousand horses were kept. My remarks are found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5, commencing on page 2774. I append a communication received from R. E. Wood, brigadier general, United States Army, Director of Purchase and Storage, giving his version of these conditions. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed as an extension of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to have the matter indicated printed as an extension. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The communication referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
PURCHASE, STORAGE AND TRAFFIC DIVISION,
Washington, February 7, 1918.

Hon. CHARLES H. DILLON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I note your speech with reference to conditions at Newport News, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5.

While the majority of the matters you treated in this speech are not under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster Corps, the corrals and remount stations are. I am attaching, for your information, copy of reports from Col. Scott, inspector of the remount division.

To enable you to understand the situation it will be necessary to state that the remount station at Newport News was not intended to keep animals any length of time. It was used as an embarkation depot, pure and simple. Animals were brought there to be shipped to Europe and, as a rule, were held in the corrals only a few weeks. At the time of the armistice we were shipping fifteen to twenty thousand animals per month.

The corrals were all right during the dry season, but during the rainy season they were very muddy. At the same time, the sheds are well-drained and dry on the inside, and the animals have an opportunity to lie down.

Just as soon as the armistice was declared this department requested authority from the General Staff to sell off the surplus animals, and when authority was received we advertised and began the sales. As you will note in Col. Scott's report, there were 4,300 animals in the corrals at the time of your visit. Twenty-two hundred were sold on February 3, 4, and 5. These animals were in good condition, as evidenced by the prices realized at the sale, which were exceedingly good. Fifteen hundred are to be sold on the 26th, which will leave about 600 animals, for which there is stable room. In other words, no animals need be kept in corrals after February 26.

While it in no way concerns me, I noticed a statement in your speech which is incorrect, and I assume that you will be glad to have your attention called to it. I happen to know personally Capt. L. G. Thom, whom you mention as being assistant executive officer and a brother-in-law of one of the Ferguson brothers. Capt. Thom is in no way connected with the Fergusons. He married a sister of Col. Altstaetter.

Very truly, yours, R. E. WOOD,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Director of Purchase and Storage.

FEBRUARY 6, 1919.

From: Lieut. Col. Charles L. Scott, Q. M. C.
To: Remount Division, O. Dir. P. & S., room 1064, Munitions Building, Potomac Park.
Subject: Inspection of Animal Embarkation Depot, Newport News, Va., December, 1918.

1. I report that I inspected the animal embarkation depot, Newport News, Va., December 27, 28, 29, and 30. This depot was in excellent condition.

2. I especially investigated the shortage of water supply, which was due to exceptionally dry weather. Recent rains have relieved this situation; also, the British remount depot at this place has sold 5,000 animals, and 1,300 have been shipped out from this depot. This also will largely reduce the amount of water being used. There was no necessity for shipping animals out to be sold at other points, and I recommended that animals be held at Newport News and sold at that place during January, February, and March.

3. Due to rains the corrals were quite muddy, but cleaning was progressing daily, and the animals were being shifted from corral to corral, in order to provide as dry corrals as possible. The sheds in each corral were dry and provided suitable shelter for animals during the rain.

4. The animals were in excellent condition.

CHARLES L. SCOTT,
Lieutenant Colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

FEBRUARY 6, 1919.

From: Lieut. Col. Charles L. Scott, Quartermaster Corps.
To: Remount Division, Office Director of Purchase and Supplies, Room 1064, Munitions Building, Potomac Park.
Subject: Inspection of animal embarkation depot, Newport News, Va., February 5, 1919.

1. I submit the following report of inspection of the animal embarkation depot, Newport News, Va., which I made February 5, 1919:

(a) Due to recent rains, corrals are quite muddy. This is a temporary and not a permanent condition. There are 31 corrals in the depot proper, of which 21 have been in constant use. Two excellent corrals belonging to the veterinary hospital, which are located on high ground, were turned over to the depot and put in use on January 27, 1919. These corrals had been used for contagious diseases, and several careful disinfections of same had to be made in addition to removing much loose earth. These corrals were vacant during these disinfections, and they are the only good corrals that have not been constantly in use.

(b) The 10 corrals now in use are located on low and poorly drained ground, 6 of them being receiving corrals along the railroad track and unloading chutes.

(c) Of the 23 good corrals, 13 have been necessary to care for animals, thus leaving 10 vacant. These vacant corrals are then cleaned and drained and animals are shifted from the 13 corrals that are occupied as conditions may warrant.

(d) Sheds are located in all of these 23 corrals and provide ample shelter in bad weather for the animals in these corrals. They are generally well drained and dry on the inside.

(e) All feed and hay racks are located outside of sheds. The ground on each side of the hayracks in occupied corrals is graded and generally well drained and provides good footing for the animals while being fed.

(f) The animals of this depot are fat and in excellent condition. Four thousand two hundred and forty-three animals were at this depot on February 1. There are now only 72 animals receiving treatment in the hospital, 50 per cent of which are old cases of injuries received in shipment.

(g) Sale of 2,200 animals was conducted on February 3, 4, and 5, 1919. This leaves about 2,000 animals in the depot, 1,500 of which will be sold February 26, 1919. After this sale stable facilities will be available for all animals remaining at the depot.

(h) The general condition of this depot and the animals in it is very good, and from all reports and records it is better than it has ever been before under similar weather conditions.

CHARLES L. SCOTT.
Lieutenant Colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire in that time to have read by the Clerk a statement which is contained in a letter recently received by the parents, at Detroit, Mich., of a sergeant in the service of the United States with our troops in the north of Russia. There is a great interest in Michigan, as elsewhere, in the American expedition now in the north of Russia, and I think that, with other comments, this expression, which comes from one of the soldiers there, is of particular interest. I ask that the Clerk read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the clipping indicated will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The success of American armies in wars of the past has been attributed to the fact they always have had a complete knowledge and understanding of the principles for which they were fighting. This is not true of this expedition which has been sent to Russia. We are absolutely ignorant of any cause for being here, and we appeal to the folks at home to enlighten us.

If we are here to improve conditions of the Russians and to destroy bolshevism, which we must admit is a dangerous institution, does it not seem right the Russians should assist us? But they refuse to go to the front and fight with us.

We were actually compelled to turn our machine guns on a body of them the other day—Russians who had enlisted in the British Army and refused to obey commands to move to the front. Does it seem right we should sacrifice our lives for men who refuse to assist us in establishing peace in their own country?

We are here under English command. Every move we make is controlled by England, and we are living on English rations, which consist mostly of canned stew and tea. I don't want you to feel that being in doubt is lessening my fighting spirit any. I am ready at all times to give my life for my flag and my country. But all we ask is that you assist in convincing us that this expedition is justified.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back any time I may have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, here is a new one on me. There has been a good deal of complaint about the inability of boys in the Army to get their applications for discharge acted upon at all, and more complaint about their inability to get them acted upon favorably, where the conditions would all seem to indicate that the applications ought to be granted. But out at Fort Logan H. Roots, Ark., they have a new commanding officer, who turned back all the applications in effect and issued an order to the effect that all men applying for a discharge must have a letter from the Red Cross secretary stating the reason. In other words, it was not sufficient for these men to present applications and affidavits from doctors, dependents, employers, or anybody else, but, having done that, they must get the Red Cross secretary to give the reasons why, in the judgment of the Red Cross secretary, the man ought to be discharged.

I have here a very appealing letter, not addressed to me, from one of the men out there seeking to obtain from the Red Cross secretary at Chicago reasons why he should be discharged. Evidently that man has great faith in the Red Cross.

The War Department here does not seem to have as much faith in the judgment of the Red Cross. The War Department in its files here has information probably of thousands and thousands of cases where men have been killed or wounded in France; and yet if you ask for information from the Red Cross, which they have and will be glad to give, they are ordered by the War Department not to give the information unless the War Department has already given it out.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. DILLON. I will state that I had a communication from the War Department quite recently, referring me to the Red Cross to get information as to the death or whereabouts of one of the soldiers.

Mr. MANN. I understand they refer to the Red Cross, but the Red Cross is forbidden to give the information unless the War Department has previously given it out themselves. Upon receipt of the information by the War Department that a man has been killed or wounded or is missing, the Red Cross is notified, and is thereupon permitted to furnish the relatives of the soldiers with whatever additional information it has. For months the Red Cross here in Washington has been in possession of information about men in the Army, either wounded or dead, which they were not permitted by the War Department to give out to the families. One man in the Red Cross has had on his desk as many as 500 obituary letters sent by Red Cross representatives in the hospitals in France to the families of men who have died, sending the information through the Red Cross, and yet they were not permitted to forward these letters to the families or to give the information which they received from their own representatives.

That is true also of the wounded, although in some cases that rule has been violated by the Red Cross officials. I may say if I were running the Red Cross I would tell the War Department to go to sin with such an order. [Applause.] If I had the information from Red Cross representatives in hospitals in France that a soldier boy was lying there wounded, or that he had died and had been buried, I would give that information to the mother or the wife of the soldier over here, whether the War Department liked it or not. [Applause.]

Of course the claim of the War Department is that mistakes will occur; that men of the same name are in the Army, and that a man by the name of John Smith may be reported dead, but it is not the John Smith that some particular person is interested in. But I am inclined to think from the information we have had that the reports of the Red Cross upon the subject in the main are more reliable than the reports that come from the War Department.

I think it is a shame that the mother who has given her boy in France, where he has been killed, and who walks the floor, as many of them do, night after night in worry, can not receive the information which would at least allay that much of her sorrow and anxiety.

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

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Everybody agrees with the gentleman in his criticism, except as to the Red Cross. Now, the Red Cross people, as I understand it, are under the Army, and if they——

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

Mr. KAHN. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If they were to disobey these orders, it might mean that their opportunities for the great services they have rendered would be seriously curtailed by further order of the War Department.

Mr. MANN. That is their fear. I have no doubt, however, that if they disobeyed the order, the order would be revoked. The War Department can not defend such a thing before the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Absolutely not.

Mr. MANN. They can defend it in secret. As long as it is not known it can be enforced. If the war were to continue now, it would not be in force for 30 days longer.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That is true; but the Red Cross might be seriously handicapped in the great good it is doing if it should run counter to the orders of the War Department.

Mr. MANN. I am not disposed to criticize the Red Cross. If I appeared to do so, I did not mean to do it.

The other day I referred to a letter from Judge Walter I. McCoy, for many years a very valued and valuable Member of this House, now a justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, concerning the marking of the graves in France. I was glad to have some of the gentlemen here who had been over in France where the boys are buried state that those graves were well marked, and I hope that is true in all cases. Undoubtedly it was true of the cases referred to by the gentlemen here. This is what Justice McCoy says:

I am informed by one who has just returned from France, where he visited the grave of my son, that it is marked by a wooden cross on which was "written," without the Christian name or initials, simply "Lieut. McCoy, 39," and that the writing was nearly effaced by the rain. My informant tells me that he rewrote the name, so that it probably will not be obliterated, and wrote my name and address on the cross as an added precaution. * * *

Fearing the loss of identity, I endeavored several months ago through a French lady who was good enough to take an interest in the matter to have a simple stone placed on my son's grave, but she was told by the American Graves Registration Service that this would not be permitted.

Of course, I suppose Judge McCoy does not know anything further than the information furnished to him, which was that a friend of his visited the grave, found the name of his son written on the cross over the grave nearly effaced, and his friend rewrote it. A photograph just received by Judge McCoy, showing the grave of his son at Pierrefonds, discloses that the crosses marking the burial places of the American soldiers bear simply cards, which appear to be tacked upon the wood.

A great many of the boys who died abroad probably never will be brought home. They may be given a resting place there which will be entirely satisfactory and altogether suitable; but a great many will be brought home, and the relatives and friends of the boys whose remains are brought home do not want any unnecessary uncertainty as to the identity of the remains. It will be a crime if the Government of the United States has so marked those graves that the names will become obliterated, and if it becomes known in the country later that while they may bring a coffin with some remains to the mother or wife, no one knows whose remains are in the coffin.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have understood, though I can not vouch for the accuracy of it, because I have had it from no official source, that a diagram was kept of the burial plats, the graves being numbered upon that diagram, and the names set opposite the numbers. I say I can not vouch for it, because I have heard it from no official source.

Mr. MANN. That may be true. I will say this: I raise a great many flowers. One of the greatest difficulties in the world is to keep them properly labeled and to know what their names are. I have nearly a thousand different varieties of one sort of flower. There is a plat which shows where every one of them is planted. They are all labeled, most of them with two labels; and yet it is the hardest thing in the world

not to get them mixed up at times. But there ought to be no mixing up of these graves over there, not to any extent, at least. Everything ought to be done to give the people confidence that the identity of these dead soldiers is being preserved. We have given those people enough money. If they will use common sense, there will be no trouble about it at all. If they do not, God help them. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman from Nebraska use some of his time?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, the specter of Bolshevism is haunting the world. Everybody—statesman, business man, preacher, plutocrat, newspaper editor—keeps on warning the world that it is about to be destroyed by Bolshevism. A few days ago a preacher who brought to the pulpit the slang of the barroom orated against it. The chairman of the Republican congressional committee put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks which he had delivered before the Chamber of Commerce in Pittsburgh, in which he warned them of the danger of Bolshevism.

A meeting was held in Washington at which a number of Members of Congress were present. At the meeting two newspaper reporters said the things that they had been saying in the press for more than a year—things that had been published in a number of metropolitan papers, that had been published in a number of newspapers in England. One of the typical plutocratic sheets of America, the Washington Post, immediately proclaimed that the country was in danger; that within the shadow of the Washington Monument people were permitted to speak things which were not popular; that within the shadow of the Washington Monument a young man and a young woman dared to say things which were contrary to the policy of that plutocratic sheet. But the worst of it is that every movement, every new idea, every new suggestion, every new thought that is advanced is immediately denounced as Bolshevism. It is not necessary to argue any more with a man who advances a new idea; it is enough to say "That is Bolshevism." Socialism, anarchism, nihilism, all these are presented as one thing.

There is an investigation going on in another body as to what Bolshevism stands for. I would like to see an investigation as to whether there exists a conspiracy to suppress freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly.

The war is over and still we have not repealed the espionage act or the so-called sedition bill. It never was an espionage act. No man would ever vote against a bill which punished a spy. There is no more damnable crime than spying in a time of war, but what they call the espionage bill is a bill to check, regulate, and control speech, control the press, and to control thought. Hundreds and thousands of men are lingering in jail to-day because they dared express views which were unpopular in time of war. Hundreds and thousands of men are in jail to-day because they dared proclaim a political philosophy which ran contrary to the philosophy of the moment.

Mr. QUIN. Does not the gentleman think they ought to be there if they violated the law?

Mr. LONDON. First, the gentleman ought to ask if I yield. There was an old sedition law in the eighteenth century, a sedition law which cost the political party responsible for it its life. Under that old sedition law only 11 persons were tried, if the gentlemen will examine the records. The maximum penalty under that old law was two years' imprisonment and a fine of a thousand dollars. The only substantial fine imposed under the sedition law was ordered returned by the subsequent Congress.

Under the existing law the penalty is 20 years of imprisonment and a fine of $10,000. I can understand why the fine was fixed at $10,000 instead of $1,000; we are now 10 times as rich; but why should it be 20 years instead of 2 except that we appreciate liberty to only one-tenth the extent it was appreciated then. [Laughter.]

You ought to know how difficult it is to try a political case before a jury in time of war. Take the average Republican or Democratic Members of Congress. They are men above the average intelligence; they are the best men of their districts. Some of them are not even politicians, because they have no time to dabble in politics; but still if you put six Republicans and six Democrats, Members of Congress, on a jury to determine whether a Socialist was right in expressing certain views, I do not know whether they would be capable of reaching an impartial decision because Republicans and Democrats are totally ignorant of what socialism is. All they know is that it is unpopular in their districts. Take the average business man, the retired banker, the grocer, the shoe manufacturer; take the crowd the Security League has assembled together and have them decide whether certain utterances were lawful or unlawful, whether they tended to increase or reduce profits, whether they tended to overturn society, and they are sure to decide the case as their prejudices and ignorance determine.

Whatever excuse there might have been for that law during the war, there is no excuse for continuing it to-day.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman think we ought not to have any legal method of punishing the man who advocates the overthrow of this Government by methods of violence?

Mr. LONDON. My dear sir, the man who advocates the overthrow of a government by violence puts himself outside of the pale of law. The man who believes in the overthrow of anything by violence, that is not socialism; and I am opposed to the use of violence in any form.

That is why as a Socialist I have voted against war. I do not believe in the healing efficacy of violence and war. I do not believe that by putting a million men against a half million men and killing the half million men you establish any moral or ethical principle. You merely establish the fact that a million men commanded by better generals and supplied with better artillery are stronger than half a million men commanded by weaker generals and supplied with weaker artillery. As a Socialist I oppose the use of physical violence, and that is why I condemn those slanderers and ignoramuses who seek to confuse the life-giving philosophy of Socialism, which seeks to apply the noblest principles of religion to the actualities of life—that is why I condemn those who seek to confuse the philosophy of Socialism with the theory of violence.

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

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS. I fully respect the gentleman's views, but I want to ask this question: Does he believe in meeting violence with violence? What are you going to do when a man comes at you with a gun? I ask that for information.

Mr. LONDON. That will lead me away from the subject.

Mr. SUMNERS. Then I withdraw the question.

Mr. LONDON. I am not a believer in nonresistance, but that would take me away from the subject. I would refer the gentleman to Tolstoy for those things. I am not a believer in nonresistance. The doctrine of nonresistance has been preached for 2,000 years and the opposite of it has been practiced during those 2,000 years. The gentleman can find better authority than I am upon that subject and more binding authority.

The man who advocates the overthrow of government by violence puts himself outside of the law. Countries which have permitted the widest possible latitude, so far as freedom of speech goes, have not been losers thereby. Take the English Government, for instance. Every anarchist was given a place of refuge in London. They have allowed them there to talk, and England has never had a single act of assassination, while Spain and Italy, where they have had rigorous restrictive laws relating to the freedom of assemblage, have had all sorts of anarchistic attempts, because violence on the part of the Government breeds violence on the part of the people.

