

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, Clie; 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.

The Secretary read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1919.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Permit me to acknowledge receipt of the resolution adopted by the Senate on the 5th instant, which, after reciting that "It is the duty of the Attorney General to enforce the laws of the United States," directs me to report to the Senate what steps, if any, I have taken to investigate the two meetings referred to, the speeches made therein, the names of the speakers and those who supported them, and what, if any, steps I have taken to enforce the laws of the United States in the premises.

The meetings referred to took place in the city of Washington, at Poli's Theater and the Masonic Temple, on the 2d and 3d instant, respectively.

Being aware that it is my duty to enforce the laws of the United States, I had already instituted investigations of these meetings before the Senate resolution was received. Representatives of the Department of Justice were present at the meeting of the 2d, and I am in possession of rather full stenographic notes of all that occurred. What I consider accurate reports of occurrences at the meeting of the 3d are also in my possession. I believe that my department is accurately informed as to the speeches made, the names of the speakers, and everything of importance that occurred on these two occasions. This data has been and is receiving proper consideration. I shall take such action as in my judgment is warranted.

The resolution states that the speakers at these meetings advocated the subversion of the Government of the United States by force and violence. Such advocacy would, of course, be a violation of the laws of the United States. The Attorney General will appreciate it if the Senate will transmit to him the evidence on which this statement is based.

Respectfully,

T. W. GREGORY,
Attorney General.

Mr. JONES of Washington. My colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is not here; and I suggest that the communication from the Attorney General lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well; it will lie on the table and be printed.

EMBARGO ON COTTON EXPORTS.

Mr. HARDWICK. I present resolutions adopted by the State-wide cotton convention held at Macon, Ga., February 6, 1919. I ask the Secretary to read the resolutions, and then I am going to ask that they be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Resolutions adopted at State-wide cotton convention, Macon, Ga., Feb. 6, 1919.]

Whereas the New York and other cotton exchanges are no longer legitimate mediums of exchange, but have degenerated into gambling machines which, in the hands of interested speculators, has been used as an instrument for years to deprive the farmers of the South of a fair price for cotton; and

Whereas the continued existence of said New York and other cotton exchanges as at present operated is a menace to the prosperity of the South, and, being upon the same level with the Louisiana lottery, should be abolished in the same manner by legislation; and

Whereas our Senators and Representatives in Congress have from time to time attempted to curtail the gambling in the New York Cotton Exchange by certain legislation; and

Whereas this legislation has not been effective, and in a measure has impliedly recognized the right of the New York Cotton Exchange to gamble in futures between certain limits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the cotton planters and business men of Georgia in convention assembled at Macon:

First. That we call upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to introduce and pass more stringent measures regulating the New York and all other cotton exchanges.

Second. That in said legislation it shall be provided that before any person or firm shall offer to sell cotton on the New York Cotton Exchange they shall file with the secretary or bookkeeper of said New York Cotton Exchange an affidavit showing where said cotton is deposited and the grade of each bale.

Third. That said New York Cotton Exchange shall publish from day to day the number of bales offered for sale and the number of sales actually consummated, and the names of the parties buying and selling, and also showing where the actual cotton is located.

Fourth. That the books and business of the said New York Cotton Exchange shall at all times be under the inspection and control of the United States Government, through any of its duly appointed agents, and that it shall be also provided in said legislation that if any person or firm shall make a false affidavit that the same shall be a crime, to be punished by fine or imprisonment, or both.

Resolved, That this convention condemn the practice of the New York Cotton Exchange tendering nine grades of cotton on middling contracts. We demand of our representatives in Congress that the law regulating this exchange be so amended as to require delivery of the actual grade contracted for on any exchange.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me for just a moment, I wish to say that accompanying the resolutions the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia sent me a letter, from which I wish to quote. He says:

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Atlanta, February 10, 1919.

Hon. THOMAS W. HARDWICK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We attach hereto copy of extracts from the minutes of the State-wide cotton convention held in Macon, Ga., Thursday, February 6.

This meeting was attended by about 700 farmers, bankers, warehousemen, and merchants. Notwithstanding the fact that all roads in middle Georgia were rendered impassable for automobile travel by heavy rainfall, 80 Georgia counties were represented in this meeting. It is conceded that the meeting was the most thoroughly representative and more thoroughly in earnest than has ever been in any similar meeting.

The principles laid down in the resolutions attached are the representative views of our ablest and most conservative thinkers. The entire atmosphere of the meeting from beginning to end evidenced the unalterable determination of the Georgia people to stand shoulder to shoulder in this fight to protect cotton farmers and all cotton allied interests from the attacks of a money-mad class of spinners and exchange gamblers.

Unless the morally illegal practices into which the cotton exchanges have degenerated are curbed by national legislation and the natural laws of supply and demand be permitted to rule the markets of America, then the American producer has, in addition to handicaps imposed upon him by the changeable seasons during which his crops are produced, added the unsurmountable obstacle of the "stacked deck" fixed by the speculator regulating downward the selling prices of his hard-won products.

There are so many movements afoot, many of which emanate from Washington, to bring about a general downward trend of prices, which the unscrupulous money-maker is utilizing to his own selfish ends, it becomes vitally necessary to the welfare of the American farmer, and therefore to the American people, that the greatest statesmen devote their greatest consideration and deepest thought to the problems which unjustly handicap the farmer or interfere with the only sane balance in preservation of values—that is, the natural law of supply and demand.

We beg you to throw the weight of your influence to the side of the producer and, in advance, know full well that, as far as the power of the Georgia delegation carries, the interests of our farmers will be cared for.

Very truly, yours,

J. J. BROWN,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mr. President, let me say, if the Senate will indulge me for a moment more, that, in addition to the complaint voiced by the commissioner of agriculture and outlined in the resolution, in my judgment the cotton farmers of the South, and especially of Georgia, are suffering, far more than from the causes indicated in these resolutions, from an unjust and indefensible embargo upon our cotton, which was imposed as a war measure and which is maintained now, under conditions of peace, at an incalculable cost to the cotton producers of the country.

Mr. President, when this war broke out in Europe, and long before this country had become a party to it or it was even feared that it might become a party to it, when the market of the cotton planter throughout the world was suddenly destroyed by the war, the Government then took the position that the economic law of supply and demand must control in this matter. Various schemes of relief, some of which were more or less fantastic, that were suggested in the two Houses of Congress were promptly, and in most cases I admit properly, denied by the Congress and by the Government.

It does seem to me, however, that the same rule of action ought to obtain now and that, the country being at peace once more, not technically at peace but with the armistice declared and fighting ended, there is no need whatever of an embargo of any kind against any country on cotton. The economic law of supply and demand ought to control and govern this situation. It seems to me that the cotton producers of the South can only get relief when these artificial barriers to the free movement of cotton are removed.

It appears to me further, Mr. President, that if we are to have a \$700,000,000 Navy per year in order to guarantee peace among the nations of the world and to promote the interest of the society of nations, and the South is expected to contribute its part of the tremendous appropriations that are necessary to carry on this and projects of similar magnitude in every branch and line of government, it will be necessary that these restrictions on the free movement of our great product shall be removed and that cotton shall be permitted to at least stand on its own merits and its own basis in the markets of the world.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator one question?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is the embargo universal against any export of cotton?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; against all exports of cotton controlled by a licensing board here in Washington, not only against countries with which we were formerly at war but against every neutral country on earth.

Mr. LODGE. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. HARDWICK. The result is that British spinners and the interests that are controlling the British Government in

the interests of the British spinners are largely controlling and largely influencing the price of our cotton and of every movement connected with that product.

The cotton farmers of the South and the people of the South are entitled to demand at the hands of this administration that the depressing influence of this embargo shall be removed at once, not only on neutral countries, about which there can be no possible doubt, but in my judgment also as against every country on the earth. Certainly it can do no harm to let cotton go to Germany, or Holland, or Norway, or Sweden, or any country on earth where the money can be put up to buy it. The producers of the South, who have made this cotton with their toil and in their sweat, are entitled to this relief as a matter of common fairness, of absolute justice, and they will not be satisfied with less. Indeed, unless they have lost their manhood they will not accept less. I ask that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) relating to the establishment of a free, united, and independent Polish nation.

Whereas one of the 14 points proposed by President Wilson for the establishment of a permanent world peace provides for the creation of a free, independent, and united Poland, with access to the sea; and Whereas liberty and justice loving people the world over are united in their acknowledgment that Poland is entitled to a free, independent, and autonomous existence and self-government and is entitled to all the Polish territories which belonged to her prior to her dismemberment and partition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That we favor the establishment of an independent Polish State, composed of all Polish territories, inclusive of those which give Poland access to the sea, to the end that justice be done to the Polish nation, that the territories which were taken from her in violation of all international rights shall be restored, and in order that by the creation of such a State a durable peace of the world will be materially assured; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly attested by its presiding officers, be sent to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives of Wisconsin.

EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I also present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 17) urging the Senate of the United States to pass bill H. R. 13366, authorizing soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war with Germany and her allies to retain their uniforms.

Whereas bill H. R. 13366, permitting any person who has served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the present war to retain his uniform and personal equipment and to wear the same under certain conditions, has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now pending in the United States Senate; and

Whereas the privilege accorded by this bill is a fitting tribute to the people of the United States and the Nation to the valor and glorious services of the boys who served in the United States Army in the present war: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorialize and urge the Senate of the United States to promptly pass bill H. R. 13366; and be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this resolution, properly attested by the presiding officers and chief clerks of both houses, be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate and to each of the United States Senators from this State.

EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. SMOOT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Salt Lake City, Midvale, Magna, Sandy, Murray, and Ogden, all in the State of Utah, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. THOMPSON. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House resolution 11.

Whereas the largest metal mining industry in the State of Kansas is the zinc mining industry; and Whereas the said industry has been greatly crippled by reason of the immense importations of zinc ore from foreign countries, which said importations amounted in four years ending July 30, 1918, to the huge total of 824,000 tons; and

Whereas the War Industries Board has recently removed the embargo of April, 1918, which prohibited the use of ship bottoms for the importation of zinc ores; and

Whereas there are now 350,000 tons of zinc ore concentrated in Australia ready for shipment to the United States, together with a potential importation of 150,000 tons of zinc ore per year from Mexico and Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, That immediate action is necessary to save the zinc mining industry of the State from destruction by reason of these huge importations, and therefore the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take immediate action to save said industry by attaching a rider to the present revenue bill providing for a tariff of 2 cents per pound upon the metallic content of all zinc ore imported into the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Kansas be requested to immediately confer with the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House with a view to having such a provision incorporated in the revenue bill.

Adopted February 5, 1919.

W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Speaker of the House.
CLARENCE W. MILLER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of the Board of Commissioners of Kansas City, Kans., praying that six months' additional pay be given to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Education of Hutchinson, Kans., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the City Council of Cambridge, Mass., praying for the continuance of the Federal Employment Service, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. KENYON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Boone, Iowa, remonstrating against the reenactment of the daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Albans, Vt., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KNOX presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Millvale, St. Clair, Bellevue, Mount Oliver, and Bethlehem; of Local Division No. 51, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of Greenville; and of Iona Lodge, No. 218, United Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees and Railway Shop Laborers, of Harrisburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., and a petition of the Board of Trade of Ridgway, Pa., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroad, telephone, and telegraph lines, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the Merchants' Association of Pottsville; of Local Council No. 350, United Commercial Travelers of America, of Williamsport; of the Kiwanis Club of Reading; of the Business Men's Association of Coudersport; of the Business Men's Association of Lebanon; of the Rotary Club of Reading; of the Rotary Club of Williamsport; of the Rotary Club of Shamokin; of the Board of Trade of Ridgway; of the Board of Trade of Scranton; of the Board of Trade of Newton; of the Board of Trade of New Castle; of the Board of Trade of Quakertown; of the Board of Trade of Austin; of the Board of Trade of Braddock; of the Chamber of Commerce of Harrisburg; of the Chamber of Commerce of Reading; of the Chamber of Commerce of Knoxville; and of the Chamber of Commerce of Carlisle, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying that the return to private ownership of telephone and telegraph lines be deferred until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon the proper and safe procedure to be thereafter followed, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania State Board of Agriculture, favoring the early discharge of men in the service who are farmers and for the adoption of a system of universal military training similar to that used by Switzerland, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Rotary Club of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the proposed change of name of the Panama Canal to the Roosevelt Canal, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Columbia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation making navigable the Susquehanna River from Chesapeake Bay to such point as is feasible and possible, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Washington Camp No. 631, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Doylestown, Pa., praying for the proposed further restriction of immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the establishment of a league of nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a communication signed by the mayor of the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., embodying resolutions adopted at a meeting of the citizens of that city regarding the American troops in the Archangel region. I wish to say in connection with the resolution that I am in cordial sympathy with the purpose and the object sought to be obtained. I should like to have them read. They are very brief.

There being no objection, the communication was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
February 6, 1919.

HON. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting of the citizens of this city held Wednesday evening, February 5, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the United States Government is now maintaining an armed force in northern Russia, among whom are a number of soldiers from this city and vicinity; and

"Whereas it appears that the force there maintained is wholly inadequate to cope with the forces sent against them, and there is grave danger that their maintenance as at present will result in many if not all of the soldiers being overcome by the forces opposed to them; and

"Whereas it appears that their maintenance in north Russia at this time is not necessary for the safety and welfare of the country or necessary as a military measure: Therefore

"Resolved, That we, the citizens of the city of Grand Rapids, most earnestly protest against the retention of our boys in Russia; and further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of War be and he hereby is requested to withdraw said force at as early a date as practicable to the end that their lives may not needlessly be sacrificed in maintaining an unnecessary military venture; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of War, to the Congressmen from this district, and to the Members of the Senate from this State, and ask the Congressmen and Senators to cable the President to this effect."

Respectfully,

CHRISTIAN GALLMEYER,
Mayor.

Mr. FERNALD. I present a petition signed by a large number of citizens of the State of Maine, requesting Congress to enact into law a bill providing for the national ownership and Government operation of all the railroads in the country. I ask that the petition without the signatures be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1919.