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

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. I understand from the gentleman's answer to my question that he does favor a law that would prohibit a man from advocating the overthrow of this Government by violence?

Mr. LONDON. Or the overthrow of any government by violence, except to this extent—to the extent which is embodied in the American Declaration of Independence, that the people in their collective capacity reserve the right to overthrow a government which has usurped powers which do not belong to it. Of course, that is a fundamental principle, to which the gentleman subscribes, I am sure.

Mr. BLACK. If we are in agreement on that, does the gentleman know of any law that we have on the statute books that would prevent him or any other man from advocating his doctrines of socialism?

Mr. LONDON. Oh, that is exactly what is happening. What has taken place under the so-called espionage law is that men are being prosecuted and persecuted, very often by well-meaning officers, because to those officers the doctrines which the accused advocate seem to be subversive of well-ordered society. In other words, their doctrines are unpopular, their doctrines are misunderstood. Let me give the gentleman this illustration: During the campaign of 1916 the Democrats gained popularity by proclaiming the slogan, "He kept us out of war." The Republicans avoided the issue. In October, however, the National Hughes Alliance published an advertisement over the names of 27 prominent citizens, including ex-Presidents Roosevelt and Taft, Joseph H. Choate, Robert T. Lincoln, and Elihu

Root. The statement dealt with the Mexican situation. It contained, among other things, the following declaration:

"Our business is business. Year by year it becomes more apparent that the markets of the world must be kept open to American industries. We can not extend our trade further than we are able to defend it. The rivalries that begin in commerce end on battle fields. The history of war is green with international jealousies. Every great conflict in modern times had its origin in some question of property rights. We are now universal competitors and are destined to grow constantly stronger rivals for a power which other people will not surrender without a trial of wit and will and, if need be, force," and so forth.

That statement was signed by prominent Republican statesmen and is substantially true; there is no doubt about that; but if the very same things were said by a Socialist—if a Socialist were to say that most wars are caused by the clash of the economic interests of nations and are primarily business wars—it would have led him, of course, in some States to the gallows and in other places to jail after indictment and trial by prejudiced men.

If I had time, I would have no difficulty in explaining to the gentleman that what is known as bolshevism is a stage in a revolution which may continue for several years. It is a stage in a struggle incident to Russian life. No other nation in the world has or has had similar conditions. A people stretching over a territory one-sixth of the world's surface, European Russia constituting one-half of Europe, Asiatic Russia being one and a half times as great as the whole of Europe, contending——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes additional.

Mr. LONDON. I thank you. Contending with the evil wrought by a most abominable system of monarchism, where every aspiration of the people was suppressed, where the only reward the noble men and women of Russia received from their Government during the last 50 years was exile to Siberia and death on the scaffold—in this land, where revolution was the only way out, the contest for true democracy was bound to assume a revolutionary character. And then Russia has had peculiar economic institutions. So, for instance, in the greater part of European Russia the peasants look upon collective ownership of land as the only proper form of land ownership, and naturally when in a country like that a revolution takes place——

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Let me develop this argument. There the principle of collective ownership of land flows out of their life, and while it may appear to be subversive in a country where individualism prevails, over there it is merely the next stage in the evolution of the people. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman has read, of course, the constitution of the Soviets?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Does not that constitution first prohibit the private ownership of land, and then provide that the owner of the land when dispossessed could not be paid anything whatsoever for his ownership? I take that to indicate that there is private ownership of land, because the constitution itself recognizes private ownership and provides that the Soviet States shall have the right to go out and dispossess them and pay nothing at all.

Mr. LONDON. If the gentleman would not have interrupted me——

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. LONDON. I should tell the gentleman this, that while the principle of the collective ownership of land exists among the people and is a part of the very psychology of the revolution, only 12 per cent of the land was owned collectively and 88 per cent was owned individually, by large estates, by the church, and by the Czar's family. Now, the gentleman knows that the history of modern England began with the division of land of England among the generals who invaded and conquered England. The feudal system of the rest of Europe was similar in origin, and as far as Russia is concerned, the feudal system of Russia was firmly established by Catherine II, to whom Byron referred as a Queen, spelling it "q-u-e-a-n."

It is easy to understand that there should be an attempt made in Russia to extend the principle of the collective ownership of land. Whatever form of government they may have now can not be considered the last and final form of government.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman approve that part of their constitution that confiscates private ownership, title to the land?

Mr. LONDON. The gentleman is a lawyer and will concede that the very basis of American real-property law is that the people collectively are the ultimate owners of the land. That is the very basis of American law, and it is on that principle that we exercise the right of eminent domain.

Mr. BLACK. I am interested to know if the gentleman approves of that article of the Soviet constitution which provides that the private owner of land shall be deprived of his title without compensation? That is a plain question.

Mr. LONDON. No. The principle adopted by the Socialist Party is that private owners shall be compensated. That is the principle adopted by the Socialist Party.

Mr. BLACK. I am talking about this constitution.

Mr. LONDON. The principle, I say, that the Socialists have adopted is that the private owner shall be compensated. I look upon the Soviet declaration as a revolutionary step taking place during an upheaval.

Mr. BLACK. Do you approve that doctrine or disapprove it?

Mr. LONDON. I have answered you that as a Socialist I would permit the compensation of the private landowner, but I would not permit the continuance of large estates. I would not permit the church to own one-tenth of the land for the purpose of communion with the Lord, because the Lord does not need it, and when the poor peasant, who has only one-half an acre, needs that ground in order to live on it and toil on it.

The question is not whether you and I approve the particular step taken by a revolutionary government or a particular constitution. I am distressed when a Democrat expresses hatred of the effort of the masses of Russia to liberate themselves. You can not advise them. I was opposed to the sending of Root as commissioner, and advised the President against it. I knew Root would not succeed. But in justice to him it must be said no one could have succeeded—not with 180,000,000 people in revolt. It took the little American Republic four years to establish a Constitution, and the Constitution was adopted in secret, and many a delegate left that constitutional convention in disgust, and, what is more, although they adopted the most wonderful document in the history of republics, they retained the curse of slavery, which subsequently cost America a million lives.

It took the French Republic six or seven years before they adopted a constitution by a majority of one vote, and then they did not dare to openly proclaim that they were establishing a republic, but they smuggled in the word "republic" by saying, "The President of the Republic shall be elected."

That was in the year 1878. See the slow progress of the world. The individual and the people collectively live through more in a year than it would take a generation to live through. The American people should treat with sympathy the effort of the great Russian masses—their groping for liberty and their striving for a better state of society.

Mr. ROSE. Only recently I saw published in one of our local papers in the city an alleged copy of a declaration made by some government in Russia, and it appeared to me as though it advocated public ownership in women.

Mr. LONDON. Let me say that——

Mr. ROSE. I would like to have the gentleman, while on the subject of Russia, to tell us about that.

Mr. LONDON. Russia occupies a territory about twice as large as the whole of Europe.

There was a meeting of prostitutes in San Francisco. That is in the United States of America. The prostitutes demanded certain rights. Now, suppose some cheap tory or some European aristocrat—and they have been doing it for decades, trying to make the American people and the American democracy appear ludicrous—would have exaggerated that meeting of prostitutes in San Francisco as a great national movement covering the United States. That is exactly what has been done by a press that seeks to exaggerate every little disagreeable thing that occurs in the revolution. I saw a reference to that in a syndicalist paper published in Switzerland.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Can the gentleman give me 15 minutes more?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. LONDON. I saw that incident referred to in a syndicalist paper published in Switzerland. They refer to that particular incident and mention some little town, a little local soviet, somewhere in the east of Europe, near Siberia. It is very likely that such a thing should have happened in revolutionary times.

Why, there was such a school of thought in France during the revolutionary days of the thirties. These are the excrescences, these are the exuberances, these are the absurdities, of revolutionary days.

And then let me say this to the gentleman: While this proclamation has shocked him so much, I wonder whether he has been equally shocked by the report of the ravages of unmention-

able diseases under the best established methods of government? I wonder whether, when he read the report of the horrible effect of unmentionable diseases upon the youth of America, he did not ask himself the question whether, under our present state of society, millions of homes are destroyed, millions of children will be born abnormal because of the horrible effect of these diseases? The Soviet government has adopted a rather complex law dealing with the subjects of marriage and divorce.

The question is not whether their constitutions are good or bad. The question is whether the Russian people shall be permitted to solve their own problems in their own way.

Coming down to the fundamental proposition which I started out to develop, I ask you as a democratic Congress—using the word "democratic" in the broader sense, including Republicans, including all of you as Members of the House of Representatives—I ask you to repeal the obnoxious espionage law. I ask you to stop this unjust, unfair attack upon the Socialist philosophy. You can not crush it by force. Socialism seeks to apply the ethical principles of religion to life. Socialism seeks to substitute cooperation for competition wherever competition is hurtful to the interests of society. Socialism believes in the doctrine of evolution, of the power of education and of science. We are the advocates of the theory of evolution, and we do not want those who happen to be in the majority to use the physical, coercive, brutal power of the majority to suppress freedom of thought, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly.

It is not necessary for me to repudiate the doctrine that the American Republic and the American people are the greatest in the world. Believing that this is the country of the greatest opportunity and of the greatest possibilities; that we are younger, stronger, more vigorous, more energetic than any other people; that we have larger opportunities which we have not yet utilized, I ask you not to fall asleep on your rights while other nations are now conquering new liberties. I do not want you to fritter away the liberty for which your fathers fought and for which heroes bled in the past. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make the suggestion to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] that I have practically exhausted my time. I would like to know about how much longer we ought to run. I hope that we can close general debate to-night, with the exception of the time that the gentleman from California would like to have to-morrow.

Mr. KAHN. I have about an hour more to run this evening. I have time asked for to the extent of one hour.

Mr. DENT. Then I am going to make a suggestion. Of course, we can not arrange to conclude debate here in Committee of the Whole, but I am going to suggest that we remain until we finish that hour; and then I will ask, when we adjourn to-night, that the gentleman from California may have one hour to-morrow, and after that hour ask that general debate close.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve a few minutes for himself to-morrow?

Mr. DENT. I can get it under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. When I said "for himself" I meant himself as a distributor.

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman from Mississippi wishes some time, I am sure he could inform us very materially about mistakes that we have made in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I can do that under the five-minute rule in case there should be any mistakes in the bill. I do not express any opinion on that, but I did want to submit a few observations under general debate, but I will not insist upon it. I will tell you what I want to talk about——

Mr. DENT. We have always been liberal in extensions of time, and I am perfectly willing to let the gentleman from Mississippi have the time he wishes under the five-minute rule, knowing that he never asks for an excessive allotment of time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the able and clever gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON], who is always interesting in his remarks, has made one of his characteristic addresses to the House, and has been followed with much interest by those who have been privileged to hear him. He has sought to impress upon us that in his opinion, as I understood him, the dangers of bolshevism are now threatening only the peoples of Russia, and that, as far as this great Nation is concerned, we need have no apprehension of those who preach the doctrines which he mentioned, nor should we be concerned with those who seek to overthrow or undermine our form of government. Soon the gentleman will be concluding a service in this branch of the National Legislature, a service in which he has added much of interest, at least, to the discussions of the various measures that have engaged our attention. But I think, in view of the expressions of opinion which we are accustomed to hear from the gentleman from New York, when his term of service is concluded, he not having been privileged to participate in that momentous conference now being held in France, he will find a fertile field in which to put into execution some of the recommendations which he seeks to have us heed, in the land of which he speaks, amongst the people of the great country of Russia; and he will find that the men who have caused the confusion there are men who have gone from this country, where, somehow, they have become imbued with the views they are attempting to put into practice over there, men like Lenine and Trotzky, who are attempting to formulate a government which apparently meets with the gentleman's approval and which he is holding up to us, the United States of America, as a pattern to be modeled after. With him as an assistant to the leaders of that element in Russia, with the experience he has had in legislation here, I doubt not that he will be able to give great aid in bringing peace and quiet once more amidst those troublous and troubled people.

We are approaching the conclusion of a great war which has tested our resources and our strength and our statesmanship to the utmost. I believe, sir, that we should see to it that one of the consequences of that war shall not be that we have weakened our institutions or impaired the value of our form of government, and I say, sir, we ought not to heed the suggestions of gentlemen who advocate doctrines such as have been preached, aye, even during the waging of the war, in violation of our laws. Men who have preached those doctrines and who have violated our laws have been punished when found guilty. The gentleman says that the espionage law should be repealed. I assume that the espionage law will be repealed when the treaty of peace shall have been concluded. I do not imagine that the gentleman from New York was seeking to prejudge the case of one of his fellow Socialists, or at least of one who believes in some of the principles which he advocates, who has been elected to serve in this branch of the Government during the next Congress. But if our trial by jury still maintains, if the protection of the courts is still in existence, that gentleman has had a trial by jury in the jurisdiction in which he resides, and has been found guilty; and clearly such utterances as he made during the war were not such as to unite our people in its prosecution or to assist our people in winning this important struggle. So I submit that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] might well wait until the turmoil resulting from this struggle has somewhat abated, and that he might abide his soul in patience and console himself with the thought that nearly all of those who seek to revolutionize our form of government are those who have made a failure in revolutionizing or improving, according to their views, other forms of government. [Applause.] If our institutions and laws and the foundations upon which our Government is based have been sufficient to withstand the struggles through which we have gone in this crisis and in the contests and wars of the past, I submit, sir, there is no stronger hope to hold out to the peoples of the world who believe in a government of laws and not of men than that this Nation will in the future, as in the past, stand for this as the Government of liberty-loving people throughout the earth; and I have no patience with the Socialist, with the Bolshevik, or their apologists, who seek now to take advantage of the unrest in the world to advocate their doctrines and to excite our people to urge and advocate revolution or, if that is too strong a word, to advocate improvement or change under the guise of socialistic doctrines in our structure.

I believe we can continue to go along the avenues of the future under our present form of government and under our present laws, improved from time to time as conditions may arise. I am sure I speak the sentiments of the American people when I say we do not need at this time the urging or the recommendations of Mr. Lenine or of Mr. Trotzky—no, nor of the colleagues and associates of the gentleman from New York—in improving our conditions for the future. Many times, as I have listened to the gentleman from New York, who is an able man and a student of government, I have regretted that, since he has interested himself in problems of government, somewhere or somehow at the start he reached a switch which put him off upon a sidetrack, and that he has been chasing rainbows of glittering hue, and that he has not kept along the main line and associated himself with parties that believe in a government of laws under the Constitution of the United States as laid down by the fathers following the immortal truths of the Declaration of Independence. [Applause.]

This is no time nor are these the conditions under which to attempt to put into practice or to countenance the doctrine of bolshevism, to which the gentleman has referred.

I trust that the distinguished gentleman from New York when he retires to private life will see to it that, as far as he is able to, he will combat the tendency on the part of certain people to be beguiled by the preachings and teachings of these gentlemen who went from the East Side of New York and who found that they could do the things in Russia which they could only try to do in America; that he will seek to correct the apparent desire on the part of the people to be misled and befuddled by the doctrine such as the Russian Bolshevik disturbers urge and advocate. Let us see to it in the remaining days of this session, and those of us who have been sufficiently fortunate to be honored with election, in the next Congress that in meeting the problems that will confront us we shall seek to perpetuate the institutions of our Government, strengthen our laws, and make firm the great fragment of the human family and not to be diverted, misled, or beguiled by the soothing-sirup pronunciamentos which may be dealt out to us in doses from time to time by reformers, be they Socialists, anarchists, or others of their ilk. We ought to affirm and reaffirm, again and again, our allegiance to the Government of the United States of America, to its Constitution, and to its laws. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, recently the press of this country has been full of comment upon the action of the Secretary of War in granting wholesale pardons to a lot of so-called conscientious objectors, slackers, or, as they term themselves, political prisoners. These pardons were granted and these men were liberated from prison, were given full pay and an honorable discharge, although they had done everything possible to hinder and obstruct this Government in the prosecution of the war. There possibly may have been some meritorious cases among this large number, but if there were each case should have stood upon its own merits. We have witnessed this unusual procedure of liberating these so-called political prisoners and who were honorably discharged, while there still remained in the same prison over 3,500 prisoners, a great many of whom were sent there for trivial offenses, who at all times stood ready and willing to fight for their country. Some of these 3,500 were sent back here from France, some of them saw actual service on the battle field, and although they were there in prison probably for a short term they are not even considered, they are not pardoned, they are not given discharges and their full pay with mileage. At the same time we witness hundreds of thousands of the boys who are in the Army, both in the camps here in the United States and in foreign countries, who have stood ready and willing to fight for their country, who have asked and desire their discharge so that they may return home and take up their ordinary civil life, and are denied, while these so-called conscientious objectors are given preference over the boys who were not only willing to fight but worked for their country. Yet the Secretary of War is giving preference to these so-called conscientious objectors over these thousands of loyal Americans, who stood ready to pay the supreme sacrifice for liberty on the battle fields. What do these thousands of men in uniform think of Mr. Baker and of his assistants? What will the loyal American citizens not in uniform think of them, especially when they give preference to such men, who call themselves conscientious objectors, as Henry Layman? I hold in my hand a transcript of some of the testimony of the said Henry Layman when he was examined at Camp Funston, Kans. One of the questions which was asked him is as follows: "Read your Bible in Russian or American? Answer. In German." Please note the answer of this so-called conscientious objector. Do you think he is a good American citizen and should be given preference over our good loyal American boys who have fought upon the battle fields of France, who are now clamoring for their discharges? Again I quote from the testimony of this same man: "Question. If a negro were about to rape your mother and the only way that you could prevent it was to shoot him, and you had a gun, would you do it? Answer. No, sir." My God, my friends, what do you think of any department which would give a man of this character, who would make such an answer as this, preference over and above our good loyal American citizens?

My mails have been flooded with letters—and I presume every Member of this House has received them—attempting to set forth the bad treatment of these so-called political prisoners. The most of it is pure propaganda. If these men had complied with the law, they were amply protected in every way, but they did not see fit to comply with the law; on the contrary, they refused to do ordinary work, although the orders from the War Department did not compel them to wear uniforms.

I have here a statement of facts pertaining to conditions which arose between military authorities and conscientious objectors made by Eugene C. Brisbane, captain, Infantry, United States Army, on the 8th day of January, 1919, office of provost marshal, Camp Funston, Kans., which clearly sets forth the facts pertaining to these so-called conscientious objectors. The law and the regulations relating to conscientious objectors read as follows:

THE LAW AND REGULATIONS RELATING TO THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR.

1. In dealing with the class of men drafted into the Army known as religious objectors, we must consider the laws and regulations governing the service in that relation. Without regard to the early statutes exempting those who from religious teachings object to taking part in warfare in any form, the question as to what class or classes of men the legislature intended to include in the meaning of the term "conscientious objector" during the existing emergency may be clearly established by a reference to the statutes hereinafter briefly discussed.

Notwithstanding the fact that the highest duty to be performed by the individual citizens of a nation is a prompt response to the call in defense of the country, there is to be found among all peoples the religious fanatic who, because of his belief in a fixed creed, objects to participation in war in a combatant capacity. In time of peace this class of citizens enjoy all the rights and benefits of citizenship. They have no hesitancy in calling upon the police force in their communities to defend them against the lawless element when their rights or properties are subjected to trespass or criminal act, wherein they undergo danger to life and property. They freely use the courts of the land in the settlement of their controversies when it is known to them that the power of the courts is never stronger than the power of the sheriff to execute the decrees of the courts. This power is invariably represented by armed force whenever that force is required to carry into execution the orders of the court.

However, when the Nation is attacked by a well-organized military force, jeopardizing her peace and happiness and even the titles to properties, as well as the lives of her citizens, these religious fanatics who have enjoyed freedom, enforced only by armed strength on the part of their Government, demand exemption from duty with the colors in repeling invasion of her rights and homes, and expect their fellow citizens to defend them and their properties against the common enemy.

In times of national calamity, such as confronts us to-day, it is needless to say that the religious objector deserves no consideration whatever, as a class, that is not extended to all citizens alike. To discriminate among classes in the organization of a national force for the common defense is to create dissention and a division of forces within the Nation that bids fair to lead us to utter defeat through the breaking down of the morale of the people and their military forces.

Regardless of all that may be said against favoring a class or classes of the people by exemption from militia service, Congress saw fit, in section 59 of its act of June 3, 1916, known as the national defense act, enacted during peace times, to provide for the exemption from military service of a designated class in the following words:

"* * * all persons who because of religious belief shall claim exemption from military service, if the conscientious holding of such belief by such persons shall be established under such regulations as the President shall prescribe, shall be exempted from militia service in a combatant capacity; but no persons so exempted shall be exempt from militia service in any capacity that the President shall declare to be noncombatant."

It will be noted that a broad interpretation of this act would operate to release from combatant military service any and all men who claim exemption, and unless such regulations as prescribed by the President thereunder properly controlled the situation, every member of the Military Establishment would be at liberty to refuse to enter actual combat at any time he saw fit to set up his claim for exemption.

However, when the lawmakers were considering this subject under war conditions, they evidently deemed it advisable to change the law to make it applicable to bona fide claims only, and not to leave it to the dictates of the conscience of each individual soldier to establish his rights thereunder, and by section 4 of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, known as the draft act, it is provided:

"And nothing in this act contained shall be construed to require or compel any person to serve in any of the forces herein provided for who is found to be a member of any well-recognized religious sect or organization at present organized and existing and whose existing creed or principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form, and whose religious convictions are against war or participation therein in accordance with the creed or principles of said religious organization; but no person so exempted shall be exempted from service in any capacity that the President shall declare to be noncombatant."

It is clear that Congress intended that this provision should only apply to members of well-recognized religious organizations existing at the time of the passage of this act, with a then existing creed or established principles forbidding the members thereof from participating in war in any form, and further, members of such organizations claiming exemption under this act were to be required to establish the fact that they live up to such creed or principles by individually entertaining religious convictions in accordance with the creeds of their various sects.

There is nothing in the law that could be construed to mean that any drafted man would be permitted to walk about the post or camp dressed in civilian clothing. However, the first instructions to the Army under the law exempted a certain class of men from wearing the uniform by the following telegram from the War Department to all division commanders, dated September 25, 1917:

"Secretary of War directs that selected Mennonites who report to your camp for duty be not forced to wear uniform, as question of raiment is one of the tenets of their faith."

On October 10, 1917, the following confidential letter was sent out to all division commanders:

"1. The Secretary of War directs that you be instructed to segregate the conscientious objectors in their divisions and to place them under supervision of instructors who shall be especially selected with a view of insuring that these men will be handled with tact and consideration and that their questions will be answered fully and frankly.

"2. With reference to their attitude of objecting to military service, these men are not to be treated as violating military laws, thereby subjecting themselves to the penalties of the Articles of War, but their attitude in this respect will be quietly ignored and they will be treated with kindly consideration. Attention to this connection is

invited to a case where a number of conscientious objectors in one of our divisions when treated in this manner renounced their original objections to military service and voluntarily offered to give their best efforts to the service of the United States as soldiers.

"3. It is desired that after the procedure above indicated shall have been followed for a sufficient length of time to afford opportunity to judge of the results derived from it a report of the action taken and the results obtained under these instructions be submitted to the War Department by each division commander. As a result of the consideration of all these reports, further instructions will be issued by the Secretary of War as to the policy to be observed in the future in the case of conscientious objectors.

"4. Under no circumstances are the instructions contained in the foregoing to be given to the newspapers."

Notwithstanding the fact that the statute clearly defined the term "conscientious objector," the following confidential letter extended its meaning to include any soldier announcing personal scruples against war. This letter was dated December 19, 1917, and was addressed to all camp commanders except Camp Grant:

"1. The Secretary of War directs that until further instructions on the subject are issued 'personal scruples against war' should be considered as constituting 'conscientious objectors,' and such persons should be treated in the same manner as other 'conscientious objectors' under the instructions contained in confidential letter from this office dated October 10, 1917.

"2. Under no circumstances should these instructions be communicated to the newspapers."

Then, on March 11, 1918, the following letter was published to camp commanders:

"1. You are informed that instructions regarding the segregating of conscientious objectors contained in confidential letters from The Adjutant General of October 10 and December 19, 1917, should not be construed as requiring the mingling in one group of different classes of conscientious objectors, who for the good of the service may better be kept apart.

"2. Under no circumstances are the instructions contained in the foregoing to be given to the newspapers."

This letter was followed by an Executive order dated March 20, 1918, published by General Order No. 28, War Department, current series, containing the following:

"I hereby declare that the following military service is noncombatant service:

"(a) Service in the Medical Corps, whenever performed. This includes service in the sanitary detachment attached to combatant units at the front; service in the division sanitary trains composed of ambulance companies and field hospital companies, on the line of communications, at the base in France, and with the troops and at hospitals in the United States; also the service of supply and repair in the Medical Department.

"(b) Any service in the Quartermaster Corps in the United States may be treated as noncombatant. Also, in rear of zone of operations, service in the following: Stevedore companies, labor companies, remount depots, veterinary hospitals, supply depots, bakery companies, the subsistence service, the bathing service, the laundry service, the salvage service, the clothing renovation service, the shoe-repair service, the transportation repair service, and motor-truck companies.

"(c) Any engineer service in the United States may be treated as noncombatant. Also, in rear of zone of operations, service as follows: Railroad building, operations, and repair; road building and repair; construction of rear-line fortifications, auxiliary defenses, etc.; construction of docks, wharves, storehouses, and of such cantonments as may be built by the Corps of Engineers; topographical work; camouflage; map reproduction; supply-depot service; repair service; hydraulic service; and forestry service.

"2. Persons ordered to report for military service under the above act who have (a) been certified by their local boards to be members of a religious sect or organization as defined in section 4 of said act or (b) who object to participating in war because of conscientious scruples but have failed to receive certificates as members of a religious sect or organization from their local board will be assigned to noncombatant military service as defined in paragraph 1 to the extent that such persons are able to accept service as aforesaid without violation of the religious or other conscientious scruples by them in good faith entertained. Upon the promulgation of this order it shall be the duty of each division, camp, or post commander, through a tactful and considerate officer, to present to all such persons the provisions hereof, with adequate explanation of the character of noncombatant service herein defined and, upon such explanation, to secure acceptance of assignment to the several kinds of noncombatant service above enumerated; and whenever any person is assigned to noncombatant service by reason of his religious or other conscientious scruples he shall be given a certificate stating the assignment and reason therefor, and such certificate shall thereafter be respected as preventing the transfer of such persons from such noncombatant service to combatant service by a division, camp, post, or other commander under whom said person may thereafter be called to serve, but such certificate shall not prevent the assignment of such person to some other form of noncombatant service with his own consent. So far as may be found feasible by each division, camp, or post commander, future assignments of such persons to noncombatant military service will be restricted to the several detachments and units of the Medical Department in the absence of a request for assignment to some other branch of noncombatant service as defined in paragraph 1 hereof.

"3. On the 1st day of April, and thereafter monthly, each division, camp, or post commander shall report to The Adjutant General of the Army, for the information of the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of War, the names of all persons under their respective commands who profess religious or other conscientious scruples as above described and who have been unwilling to accept, by reason of such scruples, assignment to noncombatant military service as above defined, and as to each such person so reported, a brief, comprehensive statement as to the nature of the objection to the acceptance of such noncombatant military service entertained. The Secretary of War will from time to time classify the persons so reported and give further directions as to the disposition of them. Pending such directions from the Secretary of War, all such persons not accepting assignment to noncombatant service shall be segregated, as far as practicable, and placed under the command of a specially qualified officer of tact and judgment, who will be instructed to impose no punitive hardship of any kind upon them, but not to allow their objections to be made the basis of any favor or consideration beyond exemption from actual military service which is not extended to any other soldier in the service of the United States.

"4. With a view to maintaining discipline, it is pointed out that the discretion of courts-martial, so far as any shall be ordered to deal with the cases of persons who fail or refuse to comply with lawful orders by reason of alleged religious or other conscientious scruples, should be exercised, if feasible, so as to secure uniformity of penalties in the imposition of sentences under articles of war 64 and 65 for the willful disobedience of a lawful order or command. It will be recognized that sentences imposed by such courts-martial, when not otherwise described by law, shall prescribe confinement in the United States disciplinary barracks or elsewhere, as the Secretary of War or the reviewing authority may direct, but not in a penitentiary; but this shall not apply to the cases of men who desert either before reporting for duty to the military authorities or subsequently thereto.

"5. The Secretary of War will review the sentences and findings of courts-martial heretofore held of persons who come within any of the classes herein described and bring to the attention of the President for remedy, if any be needed, sentences and judgments found at variance with the provisions hereof."

With a view to determining the mental condition of the conscientious objector, the following instructions were issued by the War Department on April 10, 1918:

"Referring to the instructions to have a psychological examination of all conscientious objectors made, which were contained in letter of March 6, 1918, the Secretary of War directs that all of these men whom the examination psychologists, for any reason, consider should receive further examination by a psychiatric specialist be examined by such a specialist. In all cases where psychiatric specialists recommend the discharge from service of such men for mental deficiency or derangement their discharge for the good of the service is authorized."

From the above letter it is to be observed that the conscientious objector is placed in a class entirely separate from other soldiers of the Army. Under existing regulations the disposition of mental defects is provided for.

Although all soldiers of the United States Army are at all times subject to the penalties to be imposed by the Articles of War, without the proper application of which discipline can not be maintained, the conscientious objector is exempted therefrom, and the attention of all commanders was called to the provisions of previous instructions by the following War Department letter of April 18, 1918:

"1. With reference to the Executive order dated March 21, 1918, published in General Orders No. 28, War Department, 1918, the Secretary of War directs the attention of all commanding officers to the provisions of paragraph 3 of this order, to the effect that no punitive hardship of any kind be imposed upon conscientious objectors who do not accept assignment to noncombatant service before their cases shall have been submitted to the Secretary of War, and instructions relating to their disposition shall have been issued by him."

On the same day the following memorandum from the Secretary of War to The Adjutant General was published:

"Mr. Keppel has brought to my attention the question raised in my absence as to whether men who accept service in noncombatant branches under the provisions of the President's Executive order shall be required to bear side arms.

"My judgment is that it should be contrary to the spirit of the order to require these men to bear arms if they can not conscientiously do so."

The side arms of a soldier, referred to in the above memorandum, consist of a belt, with bayonet and scabbard, worn, as a rule, to designate men on certain duties.

Extending further consideration and privileges to the conscientious objector on June 1, 1918, the following instructions were published by the War Department:

"1. By the terms of the presidential order of March 20, 1918, men reporting at the training camps under the provisions of the selective service law who profess conscientious scruples against warfare are given an opportunity to select forms of service designated by the President to be noncombatant in character. By direction of the Secretary of War, dated April 22, 1918, instructions were issued by this office April 27, 1918, to try by court-martial those declining to accept such noncombatant service; (a) whose attitude in camp is defiant; (b) whose sincerity is questioned; (c) who are active in propaganda.

"2. All other men who profess conscientious objections now segregated in posts and camps—i. e., those who, while themselves refusing to obey military instructions on the ground of conscientious scruples, religious or other, have given no other cause of criticism in their conduct, and all who have been or may be acquitted by such court-martial—shall be transferred to Fort Leavenworth. Orders for such transfers will be obtained from this office. The commanding officer, Fort Leavenworth, will keep these men segregated, but not under arrest, pending further instructions from this office.

"3. The same procedure shall be carried out as promptly as possible in the cases of men professing similar scruples who may report at posts or camps in the future.

"4. Under no circumstances will conscientious objectors otherwise qualified to perform military duty be discharged from their responsibilities under the selective service law, but the Secretary of War has constituted a board of inquiry, composed of a representative from the Judge Advocate's office (Maj. Richard C. Stoddard), chairman; Judge Julian W. Mack, of the Federal court; and Dean H. F. Stone, of the Columbia University Law School. It will be the duty of this board to interrogate personally each man so transferred. Such men as may be determined by this board to be sincere in their attitude and desirous of serving their country in any way within the limits of their conscientious scruples may be furloughed by the commanding officer, Fort Leavenworth, without pay, for agricultural service, upon the voluntary application of the soldier, under the authority contained in the act of Congress of March 16, 1918, and the provisions of General Order No. 31, 1918, provision being made:

"(1) That monthly report as to the industry of each person so furloughed shall be received from disinterested sources, and that the furlough shall terminate automatically upon receipt of report that he is not working to the best of his ability; and

"(2) That no person shall be recommended for such furlough who does not voluntarily agree that he shall receive for his labor an amount no greater than a private's pay, plus an estimated sum for subsistence if such be not provided by the employer. It is suggested that any additional amount which may be offered for the service of such men be contributed to the Red Cross.

"5. In exceptional cases the board may recommend furlough for service in France in the Friends' reconstruction unit.

"6. If there shall be any instances in which the findings of courts-martial at camps or posts in cases involving conscientious objectors shall be disapproved by the Secretary of War, the men concerned shall also be transferred to Fort Leavenworth and similarly examined and reported upon by the board of inquiry.

"7. Any man who is not recommended for furlough by this board, or who being offered such furlough shall refuse to accept it, or whose furlough shall be terminated for the reasons indicated above, or for other reasons deemed sufficient by the Secretary of War, shall be required to perform such noncombatant service as may be assigned to him, and shall be held strictly accountable under the Articles of War for the proper performance of such service and to strict obedience to all laws governing or applicable to soldiers employed in that status. In the event of disobedience of such laws or failure to perform such service, the offender shall be tried by court-martial, and if found guilty and sentenced to confinement shall be detained in the disciplinary barracks for the term of his sentence.

"8. Pending the final decision in each case, as to the disposal of these men, the directions as to their treatment issued from time to time by order of the Secretary of War remain in force. These may be summarized as follows:

"As a matter of public health, every man in camp, entirely apart from his military status, shall be expected to keep himself and his belongings and surroundings clean, and his body in good condition, through appropriate exercise. Men declining to perform military duties shall be expected to prepare their own food.

"If, however, any drafted man, upon his arrival at camp, either through the presentation of a certificate from his local board or by written statement addressed by himself to the commanding officer, shall record himself as a conscientious objector, he shall not, against his will, be required to wear a uniform or to bear arms; nor, if, pending the final decision as to his status, he shall decline to perform, under military direction, duties which he states to be contrary to the dictates of his conscience, shall he receive punitive treatment for such conduct.

"No man who fails to report at camp, in accordance with the instructions of his local board, or who, having reported, fails to make clear upon his arrival his decision to be regarded as a conscientious objector, is entitled to the treatment outlined above.

"In the assignment of any soldier to duty, combatant or noncombatant, the War Department recognizes no distinction between service in the United States and service abroad."

The instructions were supplemented on June 10 by the following:

"1. The following confidential instructions, supplemental to instructions from this office, June 1 and June 8 (18), 1918, are furnished for your information and guidance:

"2. The board of inquiry referred to in paragraph 4, letter of June 1, is authorized in exceptional cases to recommend furlough for the purpose of engaging in industrial occupations as well as to engage in agricultural work.

"3. Such recommendations will be dealt with in the same manner as is provided in orders with respect to agricultural work."

And on the same date instructions were issued, as follows, concerning the furloughs to be granted these men under circular letter of June 1, 1918:

"1. The following instructions relative to men furloughed to engage in agricultural work, pursuant to instructions from this office contained in circular letter (382.2 Disposition Misc. Div.), dated June 1, 1918, are published for the information of all concerned:

"2. The board referred to in paragraph 4 of the circular letter cited will visit such camps and cantonments at which conscientious objectors are now stationed or to which they may be transferred as the board deems proper for the purpose of conducting the examination referred to in the above-mentioned letter.