To the Hon. BERT FERNALD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned, citizens of the State of Maine, respectfully urge upon you, and through you the Congress of the United States, to have enacted into law a bill similar to or identical with H. R. 10550, providing for the national ownership and Government operation of all railroads within the territory of the United States and its possessions necessary for the furnishing of transportation to the people of the United States, including all lands, terminals, and equipment required or desirable for successful operation; and that you will cause this petition to be noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and referred to an appropriate committee.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE A. HAYHURST
(And others).

AMERICAN FORCES AT BREST, FRANCE.

Mr. CALDER. Several weeks ago the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] submitted a Senate resolution asking for an investigation of the conditions existing at the army camp at Brest, France. I have received numerous letters and calls from people interested in that subject, and I present to the Senate a telegram which I received this morning on the subject. I wish that the Committee on Military Affairs would take immediate steps to investigate this matter. I ask that the telegram be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., February 9, 1919.

United States Senator WILLIAM H. CALDER,
Washington, D. C.:

My daughter, Frances Williams, manages Memorial Hut at Brest. Reports conditions frightful for American troops. Hopes for investigation.

Mrs. JAMES HARVEY WILLIAMS.

SERVICE OF WOMEN IN THE WAR.

Mr. CALDER. I have a resolution adopted by the Woman Suffrage Party of the City of New York, urging Congress to enact legislation providing for the proper decoration of women who have served in our Army in France. The resolution is very short, and I ask that it may be printed in the Record. I know that no Senator will object to that request, for it deals with the women who served our country.

The resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

WOMAN SUFFRAGE PARTY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, February 6, 1919.

[Passed at a conference held Feb. 3, 1919, at 373 Fifth Avenue, New York City.]

We, the leaders, officers, and members of the New York City Woman Suffrage Party, hereby declare our belief that it is only just for the Nation to show some honor to the heroic women who enlisted under the War Department for service as nurses in the military hospitals and for canteen, welfare, and reconstruction work under the supervision of the various war organizations.

And that this honor may take concrete form we appeal to all committees whose duty it is to welcome the home-coming soldiers to take due cognizance of the return of our war sisters.

And we strongly urge the War Department to bestow upon women who have rendered military service of a high order medals or other insignia of honor, or if present rules forbid this we call upon Congress to pass a bill that will make possible national recognition of the women war workers' services and sacrifices.

MISS ADALINE STERLING,
Corresponding Secretary.

ARMY DEMOBILIZATION.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, in relation to the telegram which the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] has just submitted I desire to ask the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], if he can inform the Senate how rapidly the demobilization of the Army is taking place and what number of men are being demobilized daily?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that I can not give the Senator from Idaho any information on that subject, except what he doubtless has and has seen in the newspapers. That is about the only information our committee has on the subject.

Mr. BORAH. Well, of course, I see certain items in the newspapers, and I always believe what I see in the newspapers. Still, at the same time, I thought perhaps the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, might have some specific official statement in regard to it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I regret very much to say, Mr. President, that I do not get any official statements from the War Department nor have conference with them unless specially requested. Other Senators have the same source of information that I have in that respect. Our committee has been pretty busy all the time taking up matters which have been presented to us and are of pressing importance. This matter has not been called to the attention of the committee; but if the Senator from Idaho desires to have it taken up and have an inquiry made into it we shall be glad to do so.

Mr. BORAH. I was not, even by inference, criticizing the Committee on Military Affairs. I know the committee is very busy, and I know it is attending to its business in the proper way.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 15462) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 711) thereon.

The committee has only reported one or two amendments to the bill, and I shall in due time ask to have it considered by the Senate.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BECKHAM, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill (S. 5536) to provide for the erection of memorials and the entombment of bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington National Cemetery, Va., reported it without amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4949) for the relief of J. C. Garrett, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 714) thereon.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14945) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 715) thereon.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 5371) for the relief of Roland S. Robbins, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 717) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4526) for the relief of the Arundel Sand & Gravel Co., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 716) thereon.

FALLS BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT CO.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The bill (S. 5478) granting the consent of Congress to the Falls Bridge Improvement Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug River was wrongly referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I ask that the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

COOS BAY WAGON-ROAD GRANT.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar 595, H. R. 8625, it being entitled "A bill to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled 'An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State,' commonly known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes." The bill passed the House, was duly referred to the Public Lands Committee of the Senate, and was reported out without amendment. It affects only my State. It is recommended by the Departments of the Interior and Justice, as well as by those who are interested in the grant, who are anxious to have the bill passed and to adjust the differences between the United States and the grantees in reference to the terms of the grant. It will not, I am sure, take a moment to consider the bill. If it is not passed now, it means that another year's taxes will have to be assessed against the property eventually. The Government of the United States receives a large part of the money that is to come from the sales of the lands within the limits of the grant, the State of Oregon a smaller portion of it, and the grantees a part in satisfaction of their interest therein.

Mr. BORAH. If the matter leads to debate, the Senator will not ask for its consideration?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In that event, I will not ask to have the bill considered, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the execution and delivery by the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, of a deed satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, reconveying to the United States all the right, title, and interests of the said Southern Oregon Co. in and to the lands situated in the counties of Coos and Douglas, in the State of Oregon, and embraced within the limits of the grant made by the United States to the State of Oregon by the act of March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant, and now involved in litigation pending in the Supreme Court of the United States under the style and title "The Southern Oregon Co. against the United States," the said lands shall again become a part of the public domain, and the United States shall pay to the Southern Oregon Co. the sum of \$232,463.07. The execution and delivery of the aforesaid deed within 30 days from and after the approval of this act shall constitute the acceptance of this act by the said Southern Oregon Co.; and upon the approval of such deed by the Attorney General of the United States the aforesaid suit shall be dismissed and all matters of difference, controversy, and litigation between the United States and the said Southern Oregon Co. arising out of said land grant shall be deemed fully settled, adjusted, and terminated: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the United States from instituting and maintaining such suits or actions as may be necessary to recover the value of timber or other material heretofore cut or removed from any of said lands without the consent of the Southern Oregon Co.

SEC. 2. That the taxes accrued, unpaid, and delinquent on the said lands on the date of the delivery of the deed provided for in the preceding section shall be paid by the Treasurer of the United States upon the order of the Secretary of the Interior as soon as may be after this act becomes effective, and a sum sufficient to make such payment and also to provide for the payment of the said sum of \$232,463.07, as provided for in section 1 of this act, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 3. That the said lands shall be classified and disposed of in the manner provided by the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 218), for the classification and disposition of the Oregon & California Railroad grant lands: *Provided*, That such persons who, being citizens of the United States, have continuously leased from the said Southern Oregon Co. for a period of not less than 10 years, or who under lease from said company have cultivated and placed valuable improvements upon any of said lands classified as agricultural, not exceeding 160 acres to each person, shall be allowed a preference right of six months in which to purchase such lands from the United States by paying therefor the sum of \$2.50 per acre and reimbursing the United States for the taxes paid on such land: *Provided further*, That where any of such leased lands have been resided upon, to the same extent and in the same manner as is required under the homestead laws, since the 1st day of December, 1913, by any person duly qualified to enter such lands claiming adversely to such lessee, and who has improved the land and devoted some portion thereof to agricultural use, and who shall have maintained his residence to the date of his application, the claim of such settler and resident shall be superior to that of the lessee, and he shall be allowed the preference right of entry afforded actual settlers by section 5 of the act of June 9, 1916, aforesaid.