"3. The board will be given every facility and assistance to examine all persons claiming to be conscientious objectors, who have not been court-martialed and are not under charges, and, with the consent of the camp commander, such also as are under charges and have not yet been brought to trial.

"4. Furlough will be issued by the commanding officer of the respective camps at which the men to be furloughed are stationed, pursuant to the recommendations of the board. Such furlough shall not be granted until the commanding officer is satisfied that bona fide employment at the prevailing rate of wages in this occupation can be secured. The furlough shall be conditioned upon the man's written agreement that he shall receive no more than private's pay plus a reasonable amount of subsistence, clothing, and medical attention, and that the balance of such wages be paid to the American Red Cross.

"5. Men furloughed pursuant to these instructions will be transferred as of date of furlough to Fort Leavenworth, Kans. Their service records will be sent to the commanding officer, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and upon the termination of their furlough for cause they will be sent to that post.

"6. When it becomes necessary to revoke the furlough of any man furloughed under the provisions of these instructions, the commanding officer, Fort Leavenworth, will request the department commander of the department in which the man is employed to take him into custody and send him under guard to Fort Leavenworth.

"7. The commanding officer concerned will send to Fort Leavenworth, Kans., such of the men so examined by the board as it may recommend. Men so sent shall be held at Fort Leavenworth for further examination and report by the board.

"8. Definite instructions as to the method to be followed in arranging for employment for men to be furloughed under the foregoing instructions will be furnished later."

2. A careful study of the above instructions and orders issued concerning the conscientious objector, in comparison with the law under which such instructions have been issued, clearly shows that those controlling the issuance of such instructions went far beyond the intention of the lawmakers in many instances. A comparatively few men drafted into the service are members of well-recognized religious sects whose creeds prohibit their members participating in war of any kind, and which organizations were in existence at the time of the passage of the law granting their members exemption from combatant service with the military forces.

Add to the few religious objectors contemplated in the law the pacifists, cowards, disloyalists, and others who desire to avoid military service or to interfere in every way possible with the proper disciplining of the Army, and the result is that at each of the training camps there are to be found several hundred of these men doing nothing to assist in the prosecution of the war. The presence of these men in camp, privileged as indicated in the above instructions, injuriously affects the discipline of the entire command.

It was never intended by the legislature that any citizen of the United States should be exempted from service with the colors during the existing emergency. It was not their intention that any class of soldiers should be drafted into the United States Army and encouraged to claim exemption from military service by simply stating their conscientious objections.

Under the above instructions any soldier arrested for a military offense may profess his religious objections to military service, regardless of the requirements of law to show membership in a well-recognized religious sect, and thereby escape any form of punishment.

3. Section 1199, Revised Statutes, provides that the Judge Advocate General of the Army "shall receive, revise, and cause to be recorded the proceedings of all courts-martial." In all cases of trial by general courts-martial the records of trial are reviewed in the office of the Judge Advocate General. If the proceedings are found to be legal and action thereon final, the records are filed. But under the instructions issued March 11, 1918, the conscientious objector convicted by court-martial is extended the privilege of a review of the findings and sentence in his case by the Secretary of War, to whose attention the conviction must be called.

—

STATEMENT OF FACTS PERTAINING TO CONDITIONS WHICH AROSE BETWEEN MILITARY AUTHORITIES AND CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

(By Eugene C. Brisbin, captain, Infantry, U. S. A. Office of Provost Marshal, Camp Funston, Kans., January 8, 1919.)

1. Let me first state that the preceding laws and regulations governing the religious objector and so-called conscientious objector, as issued by the War Department up to the present time, have been very closely adhered to, and in no case do I conscientiously believe any of them have been violated to the most minute extent which I will endeavor to prove in the following samples:

2. When the first draft arrived at Camp Funston there was considerable trouble experienced with the so-called conscientious objectors. The majority of these objectors we found to be in possession of certificates from their church and were either Hutternite or Mennonite believers and were segregated in compliance of confidential letter sent out by the War Department under date of October 10, 1917; also, in compliance of telegram of War Department under date of September 27, 1917. These men were not forced to wear a uniform but were taken into hand by a very competent officer who examined them very carefully as to their actual belief. Many of these men, after very close questioning, and upon being told that they would be put into noncombatant units, accepted their oaths, put on their uniforms and were placed in sanitary trains, Quartermaster Corps, etc., in accordance with General Order No. 28, and in the majority of instances, where men were placed in noncombatant organizations, these men, although still professing to be conscientious objectors, have rendered excellent—also conscientious—service to their Government and in very few cases have these departments experienced any trouble whatsoever with these men.

3. With the balance of the conscientious objectors received, there appeared, not only to be a religious resentment to military duties, but a very antagonistic feeling toward all military persons, and endeavored from the time they arrived in camp to impose as great a hardship upon those directly over them as was possible in their mind.

4. These men were afforded the best possible treatment and in no cases were abused or mistreated by either the guards over them or any of their superior officers. They were not ordered to, or forced to, don the uniform of the United States, but were segregated and the only orders they received at any time were those necessary for their own welfare, both mentally and physically.

5. At the time the first draft was called these men were not segregated into one large group but were segregated in the organizations to which they were assigned, and in one case, referring to my own, although the same occurrence was prevalent throughout the entire camp—two conscientious objectors were received and assigned to my organization. Shortly after their arrival, evidently through propaganda distributed by the enemy of our country through these men, there appeared five other conscientious objectors, or men who claimed to be conscientious objectors. These men gave no end of trouble and the situation became very trying inasmuch as the War Department had issued certain orders and regulations opposing the use of drastic measures upon these men, and it was with great difficulty in complying with these War Department orders that we prevented the spread of this existing condition amongst the more weak-minded men of these organizations. One of these five men openly stated that he was a conscientious objector and he didn't care who knew it, that he had made that decision of his own free will, after having held consultation with God. Upon investigation found that this man had served two or three years in the Missouri National Guard, having served on the Mexican Border, and had also been secretary to some official, I do not remember who, in Washington.

6. In less than one week from the time the draft arrived in this camp we were pestered by large numbers of civilian people, both male and female, in the endeavor to get in communication with the so-called conscientious objectors. This condition existed for some little time until it had grown to such an enormity that these Mennonites would arrive in camp 30 or 40 strong, distributing themselves to the various organizations and would endeavor to convert any of the enlisted men, even though they were not conscientious objectors, whom they could conveniently talk to. In not only my opinion, but in the opinion of the high-ranking officers who were here at that time, this was not only a case where they were endeavoring to post their own religious sect on bulletins and memorandas issued by the War Department for the protection of the conscientious objectors, but was in all appearances a rank deliverance and spread of German propaganda.

7. The increase in the number of conscientious objectors was very small until about January 1, 1918, when there appeared in this camp a handbill which originated after the meeting of the committee representing eight branches of the Mennonite Denomination which was held at Goshen, Ind., on January 9 and 10, 1918, which reads:

"At a meeting of committees representing eight branches of the Mennonite Denomination at Goshen, Ind., January 9 and 10, 1918, attention was called to some trouble in the past which might have been averted if more information had been in the hands of our registered brethren. Consequently, a committee was appointed to publish some authoritive information for immediate use. Another committee will publish later a more complete collection of documents bearing on this subject."

And further, in the same publication, is found the following:

"Our boys who report at their respective camps have the privilege of taking their stand on the following points:

"No uniform.

"No drill.

"No service of any kind in the camp.

"Taking their stand on these points, they will be placed in detention camps.

"They will be offered a list of services considered noncombatant. They need not accept any in violation of their conscience. They will

be properly fed and cared for. Those who can not accept any service under the military arm of the Government will be held in detention camps to await such disposition of their case as the Government may decide upon. We recommend that our brethren comply with every requirement of the Government, availing themselves of every opportunity to present their claims for exemption, exercising care they do not commit any act that could be rightly interpreted as desertion or treason; and at the time when they receive the summons to enter the military service they present themselves to the authorities and meekly inform them that under no circumstances that they consent to serve, either combatant or noncombatant, under the military arm of the Government, citing them to the fact that they are members of a church whose creed and principle forbid them to have part in war in any form, and that their conscience coincides with this position; submitting to any penalty the Government may see fit to inflict, trusting to the Lord for guidance and protection."

8. From about March 1, 1918, up to the present time there has been taken from a large number of persons who profess to be conscientious objectors on entering this camp printed handbills, circulars, some of which are supposed to have been signed not only by prominent officials of this country but by the President of the United States, and it has been a rank injustice to other drafted men who are members of this great Army, and our true soldiers, to allow the publishers and possessors of these falsehoods to go unpunished, and it most certainly appears that these men are receiving the support of some very high authority of this country.

9. The following letter was printed upon one of the handbills received in this camp:

"A LETTER FROM PRESIDENT WILSON.

(The bill here mentioned has since become law.—P. H. R.)

"The following letter from the President to Brother H. C. Early is self-explanatory and will be of great interest to our readers:

"MY DEAR SIR: I have received the memorial of the Church of the Brethren with regard to the assignment of members of that church now in the military service, to noncombatant occupations, in agriculture and other constructive pursuits.

"The Secretary of War has presented to the Congress for its approval a bill which will authorize the War Department to furlough, without pay, men in the military service. Should the Congress enact this legislation it will then be possible, under its provisions, to assign by conditional furlough men whose conscientious scruples can not otherwise be met to civilian occupations of the general sort which you indicate. At the same time, the Secretary of War is endeavoring to broaden the list of noncombatant occupation directly associated with the activities of the Army and tells me that he hopes soon to have prepared, for presentation to me, such a list. When this is done it may well be that the members of your church will find services which they can render without invasion of their beliefs, and I trust every effort will be made by your members so that this difficult question can finally be settled in a way consistent at once with the sentiment of those involved and the best interests of the Government.

"Cordially, yours,

WOODROW WILSON."

(From Gospel Messenger.)

Taking all things into consideration, if carefully noted, will bring out the fact that on or about March 1, 1918, a tremendous pressure was brought to bear upon the War Department in order to influence the higher authorities there in favor of the conscientious objectors. The following is a clipping from the Gospel Messenger of March 9, 1918, published letter from W. J. Seigart, written from Huntingdon, Pa., on February 25, 1918:

"Owing to the throng and rush about the War Department and the arduous pressure of responsibility upon these men, it is a marvel how they in any sense get through, and the obtaining of interviews is really embarrassing and not very satisfactory. Matters can be better brought to their attention by correspondence and can thus probably have more studied attention when considered away from the hours when the press is so great and everybody wants a hearing. * * * I have headquarters in Washington at 337 North Carolina Avenue SE., where letters or wire messages may be sent. * * * I also have arrangements with a Member of the House, who is interested, to post me on legislation and other matter that may concern us. * * * there are brethren who have been in camp since October or September who have not yet had a visit and seem not to know that there is a provision for such. There are members in camp who are taking the military drill because they do not know how to get out of it. A little counsel and help from the visitors would release some of them, at least, * * * the congregation should see that persons doing such work be made whole for expenses incurred. The boys should have help. * * *."

The writer then refers to certain publications, such as the Statement to the Churches and Drafted Brethren, with the following remark:

"Every brother in camp and every brother going to camp or likely to be called should have one from his home church with the certificate of membership duly signed. It would be well if many who are not going to camp should have the statement and study it."

It was literature and handbills of this kind distributed around the camps and through many of the organizations which soon caused a marked increase in the number of so-called conscientious objectors; so from January 1, 1918, the number has increased from a mere handful until up to a few days ago there were 553 in this camp, and it is very surprising to know that of those 553 only 21 have been so disobedient or so antagonistic to any military authorities whatever that it has forced the proper authorities to take action against them. This action has been made necessary by two important factors, for both of which the responsibility may be placed on the men themselves.

(a) Their complete and whole-hearted belief in these handbills or German propaganda which was spread through the camps.

(b) They all rest assured, in their own mind, that nothing can happen to them, as they have a great friend in Washington, Mr. Keppel, the Third Assistant Secretary of War, who will support them, "so they state," in anything their conscience tells them to do, and that all other military authorities are to be considered their enemies; therefore the hardships brought to bear upon the guards over them and their superior officers, due to this extreme narrow-mindedness, or in some cases I may even state cowardice, have been of such a nature, at the same time taking into consideration the War Department's instructions, an officer or enlisted men having any connection with them whatsoever is called upon to do the impossible, and I do not believe that these men were treated with any more disrespect, and in some cases I know they were not treated with as much respect in other camps, as they are in this one; but, nevertheless, upon using the utmost precaution and tactfulness in the handling of these men opposition was received at every turn of the wheel from one source or another.

The following gives some information on the status of conscientious objectors as determined at a meeting of the military exemption committee of the western district conference, which sent a delegation to Washington and handed Secretary Keppel a list of questions, which he answered as follows:

"1. What is the status of the conscientious objector who accepts service in one of the departments named by the President noncombatant?

"(a) Must they bear weapons of any kind, including such as revolver, dagger, etc.?

"Answer. No.

"(b) Must they drill with the rest of the men who are preparing for service in the Army?

"Answer. Yes.

"(c) Are such men considered a part of the organized military force of the States?

"Answer. Yes (as part of the noncombatant forces).

"2. Can these men, who because of conscientious scruples can not accept service in one of the three departments named by the President, remain in the camp and do civilian (that is, not under military orders), work without becoming a part of the military organization under any department?

"Answer. It may possibly be; but it would not be wise, because of the resentment of the other men if such men, conscientious objectors, are not uniformed and subject to regular discipline.

"3. (a) What are the rules and what is the plan under which 'conscientious objectors' are to be furloughed for farm work?

"Answer. No definite rules have thus far been adopted, but will soon be issued.

"(b) Would a representative of our conference be permitted to be present and cooperate in a consulting capacity in cases where men of our membership are to be furloughed?

"Answer. Too cumbersome; but I will assure you men that your men will be treated with consideration. Certain men have already been furloughed out, in cooperation with the nearest State agricultural department, for about two months, with the thought that the furlough will be extended under the regulations to be adopted. The furloughing will be placed in charge of a civilian commission, who although not a conscientious objector will be sympathetically disposed, and he will have the advice of a committee of representatives from the Quakers, Dunkards, and Mennonites. The men will not be furloughed to their home communities of their faith.

"4. Would a representative of our people be permitted to be present when a member of our church is under trial by court-martial as a conscientious objector?

"Answer. This is a matter for the court-martial board itself to decide. They may admit a civilian in cases which in their judgment make such action advisable.

"5. Has a conscientious objector who, under pressure of one kind or another, has accepted service in some department of the armed forces of the United States, which he finds to be contrary to his conscientious convictions, thereby forfeited his rights as a conscientious objector?

"Answer. Yes; unless such service was accepted under duress. In that case he must bring positive proof that undue pressure was brought to bear on him and caused him to accept service contrary to his conscientious convictions.

"6. Can a conscientious objector be employed in the Hospital Department without at any time bearing weapons of any kind while engaged in such service?

"Answer. Yes; absolutely. A new department of the hospital service will be established for the purpose of teaching disabled men new lines of occupation, suited to their condition, such as gardening, fruit growing, and small farming. Such disabled men will not go back to war, and helping and teaching such men will not assist in the war. This will be an opportunity for service for nonresistants in human reconstruction work.

"There will also be published a list of different kinds of civilian service for conscientious objectors, including clothes and shoes and other trades and lines of work.

"We feel that we should state it as our convictions that the heads of the War Department are sincerely endeavoring to handle the problem of the nonresistant citizens with a most sympathetic spirit of kindness, fairness, and consideration, anxiously careful that the individual freedom of conscience should be sacredly respected and shielded. That such a spirit prevails in Washington in this trying time may well be recognized by all Mennonites as a cause for deepest gratitude to God and to our Government in Washington.

"The delegation.

"H. P. KREHBIEL, *Newton, Kans.*

"PETER H. UNRUSH, *Goessel, Kans.*"

In view of Mr. Keppel's answers to the above questions anyone would most naturally suppose that these would be complied with, not only by the military authorities but by the conscientious objectors themselves. In answer to question (a), from a military standpoint these men were not forced to carry side arms or weapons of any kind, nor did any dispute ever arise that I am aware of or upon investigation have been able to find out over this question.

Answering question (b) and the answer to same:

In the majority of cases where these men were ordered to drill with their organization they complied, but not with the spirit that should have been shown and the interest that should have been taken, taking into consideration Mr. Keppel's statement that they should drill and the acceptance of this statement by their own delegation. Most of these men had to be kept in awkward squad or placed in development battalions, not because they did not have the brain or the ability to learn but due to their prominent and antagonistic feeling on their part toward anything military. Some of these men actually refused to go out and drill, even after threatened with punishment, which punishment should have been justifiable and was justifiable according to War Department order, but in the early stages of the game no punishment was inflicted on these men.

(c) The answer to which was, "Yes."

Again, in a large majority of these cases these men did accept noncombatant service, and it appears that in these cases a large proportion of them have given very good service to their country. However, there is still quite a number of these men who remained antagonistic and refused to accept anything that was offered them.

In answer to No. 2, question (a).

The man who accepted noncombatant service donned the uniform of the United States; those who did not accept anything which was offered them refused to wear our uniform.

Answer to No. 3, question (a).

In some cases where men were furloughed for farm work: These furloughs were obtained through sympathizers of theirs who brought pressure to bear upon the War Department, which in some cases, according to their own statements, were falsehoods. In one case, that of Pvt. Louis Kopelin, telegram received June 14, commanding general Camp Funston, Kans. Grant Pvt. Louis Kopelin, said to be in Twenty-third Company, One hundred and sixty-fourth Depot Brigade, Camp Funston, Kans., indefinite furlough, without pay or allowance, and direct to report immediately at own expense to J. J. Sheppard, Fort Scott, Kans., for employment. Forward service record to commanding general Central Department, with proper notation therein, showing status of soldier. Expedite and report action. Signed "McCane."

On June 16 Mr. J. I. Sheppard stated he had seen the Secretary of War personally and had been assured that furlough would be granted. In reply to a communication sent to Mr. Sheppard, extracts have been taken, dated June 18. "It pleases me to comply with your request to give you a short statement of the object and purpose of the mission to England, France, and Italy upon which Pvt. Kopelin had gone as secretary. Mr. Sheppard states that he is a true American socialist and that Pvt. Kopelin has been attached to this mission with the hopes that they may offset the lies which are spread through this country by socialists other than through American socialists.

Why did the War Department order this man furloughed for farm work, or did they not know that the mission was other than that represented to them in request of this man's furlough?

In answer to questions b, 4a.

As nothing pertaining to the above questions has been brought up in this camp will not try to debate on these questions.

In answer to question 5.

At no time were conscientious objectors forced or even undue pressure brought to bear upon them, leaning toward their acceptance of military duties, therefore those men violating their acceptance of military duty were entitled to and should have received the proper disciplinary action for their misconduct.

In answer to question 6.

State that in some cases conscientious objectors were transferred and assigned to both medical and hospital units, and are at no time required to bear weapon.

In view of the above questions and their answers I sincerely believe that the military authorities at Camp Funston have exerted every effort possible to carry into effect the policies of the War Department laid down.

On December 12, 1918, the following telegram was received at this camp from the War Department:

"212 KSJ 130GVT GNS 1W,

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 4.15, *December 12, 1918.*

"COMMANDING GENERAL,
"Camp Funston, Kans.:

"Discharge Maj. Gustav C. Taussig, Infantry; Maj. Frank S. White, junior judge advocate general; Capt. R. W. Wittman, military police; Capt. Joseph E. Young, One hundred and sixty-fourth Depot Brigade; and Capt. S. H. Negrotto, Sixty-fifth Pioneer Infantry, from the service as soon as settlement of accounts, completion of records, etc., required in cases of all officers discharged in accordance with general plans for demobilization have been made. Following form of order will be used by you in this connection, 'By direction of the President and under the provisions of section 9, act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, Capt. John Doe, Infantry, is discharged from the service of the United States to take effect this date.'

"HARRIS."

In reference to the above telegram, received from the War Department, it was not known in this camp why these men were discharged other than they had been in close connection, and had been at different times commanding officers over these conscientious objectors, and as they have without question carried out their orders to the letter, it appears that a rank injustice was done them upon the sending of this telegram. The matter was immediately taken up with the War Department through various sources, and on December 17 the following telegram was received: "Reference your telegram 17th, suspend action of discharge of Maj. Taussig and Maj. White until you receive further instructions from War Department." Signed "Harris. 4.15 p. m." In the case of the other three officers included in this telegram, action was suspended on account of their being members of the Regular Army and that such discharge was illegal. The following is a report which reached this office in the form of a handbill, supposed to have been a copy of a diary kept by the conscientious objectors who were in the guardhouse pending confirmation of the sentences which had been imposed upon them by a general court-martial.

Dated Thursday, September 5, 1918.

—

REPORT OF TREATMENT OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS AT CAMP FUNSTON GUARDHOUSE.

(The following extracts are taken from this report. Complete report is on file at Camp Funston.)

On Saturday, September 14, they state that Col. Barnes, provost marshal, called at the guardhouse and ordered them to stand at attention, and when they refused to comply he proceeded to kick the legs of the men; one man (Kaplin) stated he had his legs and ankles bruised as the result, and that upon the colonel leaving the guardhouse he hinted to the prisoners that he would be tempted to pardon them if they would beat these men up. This was not so, as the other prisoners of the guardhouse testified upon being questioned.

On Friday, September 27, they state that while taking their exercises (which in no case they underwent willingly), they were grossly maltreated. They state the bayonet was applied to all of them, one man, Larson, receiving a scar. Two others, Kaplin and Berger, were beaten by the butt end of a rifle and all were kicked and shoved about, and that later in the day, when they were called out and refused to march around the building, bayonets were again used, and upon the guards insisting upon their marching in a strict military posture kicks and blows were rained upon them. One man, Eichel, refused to submit to this abuse, and a guard seized him by the neck, forcing him around the building, heaping blows and kicks upon him at the same time. Later on in the evening one man, Steiner, refused to walk and states he was seized by the ears and dragged around the building. They state a few days after that they were forced under cold shower baths with their clothes on, the result of which one man, Sandin, collapsed and became sick, and upon asking the officer of the day for medical attention was refused.

These are but a very few of the various abuses that they claim were heaped upon them while in the guardhouse, and anyone with half a mind can very readily determine that the claimed abuses are rank falsehoods, as it is ridiculous to believe that any officer or enlisted man is going to deliberately incriminate himself by violating strict regulations that were laid down by the War Department. These men persisted in making the statements that they knew were upheld by the War Department, and that sooner or later this matter or condition would be referred to Mr. Keppel, who would immediately see to it that their superiors were punished.

The following is a copy of a letter mailed to Julius R. Greenberg by his father, inclosed with a letter of his father's own handwriting, which we have here and which states that Mr. Keppel has advised him that he, Julius R. Greenberg, is one of those chosen to be discharged by order of the War Department:

Copy of inclosure.

"WAR DEPARTMENT,
"THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
December 10, 1918.

"Re Julius R. Greenberg case.

"1. Report from the Judge Advocate General's office states that this is one of the several general court-martial cases from Camp Funston recently received in the office of the Judge Advocate General, where recommendation was made that the findings and sentence be disapproved and the soldier restored to duty.

"The case goes to the President for action.

"By order of the Secretary of War.

"(Signed) R. J. HERMAN,
"Adjutant General."

[The following in own handwriting of the writer:]

"For your information, will let you have further information when available.

"(Signed) F. B. KEPPEL."

While dwelling on the subject of various communications, which are claimed to have originated by the War Department, quote the following:

"In the September issue we published a letter to President Wilson on the subject of those in jail for antiwar agitation. The following correspondence explains itself:

"'THE WHITE HOUSE,
"'*Washington, July 30, 1918.*

"'MY DEAR MR. SINCLAIR: Referring to your recent communication, the President has asked us to invite your attention to the inclosed copy of a letter which he has received from the Secretary of War.

"'Sincerely, yours,

"'J. P. TUMULTY,
"'*Secretary to the President.*'

"'WAR DEPARTMENT,
"'*Washington, July 22, 1918.*

"'DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you for sending me Upton Sinclair's interesting communication. I think, however, he should be informed that we are now doing absolutely all that public opinion will stand in the interest of conscientious objectors and others whose views do not happen to coincide with those of the vast majority of their fellow countrymen.

"'I have given directions that all the court-martial cases having to do with these people shall be carefully and sympathetically reviewed in the light of the experience gained by the special board of inquiry, consisting of Judge Mack, Dean Stone, and Maj. Stoddard. The terms of imprisonment which conscientious objectors may, in the last analysis, be compelled to serve will be served in the Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, where the men have a wholesome outdoor life and are kept busy upon things that are worth doing. Most of the conscientious objectors who declined to accept military service in any form, however, are now engaged in farm work at a private's pay, through cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the War Department.

"'I do not know how many of what Mr. Sinclair calls political prisoners are now under the control of the Department of Justice, but if you care to have me do so I could find out from the Attorney General whether there are any prisoners under his direction whom he thinks it wise to have transferred to Fort Leavenworth.

"'Respectfully,

"'NEWTON D. BAKER,
"'*Secretary of War.*'"

Following are statements made to commanding general Camp Funston, Kans., relative to the increased defiance on the part of conscientious objectors after November 1, 1918:

1. During the last few days the prisoners held in my guardhouse awaiting trial who are conscientious objectors have been individually examined by the inspector general at his quarters at the Foreign Mission Building. I have no idea what transpired during the examination of these men, but their defiance to military authority has increased, and I believe it is partly due to the manner in which they were treated by the inspector general and the conditions surrounding the investigation.

2. For some time we have been greatly hampered in the work of caring for these prisoners. Our attempt to properly discipline them and make them abide by the prison rules is seriously affected by the numerous inspections and investigations ordered by the War Department. Upon each of such inspections these men add one more name to their list of sympathizers, and have come to the belief that those of us who are immediately responsible for their keep, care, and discipline are overriding the rules and regulations set out by the War Department and that they have no friends here.

3. As a matter of fact, every conscientious objector prisoner under the control of the provost guard has been treated with such great leniency and given such consideration that those prisoners who are loyal soldiers and confined for purely military offenses, required to suffer all the penalties of discipline because of their being good soldiers, have become disgruntled and dissatisfied in the service. This is quite naturally true when men who have refused to do their duty as soldiers are confined with them and extended privileges never before extended to military or other prisoners.

4. This subject, which has been transferred from a mole hill to a mountain, is now a serious one for those responsible for the care of the prisoners. Not only fellow prisoners, but the guard over such men, hold them in utter contempt, and human nature in man is so constituted that true soldiers can not be made to treat this class of soldiery with any degree of respect. To add to this by encouraging these men in the belief that the War Department and its officials are in full

sympathy with their conduct is to make it impossible for any officer properly to conduct the prison.

5. It is therefore recommended that, if during the present investigation further testimony is to be taken of these prisoners, the inspector general be required to visit the guardhouse for that purpose and that these prisoners be not sent from there for the purpose of interrogation. It is further recommended, in due respect for the decent soldiers, that these men be segregated in a guardhouse separate and apart from any other prisoners, to enable the officers charged with their protection to deal with them as sympathetically as may be required without lowering the discipline in the guardhouse where good soldiers are confined.

(Signed) J. W. BARNES,
Colonel, Infantry, United States Army.

Memorandum for the commanding general.

Subject: Prisoner Lester G. Ott.

1. As it has recently come to my knowledge that one of the prisoners in the military police guardhouse who has given much trouble by reason of his attitude to service of any kind is a man named Lester G. Ott, who was formerly in my employ, I beg to submit certain facts in connection with him which may throw light upon the sincerity of some of the so-called conscientious objectors.

2. Prior to my assignment to duty I was in active practice of the law at Cincinnati, Ohio, as the junior member of the firm of Worthington, Strong & Stettinius. In the late summer of 1917 I employed Ott as a law clerk upon the recommendation of a young lawyer who had been his classmate at the Cincinnati Law School, and of the dean of that school. Ott told me that he had been rejected for military service, because of insufficient weight, by his local draft board at Hamilton, Ohio, and, as I recall it, also told me that he had been refused admission to one of the officers' training camps for the same reason. He further said that he had never been pro-German, and that his friends were not German sympathizers.

3. During the months of December, 1917, and January, 1918, Ott acted as an associate legal adviser to one of the local draft boards at Cincinnati, and, I presume, took the oath set forth in section 317 of the selective-service regulations, as all of the associate legal advisers to local draft boards were required to do so. The oath is probably now on file with the adjutant general of the State of Ohio. As far as I know, Ott's work as a legal adviser was satisfactory, and I heard no complaint that he was endeavoring to dissuade registrants from entering the military service.

4. Early in 1918, at my suggestion, Ott became a member of Company C of the Cincinnati Home Guard, drilled with it, and did guard duty as an armed sentinel on at least one occasion, during the floods in the Ohio River. As a member of the home guard he also took an oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies of the United States.

5. After about three months' service in the Cincinnati Home Guard, Ott resigned, because he had taken additional night employment which prevented his attending drills. Late in April or early in May, he also left the employ of my firm in order to take a position as inspector in some factory doing Government work, because it enabled him to make a larger salary. Shortly thereafter he was placed by his local draft board in class 1 as physically fit for service, was drafted, and sent to Camp Sherman.

6. In June, 1918, I was shown a letter written by Ott, in which he said that he had drilled for a time, but nobody seemed to want him; and as he had been placed with the conscientious objectors, he expected shortly to get furloughed for farm work. I also heard that after he had been at Camp Sherman for some time he was nominated for the office of prosecuting attorney of Butler County, Ohio, on the Socialist ticket.

7. During the time of his employment by my firm, Ott's work as a law clerk was fairly satisfactory, but he was unmanageable, and did not show a willingness to receive instructions. From my knowledge of his character, I am convinced that his objection to military service is based solely on his personal dislike to discipline of any kind, and that his present defiant attitude is due to the type of stubbornness which is shown by a balky mule.

8. Yesterday evening, at the suggestion of the division judge advocate, I called upon the inspector general, Brig. Gen. Williams, who had interrogated Ott in an investigation of complaints made by conscientious objectors, in order to furnish him with the above information, which I thought might assist him in arriving at conclusions in his present investigations. Gen. Williams first told me that he did not know whether or not Ott was conscientious, as the special board to examine into the sincerity of conscientious objectors had decided he was. After referring to his files, however, he said that Ott's case had not yet been decided by that board. I then told him that Ott had been employed by me as a law clerk, and that I felt I knew something about his attitude toward bearing arms. The inspector general, however, refused to allow me to continue, and said politely that the matter was of no interest to him.

(Signed) JOHN L. STETTINIUS,
Major, Judge Advocate, Assistant Division Judge Advocate.

The following reports of conscientious objectors were submitted by Camp Commander Maj. C. E. Desobry—one dated October 14, 1918; the other November 17, 1918.

These reports are contradictory in their entirety; and I honestly believe—in fact, am almost certain—that pressure was brought to bear on Maj. Desobry upon submitting the second report, which originated from a source other than in this camp:

"OFFICE OF CAMP INSPECTOR,
"*Camp Funston, Kans., October 14, 1918.*

"From: Camp inspector.
"Memorandum: For executive officer.
"Subject: Investigation of treatment of conscientious objectors, with recommendation.

"1. Pursuant to verbal instructions from headquarters, Camp Funston, I this day made an investigation of the treatment received by alleged conscientious objectors now in the guardhouse at this camp. From my visit to the guardhouse I found in one cell of ample space 18 of these men. One other was found to be confined in a room by himself in another part of the guardhouse. It appears that these men are in fact mutineers, although under the law they probably couldn't be tried for mutiny. They absolutely and positively refuse to obey any military order or any instructions that appear in any way to be from a military source. They are determined to follow their own individual inclinations and show an utter disregard and contempt for any military rule or regulations imposed upon them. This condition makes it extremely hard for the guard over them to properly handle them. If they are told to take a bath, they will or they won't, as they see fit. They will not march to meals in any orderly formation. If they are to go in or out of a door and decide that by so doing they are obeying a military order, they refuse to do so. Any number of other instances may be quoted to show their attitude toward the military authorities and the Government. Their attitude is extremely exasperating to those who are required to guard and care for them. This has caused possibly in some instances an over amount of force being used to require them to perform necessary things. It is very difficult, particularly for enlisted men over them, to handle these men with gentleness, kindness, and firmness to the proper degree.

"(Signed) S. M. WILLIAMS,
"*Lieutenant Colonel, General Staff, Executive Officer.*"

The attitude of the members of the guard placed over those individuals and all other enlisted men, including prisoners, is naturally one of extreme hostility. From my observation of the surroundings of these men, I believe there is no real foundation for complaint of treatment or criticism of the methods adopted. I believe that under the circumstances they are as well taken care of as could be possibly expected. They are properly housed, properly clothed, properly fed, and are given ample opportunity to maintain cleanliness of both person and surroundings. They are given opportunity to take exercise necessary to maintain their health. No punitive hardships whatever are imposed upon them. One thing, then, I believe necessary is to see that the treatment they receive from those over them is proper and just.

2. In order to insure the proper treatment, care, and security of these men I recommend the following:

3. Recommendation.

(a) That under provisions paragraph (256), Manual of Interior Guard Duty, United States Army, a commissioned officer be detailed as officer in charge of prisoners. This officer to have charge of all prisoners in the camp guardhouse; that he censor all outgoing mail of the conscientious objectors; that he handle incoming mail for these men as prescribed for general prisoners in paragraph (382), Manual of Interior Guard Duty; that he be in charge of the special guard for conscientious objectors to be recommended below; that this office be charged with the duty of seeing that no person be permitted to communicate with any of these conscientious objectors, either directly or indirectly, unless so authorized by the camp commander or the commander of the provost guard; that he make frequent and irregular inspections of the guardroom where these men are confined to see that no unauthorized articles are kept by them, and that all windows, doors, floors, walls, and ceilings are not tampered with, with the view of providing means of communicating with outside persons; that he further be charged with the duty of seeing that these men are sent to meals at the proper time; that they are kept under proper guard while going to and from meals; that they receive proper food; that they be given an opportunity to bathe at least twice a week; that they are given ample opportunity to wash their own clothes; that they be given opportunity to obtain necessary medical attention when sick; that they are not mistreated by those placed over them.

(b) That a special guard consisting of two noncommissioned officers and six privates specially selected for their military bearing, firmness, kindness, and proper conception of military justice be detailed over these conscientious objectors. This recommendation is made with the idea of securing uniform treatment of these men and to remove any opportunity for criticism of treatment of these conscientious objectors by members of the guard.

(c) That these conscientious objectors be allowed to have in their possession only their necessary clothing and toilet articles; that no books, magazines, papers, or reading matter whatsoever be allowed these men, except papers, books, and magazines of recognized worth; that these men be allowed only such reading matter on Sundays; that they be allowed no smoking material of any kind at any time; that they be allowed no eatables, save and except those that are regularly furnished them; that they be turned out into the inclosure for exercise for not less than two hours daily; that they be allowed to write not more than one letter per day; that they be not allowed to have any money in their possession; that such postage stamps as they may require be permitted to remain in their possession; that their writing material be kept by the prison officer and issued by him to them when necessary.

(d) That they be confined in one of the cell rooms by themselves, and that no other prisoners be confined with them.

(Signed) E. C. DESOBRY,
Major, Inspector General.

[First Indorsement.]

HEADQUARTERS CAMP FUNSTON, KANS.,
October 15, 1918.

To provost marshal, Camp Funston, Kans.:

1. Forwarded. The recommendations of the camp inspector are approved. You will take immediate steps to have them put into effect.

By command of Maj. Gen. Wood.

(Signed) S. M. WILLIAMS,
Major, General Staff, Executive Officer.