SEC. 4. That the title to all money arising out of said lands and now on deposit to await the final outcome of said suit now pending in the Supreme Court, as aforesaid, is hereby vested in the United States, and the United States is subrogated to all the rights and remedies of the obligee or obligees, and especially of Harry E. Laughlin as commissioner, under any contract for the purchase of timber on said lands.

SEC. 5. That all moneys received from or on account of said lands and timber and the timber thereon under the provisions of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate fund to be designated "The Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund," which fund shall be disposed of in the following manner: A separate account shall be kept in the General Land Office of the sales of said lands and timber within each of the two counties of Coos and Douglas, and after the proceeds from such sales amount to a sum equal to that applied to pay the accrued taxes in that county and a sum equal to \$2.50 per acre for each acre of such land therein title to which is reverted in the United States pursuant to the provisions of this act, 25 per cent of all other moneys received from said lands shall be paid to the treasurer of the county in which the lands sold are situated for common schools, roads, highways, bridges, and port districts, to be apportioned by the county courts for the several purposes above mentioned; and the remainder shall become a part of the general fund in the Treasury of the United States. The payments herein authorized shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States upon the order of the Secretary of the Interior, as the fund accumulates in the Treasury: *Provided*, That none of the payments to the counties provided for in this section shall be made until the Treasury has been reimbursed in the amount paid to the Southern Oregon Co. and also for all taxes paid pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect; and any person, applicant, purchaser, entryman, or witness who shall swear falsely in any affidavit or proceeding required hereunder or under the regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior shall be guilty of perjury and liable to the penalties prescribed therefor.

SEC. 7. That the sum of \$12,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, or otherwise, to complete the classification of the lands as herein provided, which amount shall be immediately available and shall remain available until such classification shall have been completed.

SEC. 8. That this act shall become effective upon its acceptance by the Southern Oregon Co. in the manner provided by the first section hereof.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask that the report of the committee may be printed in the Record in explanation thereof.

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

The report (S. Rept. No. 650) submitted by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Public Lands, is as follows:

The Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8625) to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay wagon-road grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes, having had the same under consideration, begs leave to report it back to the Senate with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The necessity for the above legislation is clearly set forth in House Report No. 687 of the Sixty-fifth Congress, as follows:

"The history of the Coos Bay wagon-road grant and the reasons for this legislation are in brief as follows:

"The grant in question was made to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from Coos Bay to Roseburg, in Oregon. The grant was made March 3, 1869 (15 Stat., 340), hereinafter set forth. The State selected the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co. to construct the road, and by act of its legislature October 22, 1870, hereinafter set forth, transferred all its rights and interests in and to the grant to said company subject to all the conditions and limitations prescribed in the act of Congress by which the grant was made to the State.

"The wagon road was constructed by said company in accordance with the terms of the act of Congress of March 3, 1869. By act of Congress approved June 18, 1874 (hereinafter set forth), issuance of patent to said granted lands was authorized to said Coos Bay Wagon

Road Co., and in pursuance thereof patents were issued by the United States to said company for 105,120.11 acres.

"By mesne conveyances the Southern Oregon Co., mentioned in the bill H. R. 8625, became the owner of the granted lands December 14, 1887, in so far as the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co. was competent to transfer them, with the exception of approximately 7,500 acres previously sold by the road company and one of its successors to individuals.

"In addition to said sale of 7,500 acres, some 4,500 acres of land have been disposed of to different parties, so that the entire area undisposed of is approximately 93,000 acres.

"On account of the violation of the terms of the granting act, which prohibited sales in quantities greater than 160 acres to any one person and at a price exceeding \$2.50 per acre, the Attorney General of the United States filed suit for a forfeiture of the land grant in the United States court for the district of Oregon. This court and the circuit court of appeals refused to grant a forfeiture, but decreed that the Southern Oregon Co. be enjoined from making further sales in violation of law and from making any sale or disposition whatever of the land and timber until Congress shall have reasonable time within which to provide for their disposition in such manner as it may deem proper, at the same time securing to the company all the value conferred by the granting act. The case is now pending on appeal by defendant before the Supreme Court of the United States.

"The following letter from the Attorney General of the United States gives more in detail the history of the grant and the reasons in favor of H. R. 8625 as introduced:

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1918.

"Hon. SCOTT FERRIS,

"Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,

"House of Representatives.

"MY DEAR SIR: I have just received your letter of the 19th requesting a report on House bill No. 8625, present Congress, authorizing an acceptance from the Southern Oregon Co. of a reconveyance of the lands constituting the Coos Bay wagon grant in the State of Oregon.

"The grant in question was made to the State of Oregon by the act of March 3, 1869 (15 Stat., 340), to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, and was upon condition that the granted lands should be sold in quantities not greater than a quarter section to any one person and for a price not exceeding \$2.50 per acre. By an act of October 22, 1870, the Legislature of the State of Oregon donated the lands to the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co., subject to all the conditions and limitations prescribed in the act of Congress by which the grant was made to the State.

"Upon certificate from the governor of the State that the road had been constructed, four patents were issued by the United States, as follows: No. 1, dated February 12, 1875, for 42,496.93 acres; No. 2, March 18, 1876, for 1,080 acres; No. 3, November 8, 1876, for 61,111.53 acres; and No. 4, February 17, 1877, 431.65 acres, making an aggregate of 105,120.11 acres.

"Prior to 1876 the Wagon Road Co. disposed of in small quantities about 7,500 acres of the lands to individuals, some sales embracing as much as an entire section of land, and on May 31, 1875, the company entered into an agreement to sell all of the lands and the road to one John Miller for the price of \$1 per acre for the lands, and on that day the company executed to Miller a deed for all of the lands that had then been patented and which had not been sold to individuals—that is to say, about 3,500 acres. The contract with Miller provided that the balance of the lands would be conveyed to him as soon as the patents were procured from the Government. In furtherance of this agreement the Wagon Road Co. on January 7, 1884, executed a deed to one William H. Besse for the lands that had been patented to the company since the date of the deed to Miller in 1875, for an alleged consideration of \$91,715.05; and by mesne conveyances these lands were conveyed to the Oregon Southern Improvement Co. on January 4, 1884. In the meantime Besse had acquired by intermediate conveyances the lands that had been deeded to Miller in 1875. He conveyed them to one Russell Gray on December 29, 1883, and Gray on January 5, 1884, transferred them to the Oregon Southern Improvement Co. So that in 1884 the Oregon Southern Improvement Co. became the owner of the entire grant in so far as the Oregon Road Co. was competent to transfer it, with the exception, of course, of the area of approximately 7,500 acres that had been previously conveyed to individuals.

"In order to secure certain bonds that had been issued by it the Oregon Southern Improvement Co. executed a deed of trust conveying all of its property to the Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co., of Massachusetts, which company was in 1886 succeeded as trustee by William H. Rotch and Edward D. Mandell; and during that year proceedings were begun in the United States court for the district of Oregon to foreclose the deed of trust, as a result of which a sale of the property was ordered and was made by a master to Rotch, one of the trustees, and one W. W. Crapo, who on December 14, 1887, transferred the property to the Southern Oregon Co.