[Second indorsement.]

PROVOST MARSHAL, TENTH DIVISION,
Camp Funston, Kans., October 18, 1918.

To commanding officer Tenth Military Police, Camp Funston, Kans.

1. For compliance.

(Signed) J. W. BARNES,
Colonel, Infantry, United States Army.

C. O., TENTH MILITARY POLICE,
Camp Funston, Kans., October 22, 1918.

To: Commanding officer, Provost Guard, Camp Funston, Kans.

1. Forwarded for your information.

(Signed) R. W. WITTMAN,
Captain, Infantry, United States Army, Commanding.

OFFICE CAMP INSPECTOR,
Camp Funston, Kans., November 17, 1918.

From: Maj. E. C. Desobry, inspector general, camp inspector.
To: The commanding general Camp Funston, Kans.
Subject: Report of investigation of ill treatment of alleged conscientious objectors.

1. This investigation was made between October 21 and November 13, 1918, pursuant to memoranda, instructions headquarters, Camp Funston, Kans.

2. This investigation was based on complaints made to the Third Assistant Secretary of War in telegrams from Mrs. J. Brandon, Mrs. J. Greenberg, Mrs. J. Berger, and L. Hollingsworth Wood, and letter from Norman Thomas.

3. The following witnesses were interviewed by the inspector and the assistant to the inspector:

Col. J. W. Barnes, Infantry, United States Army.
Maj. Gustav C. Taussig, Infantry, United States Army.
Capt. R. W. Wittman, Infantry, United States Army.
Capt. Joseph H. Buckley, Infantry, United States Army.
Capt. Signey H. Negrotto, Infantry, United States Army.
Capt. Joseph E. Young, Infantry, United States Army.
Capt. Arthur L. Strum, Infantry, United States Army.
Capt. Richard C. Neek, Infantry, United States Army.
Capt. Cyril Milton Stilson, Infantry, United States Army.
Capt. Charles M. Brades, Infantry, United States Army.
Second Lieut. Omar J. Stanley, Infantry, United States Army.
Sergt. John Bell, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Sergt. Noble C. Peet, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Sergt. Ray See, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Sergt. Harry Dalton, Quartermaster Corps.
Sergt. Elmer A. Henderson, Medical Department.
Corpl. James L. Cavanaugh, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Corpl. Homer D. Jamison, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Corpl. Robert L. Lipson, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Corpl. Joseph A. Olson, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Corpl. George L. Raymond, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Corpl. Simon T. Rubottom, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Corpl. John Stretcher, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Corpl. Arthur J. Nordy, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. (First Class) James C. Davis, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. (First Class) Ernest J. O. Sterman, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. (First Class) Roy F. Piper, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. (First Class) Frank J. Schulte, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. (First Class) William Jackson Alworth, Thirteenth Field Artillery.
Pvt. Leo E. Bates, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Everett J. Blagg, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Samuel A. Breeze, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Charles Arthur Bruce, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. H. Burfiend, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Chester F. Burns, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Louis S. Burns, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Hiram T. Burton, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. J. M. Calge, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Harold F. Christiancy, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Ben Edwards, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Reuben Gipe, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Albert O. Hay, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Alfred Johnson, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Leman B. Johnston, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Everett Kempkes, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. William H. Lloyd, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. A. L. McAdams, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Charles H. McFall, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Felipe G. Obregon, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Ralph Leon Pontius, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. John D. Robertson, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. William F. Thomas, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. John B. Valentine, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. August Vecellio, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Terry O. Wallace, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. Jess B. Winsted, Military Police Company, attached to Tenth Division.
Pvt. John C. Bond, Company F, Forty-first Infantry.
Pvt. Charles Cavender, Company D, Sixty-ninth Infantry.
Pvt. William David, Company F, Forty-first Infantry.
Pvt. Waldemar B. Lossman, Company B, Twenty-ninth Machine Gun Battalion.
Pvt. J. B. Miller, Forty-first Infantry.
Pvt. William Spellerberg, Company D, Sixty-ninth Infantry.
Pvt. Harry J. Wagner, camp exchange detachment.
Pvt. Francis M. Willcoxen, Company A, Twenty-ninth Machine Gun Battalion.
Pvt. Gilbert E. Wyatt, headquarters troops, Tenth Division.
Pvt. Joseph Brandon, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Mayer Bernstein, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Benjamin Breger, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Ulysses De Rosa, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. David Eichel, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Morris Franklin, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Julius R. Greenberg, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Francis X. Hennessey, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Herman D. Kaplan, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Charles P. Larson, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Henry Monskey, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Lester G. Ott, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Resford Powell, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. John E. Downey, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Max Sandin, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Thomas Shotkin, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Emanuel Silver, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Francis Steinerm, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans.
Pvt. Alfred J. Schulte, Medical Corps.
Pvt. Frank W. Satman, Ambulance Company 238, Tenth Sanitary Train.
Pvt. Vernon L. Kooncs, Company B, One hundred and forty-second Infantry.
Pvt. Robert C. Pratt, Battery B, Ninth Field Artillery.
Pvt. Quilla Davis, Five hundred and thirtieth Engineers Service Battalion.
Pvt. Henry K. Laje, Ambulance Company 238, Tenth Sanitary Train.
Pvt. George Krempkau, Company B, Twenty-ninth Machine Gun Battalion, Tenth Division.
Pvt. Scott E. Craft, Company B, One hundred and forty-second Infantry.

All witnesses were examined separate and apart from each other.

The record of their testimony is hereto appended.

4. The following facts are deduced:

First. That during the months of September and October, 1918, 19 enlisted men who claimed to be conscientious objectors and who were awaiting trial for violation of the sixty-fourth article of war were confined in the guardhouse at this camp.

Second. That, due to an apparent absence of instructions, the prison authorities attempted to treat these enlisted men as ordinary prisoners awaiting trial.

Third. That these enlisted men refused to observe prison regulations; in fact, refused to recognize military authority.

Fourth. That at least on three occasions some of these enlisted men were put on bread and water diet for refusing to obey prison regulations.

Fifth. That some of these enlisted men at one time went on a hunger strike as a protest, as stated by some of them, of the conditions imposed on them.

Sixth. That on several occasions some of them were given cold shower baths for refusing to observe prison regulations, this order being given by Capt. R. W. Wittman, Military Police Company, Tenth Division, officer in charge of prisoners.

Seventh. That upon several occasions some of them were given cold shower baths after refusing to take them as a matter of personal cleanliness.

Eighth That the guard attempted to compel them to take exercise in the inclosure, and as a rule succeeded.

Ninth. That on the night of September 7, 1918, they were deprived of their beds and one of them was deprived of his blankets as a disciplinary measure, by order of Capt. Joseph H. Buckley, Infantry, United States Army, officer of the day, acting under instructions from Maj. Gustav C. Taussig, Infantry, United States Army, officer in charge of prisoners.

Tenth. That on the night of September 23–24, 1918, these men were paraded every time the relief of the guard was formed as a disciplinary measure, this order being given by Capt. Richard C. Meek, Infantry, United States Army, officer of the day, acting under instructions from Maj. Gustav C. Taussig, Infantry, United States Army, officer in charge of prisoners.

Eleventh. That on the morning of October 8, 1918, Pvt. Hyman Block, one of the alleged conscientious objectors, was given a cold shower bath with his clothes on before appearing before the court-martial appointed to try him.

Twelfth. That on the morning of October 8, 1918, while attempting to compel Pvt. Ulysses De Rosa, one of the alleged conscientious objectors, to exercise by marching around the inclosure of the guardhouse, the guard found it necessary to pick him up from the ground, and that afterwards they gave him a shower bath.

Thirteenth. That on the morning of October 9, 1918, Col. John W. Barnes, Infantry, United States Army, commanding Trains and Military Police, Tenth Division, while attempting to compel some of the alleged conscientious objectors to stand at attention struck at least two of them—Pvt. Thomas Shotkin and Julius R. Greenberg—on the feet and legs with his riding crop.

Fourteenth. That on the morning of October 19, 1918, Sergt. John Bell, Military Police Company, Tenth Division, while commander of the guard, ordered two of the alleged conscientious objectors—Pvt. Lester G. Ott being one of them—to assist in cleaning up the latrine, and upon refusal struck him.

Fifteenth. That on various other occasions when some of the alleged conscientious objectors refused to take exercise by marching around the inclosure they were forcibly required to do so by members of the guard.

Sixteenth. That these alleged conscientious objectors received sufficient food to sustain life and health and had sufficient time in which to eat.

Seventeenth. That they received proper medical attention.

Eighteenth. That they were never deprived at any time of drinking water for any time of sufficient length to endanger their health or cause them any hardship.

Nineteenth. That at times the members of the guard, particularly Sergt. John Bell, Corpl. John T. Stretcher, and Pvt. (first class) Roy F. Piper, Military Police Company, Tenth Division, in carrying out the instructions given them used means and language too drastic in compelling their obedience.

Twentieth. That a feeling of hostility existed between the members of the guard and the alleged conscientious objectors, due to the feeling on the part of the guard that these alleged conscientious objectors should be required to perform the military duties required of others.

5. Conclusions:

First. That the prison authorities were in a very difficult position in their efforts to enforce discipline among these alleged conscientious objectors due to their absolute defiance of all military authority.

Second. That summary punishment for breaches of prison discipline on the part of these alleged conscientious objectors was the only method, in fact, that could be used for the very obvious reason that trial by courts-martial of these men for such offenses and the awarding of forfeitures and confinement with hard labor would have had no effect on them due to their attitude toward military authority and the probability of their being convicted of a violation of the 64th Article of War followed, in all probabilities, by a sentence of dishonorable discharge from the service and confinement at hard labor for a long period of time.

Third. That the absence of orders published by the War Department, governing special treatment of these alleged conscientious objectors was the reason the prison authorities attempted to compel, on the part of these men, the same observance of prison regulations as was required of the other prisoners.

Fourth. That the giving of shower baths as a disciplinary measure was too drastic at times and other means should have been used to enforce discipline.

Fifth. That the methods used in compelling these men to take exercise by marching around the guard house was too drastic at times.

Sixth. That the placing of these men on a bread and water diet was unauthorized by the manual of interior guard duty as they were neither general or garrison prisoners (but see 2d conclusion).

Seventh. That Col. John W. Barnes, Infantry, United States Army, in striking the alleged conscientious objectors with his riding crop was not, under the law, justified and violated the 96th Article of War.

Eighth. That Sergt. John Bell, Military Police Company, 10th Division, was not justified in striking the alleged conscientious objectors on the morning of October 19, 1918.

Ninth. That Maj. Gustav C. Taussig, Infantry, United States Army, permitted too drastic measures to be used in compelling the alleged conscientious objectors to take exercise.

Tenth. That Capt. R. W. Wittman, Military Police Company, 10th Division, permitted too drastice measures to be used in compelling the alleged conscientious objectors to take shower baths and exercise.

Eleventh. That Sergt. John Bell, Corpl. John T. Stretcher, Pvt. (first class) Roy F. Piper, Military Police Company, 10th Division, and other members of the guard used means and language too drastic in carrying out their instructions, but due to conflicting testimony received it is not very probable they could be held responsible.

Twelfth. That Corpl. Joseph A. Olson, Military Police Company, 10th Division, commander of the guard on the morning of October 8, 1918, was responsible for the sending Pvt. Hyman Block to the court-martial room in wet clothes.

Thirteenth. That Pvt. De Rosa was handled unnecessarily rough on the morning of October 8, 1918, but in view of the very conflicting testimony it is not probable any members of the guard could be held responsible.

Fourteenth. That the members of the guard in giving testimony in this investigation were, in a great many instances, evasive, withheld the truth and undoubtedly gave false testimony.

6. Recommendations:

First. That Col. John W. Barnes, Infantry, United States Army, be brought to trial under the 96th Article of War for striking with his riding crop Pvt. Thomas Shotkin and Julius R. Greenberg, Company A, 1st Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans., on the morning of October 9, 1918.

Second. That Sergt. John Bell, Military Police Company, Tenth Division, be brought to trial under the ninth article of war, for striking Pvt. Lester G. Ott, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans., on October 19, 1918.

Third. That Corpl. Joseph A. Olson, Military Police Company, Tenth Division, be brought to trial under the ninth article of war, for allowing, while commander of the guard, the sending of Pvt. Hyman Block, Company A, First Casual Battalion, Fort Riley, Kans., to the court-martial room in wet clothes.

Fourth. That Maj. Gustav C. Taussig, Infantry, United States Army, be reprimanded for permitting unnecessarily rough measures being used in compelling the alleged conscientious objectors to take exercise.

Fifth. That Capt. R. W. Wittman, Military Police Company, Tenth Division, be reprimanded for permitting the use of measures of too drastic a nature in compelling the alleged conscientious objectors to bathe and take exercise.

(Signed) E. C. DESOBRY.

CAMP FUNSTON, KANS., *January 6, 1919.*

EXAMINATION OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

HENRY LAYMAN.

Q. What is your name?—A. Henry Layman.

Q. Where are you from?—A. Colorado; Ordway, Colo.

Q. What branch of Mennonites?—A. I belong to the Church of God.

Q. How long have you belonged?—A. Since 1916.

Q. You have belonged about two years? Swear you belong that long?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do your father and mother belong to that church?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do your brothers and sisters?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many brothers have you?—A. I have got two right brothers. He is my stepfather.

Q. You call stepbrothers "right brothers"?—A. I have got two real brothers.

Q. Any sisters?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you any brothers in the Army?—A. No, sir.

Q. How old a boy are you?—A. Sir, me? I am 24 this fall.

Q. How much schooling have you had?—A. I have none in America, just a few, couple months; I was born in Russia.

Q. Born in Russia?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you been naturalized?—A. Yes, sir; I have been naturalized. Soon as I was in the Army. Yes, sir; I got my citizen papers. I am here in the Army.

Q. You are doing noncombatant work?—A. Yes, sir; I did work in truck company.

Q. Are you doing it now?—A. I am not now.

Q. What do you mean by that exactly?—A. I am working some here. Whatever I could do.

Q. Is it against the creed of your church to take up fighting?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you mean to tell me that? Do you know what the creed of your church is?—A. I will explain as good as I can. I not highly educated American. When we join church we got to be given up all our sin and follow Christ Jesus in his way and be a true man in all ways, live up in God's way.

Q. And you think that you follow that pretty well?—A. Yes, sir. Just as much power I got. Just as much as God give me power.

Q. Read your Bible in Russian and American?—A. In German.

Q. How often do you read it?—A. Most every day. I tried to read the Bible several years.

Q. Do you find anything in the Bible that makes you think it wrong to go to war?—A. It is in certain ways, I guess. It says not to kill anybody; got to love your enemies.

Q. Do you love the Germans?—A. The Bible says you got to love the enemies.

Q. Do you love your enemies?—A. I got no enemies, as far as I know.

Q. Do you love the Germans?—A. I got nothing against nobody in this world.

Q. Do you want Germany in this country?—A. I never give that any thought.

Q. Did you buy any liberty bonds? Thrift stamps? Give any to the Red Cross?—A. Well, I guess they never ask me.

Q. Would it have been against your conscience to buy any stamps?—A. Not really.

Q. Is there any reason why you should not go and fight?—A. Yes, sir; I belong to a religious sect and follow Christ Jesus.

Q. What do you think would happen to you if you did go and fight?—A. I would cross God's command.

Q. Ever swear, ever drink, ever smoke, ever have any connection with a woman?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever go to moving pictures?—A. No, sir; and no man can prove it.

Q. Why not?—A. It is not right, and our church does not believe in it. And I don't, either.

Q. What is your business?—A. My business is farming.

Q. In Kansas?—A. Colorado.

Q. Not married?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you live with your people?—A. Yes, sir; with my father.

Capt. Smithey requested permission to ask a question, as follows:

Q. If a negro were about to rape your mother and the only way that you could prevent it was to shoot him, and you had a gun, would you do it?—A. No, sir. I would not shoot him. I could not kill the man. I would be going against God's law.

Q. Would you argue and reason with him?—A. I would tell him to get out. I would not kill him.

Q. Would you use force—would you strike him, knock him down?—A. That would not be right.

Q. You think that is following Christ's teachings?—A. Well, I am going to be a perfect man.

Q. Do you recall where Christ went in the temple and saw the money changers?—A. Yes, sir; I do.

Q. What did he do?—A. He ran them out with a rope. I don't believe he abused anybody.

(End of Capt. Smithey's interrogation. Maj. Kellogg resumes interrogatory:)

Q. Well, now, you say you don't believe Christ hit any of them with the whip. He just took the whip and [pantomime of waving an imaginary whip]. Now, suppose the negro was going to rape your mother and you had a pistol, you would point it at him? Wouldn't you scare him?—A. No, sir.

Q. That is just what Christ did. He just made them believe he was going to hit them?—A. He told them the house was not made for buying and selling.

Q. Well, suppose you told the negro this house was not made for raping. Wouldn't you?—A. I don't believe it would be right for me to point the pistol against him.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, on this, the 12th day of February, the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, it is very interesting to consider for a few moments the progress of the colored people of this country who feel greatly indebted to him for his efforts in securing for them freedom and opportunity.

On September 22, 1862, President Lincoln issued his emancipation proclamation wherein he stated that on January 1, 1863, all persons held as slaves within certain States were to be free. The close of the Civil War found the colored man free—not only free, but he was invested with all the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

How he has progressed since that time is now a matter of history, reduced to figures and facts, and it is well for us to consider them, bearing in mind that the civilization and progress and accomplishments of this race have taken place in the last half of a century.

In 1915 the races of the world were in about the following proportions: Yellow, 703,000,000; white, 560,000,000; colored, 258,000,000.

To give an idea of the great increase in the efficiency of the colored race I desire to submit the following figures:

Homes owned, 1866, 12,000; 1916, 600,000.

Farms operated, 1866, 20,000; 1916, 981,000.

Business conducted, 1866, 2,100; 1916, 45,000.