"By a joint resolution approved April 30, 1908 (35 Stat., 571), Congress authorized and directed the Attorney General of the United States to institute such proceedings as might be necessary to enforce all the rights and remedies of the United States growing out of this grant. In pursuance of that law the Attorney General filed a suit in the United States court for the district of Oregon praying, among other things, for a forfeiture of the land grant. However, before this suit proceeded to a determination, the Supreme Court of the United States had decided the somewhat similar case growing out of the Oregon & California Railroad land grant (238 U. S., 393), in which it held that while the railroad company had violated the law in selling lands contrary to the terms of the grant, such violation nevertheless did not operate as a forfeiture of the entire grant. In view of the action of the Supreme Court in the railroad case, the district court for Oregon, on July 12, 1915 (225 Fed., 560), rendered a decision and entered a decree in the present case along the lines of the Supreme Court's decision in the railroad case; and on the appeal of the Southern Oregon Co. the decree of the district court was affirmed by the circuit court of appeals February 13, 1917 (241 Fed., 16). By this decree the company is enjoined from making further sales in violation of the law and from making any sale or disposition whatever of the land and timber until Congress shall have a reasonable time within which to provide for their disposition in such manner as it may deem proper, at the same time securing to the company all the value conferred by the granting act. The Southern Oregon Co. took a further appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, where the case is now pending.

"The bill upon which you request my views authorizes a settlement of this litigation in the following manner: Upon the execution and delivery by the Southern Oregon Co. of a deed satisfactory to the

Attorney General, reconveying to the United States all of the company's right, title, and interest under the grant, the lands are to become again a part of the public domain, and the United States is to pay the Southern Oregon Co. the sum of \$232,463.07, whereupon the suit now pending in the Supreme Court is to be dismissed and all matters of difference, controversy, and litigation between the United States and the Southern Oregon Co. arising out of this land grant are to be fully settled, adjusted, and terminated.

"The bill also provides that the taxes accrued and unpaid on the lands at the time of delivery of the deed of reconveyance provided for shall be paid by the United States, and a sum sufficient to make that payment and also to provide for the payment of the sum of \$232,463.07 to the company is appropriated by the bill.

"The bill further provides that the lands are to be classified and disposed of in the manner provided for the classification and disposition of the Oregon & California Railroad grant lands by the Chamberlain-Ferris Act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat., 218); and after the Treasury is reimbursed for the taxes paid on the lands and in the amount paid the Southern Oregon Co. the balance of the proceeds is to be distributed as follows: Twenty-five per cent to the county in which the lands sold are situated for common schools, roads, highways, and bridges, and port districts; 25 per cent to the State treasurer to become a part of the irrevocable school fund of the State; 40 per cent to be paid into the reclamation fund; and the remainder to become a part of general fund in the Treasury.

"The evident purpose of the bill is to dispose of this somewhat complicated and vexatious matter without further litigation or further delay of any sort. The act is to become effective, upon acceptance by the Southern Oregon Co., within 30 days from and after its approval, and there has been filed in this department a proposition by the president of the company for the settlement of the case, which gives absolute assurance of the company's acceptance of the bill if enacted into law.

"Since the acquisition of the grant by the Oregon Southern Improvement Co. and the Southern Oregon Co. some 4,500 acres of land have been disposed of to different parties, so that the entire area undisposed of is now approximately 93,000 acres, and the amount to be paid the company is at the rate of \$2.50 per acre of this area. At the trial of the case in the district court the Southern Oregon Co. offered evidence showing receipts and disbursements on account of the land grant as follows:

"Receipts."	
Sale of lands	\$24,500.00
Sales of timberlands and timber	77,621.47
Leases of lands	10,937.44
Chittam bark	11,223.01
Total	124,281.92
"Disbursements."	
Land expense, cruising, fire protection, etc.	\$17,229.61
Improvement on land made by lessees	1,399.05
Stumpage expenses, cost of delivering logs	4,475.35
Chittam bark, expenses of marketing	17,904.12
General expenses	218,207.83
General taxes	325,305.17
Special road taxes	5,787.47
School taxes	762.90
Legal expenses	6,077.15
Interest	218,829.49
Total	815,978.44
Receipts	124,281.92
Excess disbursements over receipts	691,696.52
Interest	218,829.49
Excess disbursements over receipts, other than interest	472,867.03

"It should be noted that the disbursements do not include the price originally paid by the Oregon Southern Improvement Co. for the land grant. I have given little consideration to the alleged price paid by the Southern Oregon Co. at the time of its purchase from the trustees in 1886, for the reason that the new company was but, in my judgment, a reorganization of the old company; and, so far as I have been able to gather, the only new money advanced was a sum sufficient to cover the expenses of the foreclosure proceedings. However, it is clear from the evidence that the Oregon Southern Improvement Co. paid \$120,000 for the land grant at the time of its purchase in 1884, and, as above stated, that amount was not included in the disbursements, apparently having been overlooked.

"I do not feel that the company should be properly credited with all the items of disbursements submitted at the time of the trial; for example, general expenses, amounting to \$218,207.83; general taxes, amounting to \$325,305.17; interest, amounting to \$218,829.49. The general expenses were probably incurred in connection with other matters than the land grant, because the company's holdings were not limited to these lands. The same thing may be said of the general taxes, and it is not satisfactorily shown why the item of interest should be charged as a disbursement on account of the land grant. I am satisfied, however, that the company has expended more than \$200,000 in taxes on the lands, and I have no reason to question other items of expense aggregating, say, \$50,000, while it is clear that \$120,000 was paid as purchase price for the lands, all of which aggregates \$370,000.

"These lands are situated in the counties of Coos and Douglas and the company has paid no taxes since the year 1908. The taxes in Coos County, without penalty and interest, for the years 1909 to 1916 amount to \$233,636.45, while with the penalty and interest these taxes amount to \$366,693.95. The net tax claimed by Douglas County, where the smaller portion of the grant is situated, amounts to \$32,463.55, while the penalty and interest in this county are \$9,699.11, making a total for Douglas County of \$42,162.66; or, the total tax claimed by both counties, \$408,846.61. It will thus be seen that if Congress assumes the obligation of paying all the accrued taxes, with penalty and interest, the total cost to the Government will amount to \$641,369.68.

"For obvious reasons I must refrain from discussing in a communication of this character the legal questions involved in the case and upon which its determination may depend, and therefore shall merely say that upon equitable grounds I think the settlement of the litigation should be authorized along the lines laid out in the bill. Assuming a favorable decision in the Supreme Court, the matter must then be referred to Congress for action and followed by further litigation to determine the measure of the grant, the moneys received by the company on account of it, and the balance due, all of which will, of course,

involve months, if not years, of delay. The company has made nothing out of the land grant; on the contrary, it has become deeply involved in debt, having expended far more than it will receive under this settlement. These lands, which at the time of the grant were worth very little—certainly not more than \$1 per acre in the aggregate—are now worth \$15 or \$20 per acre, or at least one million and a half or two million dollars in all, and by the proposed settlement the Government will make not less than a million dollars in excess of the amount it is to disburse on account of the grant, even assuming that Congress will authorize the payment of the taxes, with penalties and interest.

"The measure of taxes to be paid should, in my judgment, be determined by Congress, and I will not go further than to suggest that the provision in this regard should be made plain so as to indicate clearly whether it is to include penalties and interest; and if so, to what extent. The disposition of the lands and the distribution of the proceeds are likewise matters not primarily within the jurisdiction of this department, and I therefore have no comment to make thereon.

"Very respectfully,

"T. W. GREGORY,
"Attorney General.

"The following is the proposal of settlement made by the Southern Oregon Co.:

"In the Supreme Court of the United States. Southern Oregon Co. v. United States of America.

"To the United States of America:

"In order to bring about a speedy determination of the controversy involved in the above-entitled suit and to settle matters of dispute between the United States and the Southern Oregon Co., the Southern Oregon Co. hereby agrees to execute a quitclaim deed to the United States for all the lands involved in the above litigation and described in the bill of complaint herein, except for lots 2, 3, and 4 of section 7 and lot 3 of section 29, township 26 south, range 12 west, the said lands having been sold by Coos Bay Road Co., at a price and in a quantity in accordance with the act for the sum of \$232,463.07, providing the United States will agree to discharge all unpaid taxes against said lands and relieve the Southern Oregon Co. from any obligation in relation thereto, and will release the Southern Oregon Co. from any claim by reason of the judgment for costs in this suit and from all claims which the United States might be considered to have or assert on account of sales heretofore made by the Southern Oregon Co. or its predecessors in interest, or on account of moneys received by said Southern Oregon Co. or its predecessors in interest, through leases, sales of personal property, or on any account.

"In order that there may be no misunderstanding hereafter as to the meaning of this proposal, it must be understood and agreed that the acceptance by the United States of our deed for such lands as are embraced in the bill and are claimed by us fully settles and discharges all claims of every nature and character which ever have been asserted or might hereafter be asserted against the Southern Oregon Co. because of its claim of ownership of the lands embraced in the Coos Bay wagon-road grant, or on any account whatever.

"SOUTHERN OREGON CO.,

"By HERBERT ARMSTRONG, President.

"DECEMBER 21, 1917.

"The granting act of March 3, 1869 (15 Stat., 340), is as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there be, and hereby is, granted to the State of Oregon, to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, alternate sections of public lands, designated by odd numbers, to the extent of three sections in width on each side of said road: *Provided*, That the lands hereby granted shall be exclusively applied to the construction of said road and to no other purpose, and shall be disposed of only as the work progresses: *Provided further*, That the grant of lands herein made shall be upon condition that the lands shall be sold to any one person only in quantities not greater than one quarter section, and for a price not exceeding \$2.50 per acre: *And provided further*, That any and all lands heretofore reserved to the United States, or otherwise appropriated by act of Congress or other competent authority, be, and the same are hereby, reserved from the operation of this act, except so far as it may be necessary to locate the route of said road through the same, in which case the right of way to the width of 100 feet is granted: *And provided further*, That the grant hereby made shall not embrace any mineral lands of the United States, or any lands to which homestead or preemption rights have attached.

"SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That the lands hereby granted to said State shall be disposed of by the legislature thereof for the purpose aforesaid, and for no other; and the said road shall be and remain a public highway for the use of the Government of the United States, free from tolls or other charges, upon the transportation of any property, troops, or mails of the United States.

"SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That said road shall be constructed with such width, graduation, and bridge as to permit of its regular use as a wagon road, and in such other special manner as the State of Oregon may prescribe.

"SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That the State of Oregon is authorized to locate and use in the construction of said road an additional amount of public land, not previously reserved to the United States, nor otherwise disposed of, and not exceeding 6 miles in distance from it, equal to the amount reserved from the operation of this act in the first section of the same, to be selected in alternate odd sections, as provided in section 1 of this act.

"SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That lands hereby granted to said State shall be disposed of only in the following manner; that is to say, when the governor of said State shall certify to the Secretary of the Interior that 10 continuous miles of said road are completed, then a quantity of the land hereby granted, not to exceed 30 sections, may be sold, and so on from time to time until said road shall be completed; and if said road is not completed within five years no further sales shall be made, and the lands remaining unsold shall revert to the United States: *Provided, however*, That the entire amount of public land granted by this act shall not exceed three sections per mile for each mile actually constructed.

"SEC. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That the United States surveyor general for the district of Oregon shall cause said lands, so granted, to be surveyed at the earliest practicable date, after said State shall have enacted the necessary legislation to carry this act into effect.

"Approved, March 3, 1869."

"The selection of the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co. to construct the road was made by an act of the Legislature of the State of Oregon October 22, 1870, and is as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

"SECTION 1. That there is hereby granted to the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co. all lands, right of way, privileges, and immunities heretofore granted or pledged to this State by the act of Congress in this act heretofore recited, for the purpose of aiding said company in constructing the road mentioned and described in said act of Congress upon the conditions and limitations therein prescribed.

"SEC. 2. There is also hereby granted and pledged to said company all moneys, lands, rights, privileges, and immunities which may be hereafter granted to this State to aid in the construction of said road for the purposes and upon the conditions and limitations mentioned in said act of Congress or which may be mentioned in any further grants of money or lands to aid in constructing said road.

"SEC. 3. Inasmuch as there is no law upon this subject at the present time, this act shall be in force from and after its passage."

"The following is the act of Congress of June 18, 1874 (18 Stat., p. 80), directing the issuance of patents:

"Whereas certain lands have heretofore by acts of Congress been granted to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of certain military wagon roads in said State, and there exists no law providing for the issuance of formal patents for said lands: Therefore

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in all cases when the roads in aid of the construction of which said lands were granted as shown by the certificate of the governor of the State of Oregon, as in said acts provided, to have been constructed and completed, patents for said lands shall issue in due form to the State of Oregon as fast as the same shall under said grants be selected and certified, unless the State of Oregon shall by public act have transferred its interests in said lands to any corporation or corporations, in which case the patents shall issue from the General Land Office to such corporation or corporations upon their payments of the necessary expenses thereof: *Provided*, That this shall not be construed to revise any land grant already expired nor to create any new rights of any kind except to provide for issuing patents for lands to which the State is already entitled."

"The following is the report of the Secretary of the Interior, Franklin K. Lane:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

"Washington, February 6, 1918.

"HON. SCOTT FERRIS,

"Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,

"House of Representatives.

"MY DEAR MR. FERRIS: In response to your request of the 14th instant for a report on House bill 5625, I have the honor to submit the following:

"The general purpose of this bill is to authorize the acceptance, on behalf of the United States, of a reconveyance from the Southern Oregon Co. of the lands granted to aid in the construction of a military wagon road by the act of March 3, 1869, from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, Ore., with certain conditions attendant upon such acceptance, to wit, the payment to the said company of the sum of \$232,463.07 and the taxes due the counties of Coos and Douglas, in said State, amounting, with interest, penalties, and costs, at the present time to \$408,846.