Wealth accumulated, 1866, $20,000,000; 1916, $1,000,000,000.
Now let us turn to educational statistics:
Percentage literate, 1866, 10 per cent; 1916, 75 per cent.
College and normal schools, 1866, 15; 1916, 500.
Teachers in public schools, 1866, 600; 1916, 36,900.
Students in public schools, 1866, 100,000; 1916, 1,736,000.
Property for higher education, 1866, $60,000; 1916, $21,500,000.
Expenditures for education, 1866, $700,000; 1916, $14,600,000.
The religious progress of the colored race has been wonderful, and here are the figures:
Number of churches, 1866, 700; 1916, 42,000.
Number of communicants, 1866, 600,000; 1916, 4,570,000.
Number of Sunday schools, 1866, 1,000; 1916, 43,000.
Number of Sunday-school pupils, 1866, 50,000; 1916, 2,400,000.
Value of church property, 1866, $1,500,000; 1916, $76,000,000.

In 1914, in the State of Georgia, colored citizens made returns upon $38,603,307 worth of property and owned 1,592,555 acres of land.

In North Carolina colored citizens made returns upon $32,197,890 worth of property.

In Virginia colored people owned 1,674,823 acres of land and had $37,851,973 worth of real and personal property.

In 1900 colored people were interested in 51 banks and insurance companies that held policies to the amount of $25,800,000.

Colored people have interested themselves in playgrounds for children, social improvement, negro uplift, civic improvement, health improvement.

They have won prizes in raising corn, pigs, cotton, potatoes, and other vegetables.

They have noted preachers, inventors, teachers, sculptors, actors, singers, painters, composers, and musicians.

The colored man in the wars of the United States has always shown himself loyal, patriotic, and ready to fight, never flinching from duty.

The blood of colored men has been shed upon every battle field from the Boston massacre to the time of the signing of the armistice last November.

Crispus Attucks, a colored man, was the first to fall in the Boston massacre, March 5, 1770.

Samuel Lawrence led a company of colored soldiers at Bunker Hill.

Peter Salem fired the shot that killed Maj. Pitcairn.

The Black Legion in 1779 covered themselves with glory at the siege of Savannah.

Over 3,000 served in the Revolutionary War and fought for the independence of this Nation.

They served with Commodore Perry on Lake Erie, who spoke highly of their bravery, courage, and fearlessness.

They fought under the great Jackson at New Orleans, and helped turn back the British on that eventful day.

They marched with Gen. Scott into Mexico and suffered with David Crockett on the Alamo.

Nearly 200,000 fought in the Union armies during the Civil War, and showed their bravery on numerous occasions.

On November 23, 1861, at a review of Confederate soldiers 1,400 colored soldiers marched, out of the 28,000 in the review.

It was the famous Tenth Cavalry that came to the rescue of Col. Roosevelt in the first battle in Cuba.

The Twenty-fifth Infantry took a prominent part at El Caney and the Ninth and Tenth at San Juan Hill.

In this present world war thousands of colored soldiers went over the top for freedom and democracy.

Over 33 colored people have received Carnegie medals, 3 graduated from West Point, and they have a lower percentage of crime than many foreign races that come to this country.

What the colored man needs is education and an equal opportunity. Education is the only safeguard for free institutions, and if this opportunity is given the colored race what will he do in the next 50 years?

Lynchings are a form of anarchy, whether the person lynched is black, white, or yellow. They should be discouraged by all the means and all the power at the Government command. If one crowd of people can lynch one person, whether he is innocent or guilty, one never knows who will be the victim of the next lynching.

I am in favor of giving every man, black or white, an even opportunity to work out his own salvation.

Equal opportunity is the essence of a free government; without it a free government ceases to exist.

Every child in this country should be given an opportunity to obtain an education. It should be a part of the fundamental law of the land. Republics that have failed in the past have failed because the people were not all educated.

"There is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us that it hardly behooves any of us to speak ill of the rest of us." That is a good policy.

I desire to speak strongly for the education of the colored man, for the care of his health, and the giving him an opportunity to work out his own future.

Many colored pupils have graduated from public schools and colleges at the head of their classes, and what one colored pupil has done many others can do and will do if given an opportunity.

In the city where I live—Cleveland, Ohio—there are colored lawyers and doctors, who stand very high in their profession, and some of the most eloquent preachers I ever listened to.

They are but representatives of the future of the colored citizen in the professions.

In conclusion let me state that if a people can accomplish these things in 50 of the first years of their freedom, what will they accomplish in the second 50?

Time alone can answer the question. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH, by unanimous consent, had leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, of course an Army and Navy are absolutely necessary to the protection and welfare of the Government, not only for the purpose of its own defense but also to see that its rights are protected and its sovereignty maintained. A short time ago it was absolutely necessary that the United States should engage in war. We found ourselves very inadequately prepared, but with the enthusiasm, with the spirit of determination of the citizens of the Republic, we set about immediately to organize an army. I am pleased to say that the test of the Republic was shown in the patriotism of its soldiers.

We have sometimes heard that a kingdom or a monarchy was the best fitted to assemble its soldiers, because their subjects are taught to serve and obey; but history has proven upon every field in many wars that the American soldiers eclipse the soldiers of any nation as fighters under every condition and never falter at any time or in any clime. [Applause.]

They came from their homes, they came willingly, and they were not urged. They were eager to go to the front. They did not request to fight alone in their own country. They raised no constitutional question that they could not be compelled to go into a foreign country to fight. But, as stated in the little poem of "Bill"—

They wanted to go over to France,
And wear those blooming pants;
They wanted to be before it was done
A roaring, fighting, son of a gun.
They wanted to follow wherever they led;
They wanted to prove their blood was red,
They wanted to go to France.
They wanted to go over to France and learn to take a chance.
They wanted to be before it was done
A roaring, fighting, son of a gun;
They wanted to hike and carry a pack,
And they didn't care if they didn't come back,
They wanted to go over to France.

Those who remained at home do not ask us for congratulations because they did not have to go to France, but they say that they are sorry they were not given the chance to serve in the front lines, go over the top, and follow the flag in a foreign clime. This war has demonstrated that the country need not be afraid when the time comes about the boys rallying to the flag. I do not care whether it is to suppress or fight Bolshevism or the I. W. W., or anarchy, the country is safe in the hands of the great American citizen and soldier. [Applause.] There is no place here for sedition. There is no place here for those who advocate a different form of government than ours. And why? Because we absolutely have the best Government the sun shines on. More men have fought for the principles upon which the Government of the United States is founded, more men today are ready to uphold and advocate the blessings and benefits of our Republic, than ever before. We have become more united and the foundations of our institutions have been strengthened by and because of the war. And woe to the traitor who seeks to undermine our Government or intrigue against our Nation. No men or set of men, organized or unorganized, should conspire against it. Wherever a republic has been formed or a new nation come into being, since the Republic of the United States, that country has turned to the Republic of the United States for its guiding principles. Our Republic is the oldest, and it goes on, anchoring its hope, its welfare, and its future prosperity, so full of opportunities, to the patriotism of its citizens. Here every man is the equal of every other man in the eyes of the law, marching on to a destiny that knows no bounds. Here in this our blessed Government let each and every one of us not only dedicate our life but also our sacred honor and our utmost resources to the limit against every foe, whether foreign or domestic.

My friends, the citizens of this Government gave these men willingly and they went willingly. We have won this war. Some think that never again ought there to be a time when the United States would have to rely upon the navy of another nation. One gentleman addressing this House yesterday said that and I wondered how many other nations relied upon the Navy of the United States. It came out at the right time. It came to the rescue. How many nations depended upon the soldiers of the United States?

The great question of demobilization is now upon us; and now that the war is over I think these men should be returned to their homes and to their previous occupations. They did not enlist or enter the Army for the purpose of making a life work of soldiering. I think that they should now be demobilized and every man returned to his home who has a place waiting for him. I think it would be a good plan if a survey of the men in the Army were taken and those who have positions waiting for them discharged and sent home, so that they may pursue their former vocations.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. No one wants to see the boys come back more quickly than I do, but I want to ask this. The gentleman said the war is over.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I did not mean that abstractly if I did.

Mr. LAZARO. Is the war really over?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is not.

Mr. LAZARO. And we saw fit to go into this war.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly; and very properly; to save our Nation and prevent German world dominion over us as well as all other nations, as I believe.

Mr. LAZARO. And it is our war as well as it is their war.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There is no doubt about that now.

Mr. LAZARO. The question is, Ought we to come back before the treaty of peace is signed?

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

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman more time.

Mr. LAZARO. In that connection I would like to know if the gentleman knows how many men are required as an army of occupation until the peace treaty is signed, and whether or not we are bound to contribute our quota to that army of occupation?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not think that we are bound to contribute our quota to the army of occupation. I think a great mistake was made in signing the armistice before we marched our Army into Berlin, much as I defer to the conclusion reached by our military leaders to do so. I think further than that that if our Commander in Chief is over there to establish this league of nations he ought to wait until he forms and agrees upon a treaty of peace. That, in my opinion, should come first. If any league of nations will compel us to furnish an army to protect the borders of these small European states and nations or to keep the boys or an army in Europe, or to keep or to send them into Russia, then I am against it. I do not think that our Army has any place, when this war is won, in a foreign country of Europe. We did not send our Army and our Navy into Europe or enter the war for the purpose of policing or permanent occupation. We sent it there to bring Germany to time, as I recollect the declaration of war. We have finished that job. The other nations can now take care of Germany, and we should bring our boys home. [Applause.]

Mr. LAZARO. But the gentleman does not answer my first question. I asked the gentleman whether or not this war was our war as well as theirs and whether or not the war was over, and the gentleman said that the war was over.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, I wish to modify that by saying it is not completely over yet, but Germany is licked. I think there is a great deal of unrest over there still, but I feel absolutely sure that England, France, Italy, and our allies can take care of Germany, and if Germany wants more of it these European allies can give her all she wants. I think the war is not in shape yet that all troops can be actually taken away, but, as stated, I think there are plenty of other troops over there to complete the work. We do not ask for any territory; we say that we are not asking for any indemnities; but I think we should have some pay for our losses when the other nations get theirs. If other nations outside of Belgium and France get nothing, of course we do the same. If this league of peace compels us to pay a part of the total cost of this war, as some of the published reports claim, then I am against that. I do not want any league formed for that purpose. [Applause.]

As I understand it and as I read and remember, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin were for a league of nations. Washington told us to avoid entangling foreign alliances. They called it then a congress of nations. I am for peace. I have often made use of the quotation to beat the swords into plowshares, and I have recited Tennyson's Locksley Hall so many times throughout my district that I think they all have heard it. I am essentially for peace. We will have peace in due course. The fighting has ceased, and it should take no longer to demobilize the Army than it did to mobilize it and put it into the field.

I particularly think it was a great mistake to send our boys into Russia. We debated the Navy bill for days on the floor of the House, and we have debated the Army bill all of to-day, but no one seems to know or can tell just why our Army was sent into Russia, or how long it will remain there, or when it will be returned. The people, the parents of the boys, and the country are greatly worried and very solicitous about them. Already leagues and societies are formed and are petitioning Congress for their return. I want to close my remarks by inserting a telegram which I received from one of these organizations. I wish our Commander in Chief would command the American troops to return from Russia to America. I am sure that this telegram expresses the sentiment of the country, and I hope our troops now in Russia may return home without further delay. An article appearing in the Battle Creek Inquirer, the leading paper published in that city, of February 9, is headed as follows:

Relatives of men in Russia meet to-day—A mass gathering is called for 2 o'clock in city hall for an exchange of views.

The telegram above referred to follows:

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., *February 9, 1919.*

Congressman J. M. C. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the wives, parents, brothers, sisters, and friends of the boys in Russia, ask you to get in connection with Senators TOWNSEND and JOHNSON and all other Senators and Congressmen you possibly can, and, if possible, bring about the very early recall of our boys from Russia, as we have no quarrel with the Russian people, and we understand our boys are in grave danger.

RUSSIA RECALL LEAGUE,
By BUELAH CALDWELL, *Secretary.*

[Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUFKIN], and he is the last speaker.

Mr. LUFKIN. Mr. Chairman, this House on Saturday adopted a conference report making the law of this land, so far as this body is concerned, the largest single tax measure in the history of the world, a tax measure which proposes to extract $6,000,000,000 from the pockets of the American people. Yesterday we commenced to spend some of the money which we are going to raise by that tax bill. We started in by appropriating over $700,000,000 for the naval bill and in authorizing over $400,000,000 more. To-day we are starting in to spend some more of that tax. We are commencing the consideration of the largest Army appropriation bill in the history of this country in peace times, and in the short time that is accorded me to-night I desire to read a letter which I have received to-day from one of my constituents, a prominent professional man in Massachusetts, who gives what seems to me to be some very interesting comments on the present administration of these large appropriations. The letter is dated Boston, February 8, 1919, and is as follows:

BOSTON, *February 8, 1919.*

Hon. WILLFRED W. LUFKIN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUFKIN: As a constituent of yours, I desire to thank you for your position on the income-tax bill now pending in Congress for $6,000,000,000 to assist in carrying on the war. I hope that you will be able to come home and help in the victory loan, the drive for which is soon to be started. The Government needs every financial assistance to carry on the war now raging about the peace table in Paris. I am particularly interested in the above matter, as I have a son now in France who enlisted as a private who would not have been reached in the draft, being in class 4. He was offered a commission as a second lieutenant in the Quartermaster Department, but declined it, thinking his duty was to fight. He went overseas in June, leaving a wife and a child less than 4 months of age. In a letter written December 28, the last one received by me, he informed me that the last letter he received from home was dated October 1, mailed in Paris by an English officer who sailed from Halifax. No letter from his wife since September. Since July 1 he has received one month's pay, which, after deducting his wife's allowance and his insurance, left him in the vicinity of $5. Since June I have sent him by checks and cables $700, hoping that some of it at least might reach him, but they have not. Packages for Christmas also failed to arrive.

I know that it is not the fault of the Government that his mail is not delivered or that he has not received his pay, for Gen. Pershing urged every one to write, write, write to their husband or son, as nothing in the world cheered a soldier like letters from home (there has been at least five letters every week since his departure and no delivery of mail with the exception of the letters before named since August). If he needs letters to cheer him up, I am much worried for fear that he may develop acute melancholia; or that the $4 paid him by the Government may lead him into a wasteful and extravagant habit in his mode of life and make it harder for him when he returns and has nothing but his profession to fall back on for the

support of himself and his family. Could you not get a portion of the hundred million dollar appropriation that you voted for to feed the hungry of Russia, Bulgaria, Turkey, Italy, and France, to keep down the rising tide of social unrest. I am sure that France, always generous, would be pleased to give up all or any part of her contribution to pay off an American soldier. He would at once put it in circulation in their country. Would it not have been well to have amended the bill providing that said sum should be paid when our own soldiers had received what was due them? Of course I know that this is not the fault of our Government that letters are not delivered or that the paymaster has not the money to give the boys their monthly pay, but it is the niggardly and parsimonious American people that have embarrassed this Government in not furnishing sufficient money to carry it on to a successful termination.

I write this letter "more in sorrow than in anger," but when you appreciate that the deaths from the influenza in this country were so terribly exaggerated in the French papers, and you keep receiving letters from one over there without one word of complaint, simply begging for letters, letters, letters—"Are you alive?" etc.—it gets under an old man's skin in time. If you will get me a passport to France I will go over and carry letters from his wife and mother, a picture of his baby, and a little cash from the old man, without any expense to this Government. I will pay my taxes without a murmur, subscribe for the victory loan, buy thrift stamps, make contributions to the Red Cross, Salvation Army, Knights of Columbus, Young Men's Christian Association, milk for French babies, and potatoes for Irish ones; will send all of my old clothes to the Belgians, pay the luxury tax on my new ones; will go without liquor after July 1; will keep all the commandments and wish there were more for me to keep—all of this, O Lord, will I do, if you will only get one little postal card to my son on the other side announcing that his wife and daughter, mother and father still live.

[Applause.]

You might also bring, incidentally, to the attention of the one who is responsible for this situation the words of the Prophet Isaiah, "They praise me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me."

Very truly, yours,

P. S.—Do not let my name appear if you use this letter, as they might send the kid to Siberia.

[Applause.]

And so it has been all along the line. From the very day the American forces landed in France the mail conditions have been intolerable and the system of payments, especially to the wounded and sick men in the hospitals, a disgrace to any great organized effort of this sort. At the beginning the War Department passed the buck to the Post Office Department, and it was promptly passed back again. "The mail conditions are improving," said the Postmaster General and the Secretary of War on this side. "Conditions are improving" echoed Gen. Pershing and his staff across the sea. Apparently everyone was satisfied except the officers and the men themselves, who continued to receive no mail or mail at very irregular intervals and who still considered a regular pay day as a total stranger.

"But this is war," said the defenders of the administration. "These soldiers can not expect to have things go on with the regularity in vogue during peace times." This argument might be sound were it not for the fact that no such conditions existed in the English Army. Apparently the English and Canadian soldiers received both their pay and mail with regularity and dispatch. But allowing for all the difficulties to be overcome while the troops were on constant move during the period of hostilities, what excuse is there for these conditions to continue and even to grow worse now that most of the units are located at fixed points? What excuse is there for a wounded American soldier in a hospital for months to have received no mail since last summer, though his family had written him on an average of four times a week? What excuse is there for these letters to be returned to the father and mother of that boy, letters which were properly and fully addressed, as described in a letter which I have recently received from a constituent in Marblehead, Mass. Listen to this:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: To you the people from this district pour out their troubles. Here goes mine: I have a son, a private in Battery A, One hundred and first Regiment, Field Artillery, American Expeditionary Forces. He has been wounded three times in action, and has been cited by Gen. Clarence R. Edwards, formerly commanding the Twenty-sixth Division, for heroic acts of bravery under enemy fire.

On January 2, 1919, we received a letter from him, dated December 12, 1918. At that time he was on his way back from the hospital (Base 19) to his battery, and he gave his address Army Post Office 709, American Expeditionary Forces. In that letter he stated that he had not received a single word from home since August, 1918, a period of over four months. Never a week passes by that less than four letters, besides newspapers, are mailed to him by we home folks, and he was terribly worried about us, as he knew that the influenza was raging here. To-day we received 11 letters we had addressed to him. The envelopes, which I am inclosing in this letter, that you may note the stamped dates on them and also see that they were properly addressed.

I hold those envelopes here, all clearly and completely addressed.

You may note that the first date is August 25, and in the boy's letter of December 12 he wrote that the letter of August 19 was the last one he received.

I am a patient and loyal man and have endured many things in silence, because the country was at war. But now patience ceases to be a virtue when I think of the inefficient way in which this Democratic Government has treated the wounded soldiers. We were advised to write letters to our boys, to keep up their morale, but it seems that Secretary Baker and Postmaster General Burleson, of cable-grabbing fame, are so interested in the political future of the Democratic Party and the furtherance of their own political future that such a thing as a home letter to a poor wounded boy lying in a hospital 3,000 miles from home is of no moment to them. It is easier to transport that letter 3,000 miles across the ocean and 3,000 miles back than to make an attempt to find the wounded boy.

God knows, and He only, where all the letters we wrote in October and November and December are. Perhaps they are on the way back to this country, and that poor boy of mine will wait in vain to hear from home.

If you could find out for me just where he is located back in his battery or at a replacement camp, I would send him a cablegram to let him know that we home folks are all right. His mother is terribly worried about the boy worrying about us. If the inclosed envelopes will be of any assistant to you in helping to arouse the majority (thank God, soon to be in the minority) party to some semblance of their responsibility to the people and not their party, you can use them in any way you please.

If the Barnum and Bailey circus parade now going on in Europe is over, and if the descriptions of that triumphal tour have all been cabled across to this country, I would suggest that President Wilson devote part of his time to straightening out the Burleson mess of congested mail conditions. Col. House is there with him, and if they are not enough, perhaps some more Texas politicians could be sent over to help out.

Seriously, Mr. Congressman, I am sore to-night when I think of the worry that has been needlessly inflicted upon my kid by the mess this administration has made in looking after the comfort and welfare of our boys. Thanking you for what you have done for me and all Marblehead in this war, I close.

Very truly, yours,

And these complaints are not confined to any one group of people or to any one section of the country. I quote you from an editorial from the Lowell Sun, one of the leading Democratic newspapers published in the district represented by my colleague, the Hon. JOHN JACOB ROGERS, who himself has for months been making a fight against existing conditions. Listen to what the editor of that Democratic newspaper has to say:

One of the most glaring instances of the failure of overseas mail to arrive at its destination in France was brought to my attention a day or two ago when I heard the story told by a Lowell young woman, who in one mail received back 38 of her own letters, written over a period of several months. The next day brought several more. Why they never reached the soldier to whom they were addressed is not known, but that does not alleviate hours of disheartening waiting which he doubtlessly experienced. A soldier away from home, without mail, soon loses his enthusiasm for the job at hand. The Government, and more acutely the postal department, should have realized this and made more than ever possible effort to get overseas mail through. This is not a remote case by any means, although it is the most deplorable piece of evidence yet brought to our attention.

Here is a case from Salem, Mass., describing another abuse now going on in France, to wit, the practice of transferring men discharged from the hospitals to new units under orders to continue indefinitely in France instead of restoring them to their old divisions and comrades, slated for an early return to this country.

Hon. WILLFRED W. LUFKIN.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor of calling your attention to a case which I should like very much to have your opinion of. My son, a corporal in Company B, One hundred and fourth United States Infantry, was sent to a hospital on October 28 with trench feet. In a letter received from him, under date of December 10, he states that he was discharged from the hospital the last of November and, with some more men of the Twenty-sixth Division, was marched to Dillon and assigned to the Three hundred and nineteenth Regiment, Eightieth Division. In a cablegram published in the papers yesterday it is stated that the Twenty-sixth Division had been ordered home. On inquiry I am informed that the Eightieth Division has not been slated for an early return. Do you think it is right for the Twenty-sixth Division to come home and some of the men who have been with it ever since it left here, men who have fought with it all through the war, be left behind? Do you think it is right to leave them over there because they were unfortunate enough to be sent to a hospital? My son has a wife depending on him for support, and if there is any possible way to have him return with the outfit he belongs with I wish you would be kind enough to let me know. I have taken this matter up with Maj. Gen. Clarence R. Edwards, and am inclosing his reply, which I would thank you very much to return with the answer to this letter.

Sincerely, yours.

The letter from the office of Maj. Gen. Edwards, formerly commanding the Twenty-sixth Division, but now commanding the Department of the Northeast in this country, indicates that this nefarious practice referred to by my constituent was once broken up, but apparently it has now again been resumed.

HEADQUARTERS NORTHEASTERN DEPARTMENT,
99 Chauncey Street, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter in regard to your son * * * has been received, and the general directs me to tell you that after long efforts he succeeded in getting an order published which required all soldiers to be sent back to their own organizations when discharged from the hospital. Apparently this order has been revoked since we left France, or somebody has violated the order in sending your son to another organization.

It is to be regretted that he could not return to his own outfit which is the same as home to him in a military sense, and if there is anything I could do to adjust the matter I would be only too glad to do it, but the American Expeditionary Forces are far away, and a matter of this sort would be very difficult to correct. * * *

Yours, very truly,

JOHN W. HYATT,
Major, Infantry.

Here is another letter from Marblehead, Mass., rockbound in both its shores and its republicanism. This letter indicates

how some of the money which we voted to take out of the people's pockets in taxes last Saturday is being spent. It also indicates how one Republican in that town looks with favor upon the gallant efforts of my friend and colleague, Congressman JAMES A. GALLIVAN, in his fight for justice to the officers and men of the Twenty-sixth, or Yankee, Division. Here is what he says:

MY DEAR SIR: I hope that you are supporting Congressman GALLIVAN in the volleys which he is pouring forth against existing conditions. I could vote for GALLIVAN with enthusiasm. Here in Marblehead two coast patrols were brought into the harbor five weeks ago. The boats are out of commission, but still the 20 men are boarding in town, at the Government's expense, doing nothing and drawing their pay. Every one of these men declares he wants to get out and get to work and not idle his days away without object or purpose. Twenty men's salary for five weeks to be added with 10,000 others to the taxes imposed upon every man who owns a hut that he calls or thinks his own. Secretary Baker has monkeyed with Congress about long enough, and I rejoice that it was a Massachusetts man who had the shades of Roosevelt to stand and rebuke him. With kindest regards for your success, I remain,

Yours, truly,

I might quote from similar letters for hours. Every Member of this House could probably do the same. But we must do more than quote from letters. We must find out who is responsible for these shortcomings, and we must place the blame where it belongs, regardless of who gets hurt. This should be one of the first and most important tasks of the new Congress. The American people demand an answer, and it is apparently impossible to obtain it from this Congress. But some committee, either a regular or a special one, must undertake these investigations once we are called into special session. I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. The function of that committee is to investigate just such matters as the ones to which I have referred. The committee has never had a meeting during the present Congress. I have never had the honor even of meeting the chairman; but with the coming of the new Congress, with a Republican chairman at the head, I predict that this committee will resume the functions for which it was intended, will endeavor to find out and tell to the American Congress and the American people who is responsible for all this cussedness and neglect in the comfort and care of our victorious warriors.

Mr. LUFKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

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. SAUNDERS of Virginia, 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. 15835, the Army appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The bill, H. R. 15608, was erroneously referred to the Private Calendar, whereas it should be on the House Calendar. The Chair therefore refers it to the House Calendar.

RATIFICATION OF PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has a certificate from the governor of Nevada announcing the ratification of the prohibition amendment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCORMICK was granted leave of absence for five days on account of important business.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill H. R. 15796.

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

PRINTING ADDRESS OF SENATOR LODGE ON LATE EX-PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] expected to ask unanimous consent to have the House print 20,000 copies of the address delivered by Senator LODGE on Sunday upon the life, character, and public services of Ex-President Roosevelt. In his absence and with his approval I make that request, the copies to be circulated through the folding room.

The SPEAKER. To be published as a House document?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that 20,000 copies of Senator LODGE's eulogy on Col. Roosevelt be printed. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire how many that would allot to each Member?

The SPEAKER. Fifty.

Mr. ROGERS. Reserving the right to object, which I shall not do, I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he has any information as to the character of the paper which will be used in this reprint, and whether he knows there is any way by which a rather better quality of paper can be used than is habitually employed in the printing of the speeches of Members of the House?

Mr. WALSH. I have no knowledge upon that point, but I think the chairman of the Committee on Printing could see that a better quality of paper is used for the printing of this document.

Mr. ROGERS. I suggest that the Members interested confer with the chairman of the Committee on Printing and urge that that be done.

Mr. WALSH. From the conversation I have had with him, I know that he would favor that.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, there have been instances where the House has ordered certain speeches printed as a House document, and where it has been printed in a form different from the ordinary document, and well fitting the occasion. I assume that will be the case in this instance.

Mr. WALSH. That can be done without any specific order of the House?

Mr. STAFFORD. Without any specific order of the House.

The SPEAKER. I do not know how it is done, but Senator KNOX made a speech in the Senate not long ago that was printed in much larger type and on better paper than the average congressional speech.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I had in mind speeches delivered by yourself and the gentleman from North Carolina and others anent the retirement of Representative John J. Fitzgerald, and which I asked unanimous consent to be printed as a document, and they were compiled in a very fitting form.

The SPEAKER. I do not think there will be any doubt about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. That will undoubtedly be properly taken care of by the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the House print 20,000 copies of the address of Senator LODGE on the late Theodore Roosevelt, to be distributed through the folding room. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PRINTING OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON REVENUE BILL.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed 14,000 copies of the conference report on the revenue bill, half of them to go to the House folding room and half to the document room.

The SPEAKER. Has the Senate passed on it?

Mr. KITCHIN. This is within the $500 limit.

The SPEAKER. But has the Senate agreed to the conference report?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the form in which the gentleman proposes to print this conference report show the text as it will actually be enacted, without any of these lines stricken through?

Mr. KITCHIN. Just exactly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] asks unanimous consent that 14,000 copies of the conference report on the revenue bill be printed, half to be distributed through the folding room and half through the document room. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I understand that general debate on the military appropriation bill has not been concluded.

Mr. KITCHIN. The understanding is that it has been concluded with the exception of the speech by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], who will have an hour to-morrow.

Mr. STAFFORD. And after that it will be considered under the five-minute rule?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 13, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Navy Department and Naval Establishments for the fiscal year 1919, and for prior years (H. Doc. No. 1787); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting copy of a communication from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting estimates of deficiencies in appropriations required by the District of Columbia for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for prior years (H. Doc. No. 1788); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. DILLON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 5316) granting the consent of Congress to 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, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1061), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAHER, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12634) to encourage instruction in the hygiene of maternity and infancy, and to extend proper care for maternity and infancy; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such instruction and care in the rural districts; to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure; and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1062), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2021) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Cal., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt National Park, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1063), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 15891) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Castle, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15892) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Frankfort, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 15893) to donate two cannons of obsolete pattern to the village of Baudette, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15894) to donate two cannons of obsolete pattern to the village of Spooner, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 15895) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Bucyrus, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 15896) for the purchase of a post-office site at Phoenix, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15897) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Oneida, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15898) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Lowville, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 15899) for the purchase of a post-office site at Youngstown, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15900) for the purchase of a post-office site at Middleport, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15901) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Tonawanda, Erie County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 15902) providing that the United States may be made a party defendant in the same manner as a private person in certain legal processes dealing with real property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 15903) to amend paragraph 5 of section 5 of the United States cotton-futures act, approved August 11, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 15904) to provide for the erection of a Federal office building on the site acquired for the Subtreasury in St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 15905) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sand Spring, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15906) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Copan, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 15907) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Wilson, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 15908) for the construction of a post-office building at Rutherfordton, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Resolution (H. Res. 572) to print the manuscript entitled "Address of Henry Cabot Lodge, in honor of Theodore Roosevelt," as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Resolution (H. Res. 573) requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the House information regarding number of persons in the United States whose incomes amount to $3,000 to $1,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 425) relating to the fuel supply of the city of Casper, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the establishment of a free, united, and independent Polish nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAY: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing Congress for the passage of an amendment to certain bills introduced in order to provide a more equitable application of Federal aid for post roads in sparsely settled States, and to provide a more reasonable time limit for the availability of such Federal aid; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New York, urging favorable action on bill amending an act for the construction of dams across navigable waters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relating to retention by the State of New York of information on selective draft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPERT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the establishment of a free, united, and independent Polish nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADOLPHUS P. NELSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the establishment of a free, united, and independent Polish nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHALL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to injuries sustained by persons in war industries, to be included in legislation for the relief of soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Education.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 15909) granting an increase of pension to John Devine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 15910) granting a pension to Abigail Merriman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15911) granting a pension to Mrs. Edward McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15912) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. Fanning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 15913) granting a pension to Melville C. Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUNN: A bill (H. R. 15914) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert G. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of New Jersey: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 426) to provide for the recognition and reasonable remuneration of William Russell Hinsdale, of Orange, N. J.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of citizens of Gloucester County, N. J., protesting against postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of Central Federated Union of Greater New York and vicinity, asking Congress to repeal law prohibiting increase in wages of customhouse laborers; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Merchants' Association of New York, relative to the discontinuance of operation by the Government of railroads, telephones, and telegraphs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of Central Federated Union of Greater New York and vicinity, asking Congress to repeal the law prohibiting increase in wages for customhouse laborers, so that the Secretary of the Treasury may legally give them a suitable, just, and living wage; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FARR: Petition of Scranton (Pa.) Board of Trade, urging control and operation of telephone and telegraph lines until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon a proper procedure to be followed thereafter; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Leon F. Moss, of Los Angeles, Cal., advocating the construction of paved trunk-line highways; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petition of mothers of soldiers and sailors of Massachusetts, protesting against $50 bonus to be paid discharged soldiers of United States, as compared with Canadian soldiers, who get six months' pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of George Werner and other citizens of Lancaster, Pa., urging enactment of legislation providing for national ownership and Government operation of railroads in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Samuel Bell and other citizens of Lancaster, Pa., urging enactment of legislation providing for national ownership and Government operation of railroads in the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William H. Hager, of Lancaster, Pa., requesting repeal of the periodical-postage amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Charles Johnson Post, New York, with 39 citizens of eighteenth Ohio congressional district, asking for repeal of zone postal system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of certain citizens of Portsmouth, Ohio, asking for passage of House bill 10550, relating to Government operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, "protesting against the improper method of computing and the excessive charges on telephone calls to points outside local-service areas throughout the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of employees of Western Union Telegraph Co., Manitowoc, Wis., protesting against elimination of certain clauses of a contract entered into between the telegraph officials and employees which in a measure would have offset the extreme high cost of living due to war conditions; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers' Association, relating to employment of returning soldiers or securing it for them; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of residents of Los Angeles and vicinity, favoring House bill 10550 providing for Government ownership and operation of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of Transportation Club of San Francisco, Cal., in protest against the proposed tax on club dues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Municipal League of Los Angeles, Cal., urging appropriation of moneys for maintenance of railways, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLK: Petition of Board of Public Education, Wilmington, Del., asking support of bill introduced by Hon. CHARLES POPE CALDWELL, of New York, requiring War Department to loan machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade and technical schools and universities; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of R. C. Stratton, C. F. Bingham, and W. A. Douglas, San Francisco; W. S. Young, Roseville; Mrs. M. E. Lofton, Henderson; S. K. Chapman, Dunsmuir; G. V. Robinson, Rough and Ready; Leland A. Colby, Clio; Mrs. J. J. Scofield, Big Oak Flat; Mrs. H. E. Hestchinson, Lake City; H. R. Wall, Sonora; K. K. Torreson and Mrs. O. Hawkinson, Jelly; George L. Burger, Junction City; Mrs. H. A. Douglas, Grass Valley; Mrs. E. M. Cooper, Oleta; Shiego Fergir, Loomis; H. L. Burnham, Los Molinos; Mrs. M. R. Smith, Camanche; H. E. Williams, Cassell; Sarah A. Bailey, Hamburg; Mrs. H. J. Hanson, Wendel; R. D. Kellog, Richfield; Mrs. George N. McDow, Susanville; Mrs. A. A. Miller, Sonora; Eva G. Clark, Westwood; C. H. Ham, Mrs. C. H. Ham, Mrs. C. F. Lewis, and Lea Feleiger, colonel, United States Army, retired, San Francisco, all in the State of California, urging repeal of the postal zone rate system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of women's clubs of Orange County, Cal., favoring the creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Business Woman's Civic Club, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the creation of a league of nations to safeguard the peace that has been won by the joint efforts of the allied nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Monday Afternoon Club, of Covina, Cal., favoring the creation of a league of nations to safeguard the peace of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUSE: Petition of residents of Dodge City and Ford County, Kans., for continuance of Government control of railroads for five years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of sundry labor employees of Utica, N. Y., protesting against the taxation provided for in House bill 12863, to provide revenue for the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 13, 1919.*

Rev. G. W. Popkins, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Oh, Lord God, our Father, Father of Jesus Christ the Savior of the world, incline Thy ears this morning and hear the prayers of Thy people. We thank Thee, Lord, for the blessings that have waited upon this Nation from its earliest history until the present moment. May we be guided in the future by Thy spirit, counseled by Thy wisdom, protected by Thy power, and saved by Thy grace. Guide these Thy servants here with Thy wisdom, and may they be lively instruments in Thy hands for accomplishing great good for this Nation and through the Nation for the world. We humbly ask it all in Jesus's name.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, February 11, 1919, when on request of Mr. MCKELLAR, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

BOLSHEVIST PROPAGANDA IN WASHINGTON (S. DOC. NO. 386).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, which will be read.