"The report of the Attorney General on this bill of the 21st instant, contains a very complete statement of the facts leading up to the present proposed measure—the grant and its covenants, the failure of the company to observe such covenants, and the resulting litigation now pending for the forfeiture of said grant—and reaches the conclusion, after a consideration of the somewhat analogous case growing out of the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co., and the judicial proceedings for the forfeiture thereof, that the settlement of the present litigation should be authorized in the manner proposed herein. This conclusion of the Attorney General seems to rest on the assumption that a decision favorable to the United States will be rendered in the suit now pending, which will require thereafter action by Congress, as in the Oregon & California case, followed by further litigation to determine the existing equities of the parties, all of which will involve a period of considerable delay, the interest and penalties on the unpaid taxes in the meantime accumulating, while if the settlement is effected as proposed the Government will ultimately realize, after payment of all claims now contemplated against the United States, a sum of probably not less than \$1,000,000, without further litigation.

"I am constrained to abide by the conclusion of the Attorney General as to the policy of this bill as to the legal and equitable considerations involved, as well as the interests of the Government from a financial standpoint, without further comment. An additional reason for this conclusion is found in the fact that the lands involved in this measure lie adjacent to those included within the Oregon & California grant, and if title thereto is reverted in the United States, as now proposed, will form a substantial addition thereto of valuable timberlands, which in itself will be an item of no little advantage in future timber sales by the Government.

"The proposed disposition of the lands and the timber thereon is practically along the lines covered by the act of June 9, 1916, in dealing with the Oregon and California grant, and so far as similar thereto calls for no comment at the present time. An exception, however, to this is found in a provision contained in section 3 of the bill, to the effect that where citizens of the United States have continuously leased from the defendant for a period of not less than 10 years any of said lands classified as agricultural not exceeding 160 acres to each person they shall be allowed a preference right of six months in which to purchase said lands from the United States by paying therefor the sum of \$2.50 per acre; an exception, however, being made to this provision in the interest of bona fide settlement claims maintained since December 1, 1913. This provision introduces an element of adjustment that I do not think should be recognized. Under no circumstances could tenants of the defendant acquire such equities as would entitle them to purchase the land from the United States on the resumption of title thereto.

"Section 4 of the bill, declaring that the title to all money arising out of said lands and now on deposit to await the final outcome of pending litigation shall be vested in the United States is intended to cover a sale made with the approval of the Department of Justice and confirmed by the court for the timber upon a part of section 35, township 26 south, range 12 west, Willamette meridian, the proceeds to be held in escrow pending termination of litigation.

"The remainder of the bill, in so far as it provides for the disposition of the proceeds of the land and the timber thereon, to which title will be secured if this bill becomes law, is practically in keeping with

the similar provisions of the Oregon and California act and calls for no special consideration at the hands of the department.

"Consideration of the situation presented, aside from any questions of law or equity involved, particularly in view of the course pursued with respect to the Oregon and California grant lands, brings me to the conclusion that the present bill should receive favorable consideration at the hands of Congress, with one amendment, however, inserting, in line 13, page 2, after the word 'State,' the phrase 'free from all claims and encumbrances, save and except the taxes due the counties of Coos and Douglas, in the State of Oregon.' With this amendment and the exception heretofore noted, I have the honor to recommend the enactment of the proposed measure.

"Cordially, yours,

"FRANKLIN K. LANE, Secretary.

"The Secretary of Agriculture, D. F. Houston, made the following report:

"FEBRUARY 13, 1918.

"HON. SCOTT FERRIS,

"Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,

"House of Representatives.

"DEAR MR. FERRIS: Receipt is acknowledged of a copy of the bill (H. R. 8625) providing for the disposition of what are commonly known as the Coos Bay wagon-road grant lands, with the request that your committee be sent such suggestions as this department may see fit to offer.

"The bill is in many respects similar to the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat., 218), providing for the classification and disposition of the so-called Oregon & California Railroad grant lands. It provides in section 1 that upon the execution and delivery by the Southern Oregon Co. (the present owners of the lands) of a deed satisfactory to the Attorney General reconveying in the United States all right, title, and interest of said corporation to said lands, they shall become a part of the public domain, the United States shall pay to the company the sum of \$232,463.07, and the litigation between the United States and the said company now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States shall be dismissed.

"Section 2 provides that all taxes accrued and unpaid on said lands at the date of delivery of said deed shall be paid by the United States and appropriates a sum sufficient for such payment and also for the payment provided in section 1. It is provided in section 3 that the lands shall be classified and disposed of in the manner provided by the act of June 9, 1916, supra, except that citizens of the United States who have leased continuously from the company for not less than 10 years not exceeding 160 acres of said lands classified as agricultural shall be allowed a preference right of six months in which to purchase them at \$2.50 per acre, and if any of such leased lands have been resided upon adversely to the lessee and improved and cultivated as required by the homestead laws since December 1, 1913, by a person qualified to enter such lands, he shall be allowed the preference right of entry afforded actual settlers by section 5 of the act of June 9, 1916, supra. Section 4 vests in the United States the title to all money arising out of said lands and now on deposit awaiting the final outcome of said suit now pending in the Supreme Court and subrogates the United States to all rights and remedies of the obligee or obligees under any contract for the purchase of the timber on said lands.

"Section 5 provides that all moneys received from the said lands and the timber thereon shall constitute a special fund and provides for the disposition of the same.

"Section 6 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to perform any and all acts and make rules and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the act, and provides that any person swearing falsely on any affidavit or proceeding required thereunder shall be liable to the penalties prescribed for perjury.

"By section 7 there is appropriated the sum of \$50,000 to enable the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, or otherwise, to classify the lands as provided in the bill.

"This department is interested in this measure in two particulars. First, it is now protecting these lands, upon request of the Interior Department, until such time as the Supreme Court of the United States shall decide the case now before it involving the proper disposition of the lands. The money obtained for this protection is an appropriation of \$10,000 made in the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat., 372). Second, section 7 of the bill proposes that the \$50,000 appropriated may be used to enable the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, to complete the classification as provided for in the bill. No doubt your committee will be informed by the Department of the Interior of the acreage and location of the lands to be thus disposed of and by the Department of Justice as to the status of the suit now on appeal before the Supreme Court of the United States. While a very small portion of the lands are within national forests and should be retained by the Government for growing timber, this department has no recommendation to make regarding them now, since it is believed that details of this character will have to be worked out later by special legislation.

"For this reason this department has no objection to the passage of the bill in its present form.

"Very truly, yours,

"(Signed) D. F. HOUSTON, Secretary.

"As section 3 of the bill provides that the lands shall be classified and disposed of in the manner provided by the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L., p. 218), for the classification and disposition of the Oregon and California railroad-grant lands, said act is as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the title to so much of the lands granted by the act of July 25, 1866, entitled "An act granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Central Pacific Railroad in California to Portland, in Oregon," as amended by the acts of 1868 and 1869, for which patents have been issued by the United States, or for which the grantee is entitled to receive patents under said grant, and to so much of the lands granted by the act of May 4, 1870, entitled "An act granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from Portland to Astoria and McMinnville, in the State of Oregon," for which patents have been issued by the United States, or for which the grantee is entitled to receive patents under said grant, as had not been sold by the Oregon & California Railroad Co. prior to July 1, 1913, be, and the same is hereby, vested in the United States: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to the right of way to the extent of 100 feet in width on each side of the railroad and all lands in actual use by said railroad company on December 9, 1915, for depots, sidetracks, wood yards, and standing grounds.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, or otherwise, is hereby authorized and directed, after due examination in the field, to classify said lands by the smallest legal subdivisions thereof into three classes, as follows:

"Class 1. Power-site lands, which shall include only such lands as are chiefly valuable for water-power sites, which lands shall be subject to withdrawal and such use and disposition as has been or may be provided by law for other public lands of like character.

"Class 2. Timberlands, which shall include lands bearing a growth of timber not less than 300,000 feet board measure on each 40-acre subdivision.

"Class 3. Agricultural lands, which shall include all lands not falling within either of the two other classes:

"*Provided*, That any of said lands, however classified, may be reclassified if, because of a change of conditions or other reasons, such action is required to denote properly the true character and class of such lands: *Provided further*, That all the general laws of the United States now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the granting of rights of way over or permits for the use of public lands shall be applicable to all lands title to which is vested in the United States under the provisions of this act. All lands disposed of under the provisions of this act shall be subject to all rights of way which the Secretary of the Interior shall at any time deem necessary for the removal of the timber from any lands of class 2.

"SEC. 3. That the classification provided for by the preceding section shall not operate to exclude from exploration, entry, and disposition under the mineral-land laws of the United States any of said lands, except power sites, which are chiefly valuable for the mineral deposits contained therein, and the general mineral laws are hereby extended to all of said lands except power sites: *Provided*, That any person entering mineral lands of class 2 shall not acquire title to the timber thereon, which shall be sold as hereinafter provided in section 4, but he shall have the right to use so much of the timber thereon as may be necessary in the development and operation of his mine until such time as such timber is sold by the United States.

"SEC. 4. That nonmineral lands of class 2 shall not be disposed of until the Secretary of the Interior has determined and announced that the merchantable timber thereon has been removed, and thereupon said lands shall fall into class 3 and be disposed of in the manner hereinafter provided for the disposal of lands of that class.

"The timber on lands of class 2 shall be sold for cash by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, or otherwise, to citizens of the United States, associations of such citizens, and corporations organized under the laws of the United States, or any State, Territory, or District thereof, at such times, in such quantities, and under such plan of public competitive bidding as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior may produce the best results: *Provided*, That said Secretary shall have the right to reject any bid where he has reason to believe that the price offered is inadequate, and may reoffer the timber until a satisfactory bid is received: *Provided further*, That upon application of a qualified purchaser that any legal subdivision shall be separately offered for sale such subdivision shall be separately offered before being included in any offer of a larger unit, if such application be filed within 90 days prior to such offer: *And provided further*, That said timber shall be sold as rapidly as reasonable prices can be secured therefor in a normal market.

"The Secretary of the Interior shall, as soon as the purchase price is fully paid by any person purchasing under the provisions of this section, issue to such purchaser a patent conveying the timber and expressly reserving the land to the United States. The timber thus purchased may be cut and removed by the purchaser, his heirs or assigns, within such period as may be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, which period shall be designated in the patent; all rights under said patent shall cease and terminate at the expiration of said period: *Provided*, That in the event the timber is removed prior to the expiration of said period the Secretary of the Interior shall make due announcement thereof, whereupon all rights under the patent shall cease.

"No timber shall be removed until the issuance of patent therefor. All timber sold under this act shall be subject to the taxing power of the States apart from the land as soon as patents are issued as provided for herein.

"SEC. 5. That nonmineral lands of class 3 shall be subject to entry under the general provisions of the homestead laws of the United States, except as modified herein, and opened to entry in accordance with the provisions of the act of September 30, 1913 (37 Stat. L., p. 113). Fifty cents per acre shall be paid at the time the original entry is allowed and \$2 per acre when final proof is made. The provisions of section 2301, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to any entry hereunder and no patent shall issue until the entryman has resided upon and cultivated the land for a period of three years, proof of which shall be made at any time within five years from date of entry. The area cultivated shall be such as to satisfy the Secretary of the Interior that the entry is made in good faith for the purpose of settlement and not for speculation: *Provided*, That the payment of \$2.50 per acre shall not be required from homestead entrymen upon lands of class 2 when the same shall become subject to entry as agricultural lands in class 3: *Provided further*, That during the period fixed for the submission of applications to make entry under this section any person duly qualified to enter such lands who has resided thereon, to the same extent and in the same manner as is required under the homestead laws, since the 1st day of December, 1913, and who has improved the land and devoted some portion thereof to agricultural use, and who shall have maintained his residence to the date of such application, shall have the preferred right to enter the quarter section upon which he was so residing whether such lands shall be of class 2 or class 3 and where such quarter section does not contain more than 1,200,000 feet board measure of timber, and where the quarter section contains more than the said quantity of timber such person may enter the 40-acre tract, or lot or lots containing approximately 40 acres, upon which his improvements, or the greater part thereof, are situated: *Provided further*, That a prior exercise of the homestead right by any such person shall not be a bar to the exercise of such preference rights: *And provided further*, That all of the following-described lands which may become vested in the United States by operation of this act, to wit: Township 1 south, range 5 east, sections 23 and 35; township 1 south, range 6 east, sections 3, 5, 7, 9, 17, 19, 29, 31, and 33; township 2 south, range 5 east, sections 1 and 3; township 2 south, range 6 east, sections 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11; township 2 south, range 7 east, section 7; township 3 south, range 3 east, section 15; township 4 south, range

4 east, sections 11 and 13; township 4 south, range 5 east, sections 19 and 29; and township 12 south, range 7 west, sections 15, 21, 23, 27, 33, and 35, Willamette meridian and base, State of Oregon, shall be withheld from entry or other disposition for a period of two years after the approval hereof.

"Sec. 6. That persons who purchase timber on lands of class 2 shall be required to pay a commission of one-fifth of 1 per cent of the purchase price paid, to be divided equally between the register and receiver, within the maximum compensation allowed them by law; and the register and receiver shall receive no other compensation whatever for services rendered in connection with the sales of timber under the provisions of section 4 of this act.

"Sec. 7. That the Attorney General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to institute and prosecute any and all suits in equity and actions at law against the Oregon & California Railroad Co., and any other proper party which he may deem appropriate, to have determined the amount of moneys which have been received by the said railroad company or its predecessors from or on account of any of said granted lands, whether sold or unsold, patented or unpatented, and which should be charged against it as a part of the 'full value' secured to the grantees under said granting acts as heretofore interpreted by the Supreme Court. In making this determination the court shall take into consideration and give due and proper legal effect to all receipts of money from sales of land or timber, forfeited contracts, rent, timber depredations, and interest on contracts, or from any other source relating to said lands; also to the value of timber taken from said lands and used by said grantees or their successors or successors. In making this determination in the aforementioned suit or suits the court shall also determine, on the application of the Attorney General, the amount of the taxes on said lands paid by the United States, as provided in this act, and which should in law have been paid by the said Oregon & California Railroad Co., and the amount thus determined shall be treated as money received by said railroad company.

"Sec. 8. That the title to all money arising out of said grant lands and now on deposit to await the final outcome of said suit commenced by the United States in pursuance of said joint resolution of 1908 is hereby vested in the United States, and the United States is subrogated to all the rights and remedies of the obligee or obligees, and especially of Louis L. Sharp as commissioner, under any contract for the purchase of timber on the grant lands.

"Sec. 9. That the taxes accrued and now unpaid on the lands revested in the United States, whether situate in the State of Oregon or State of Washington, shall be paid by the Treasurer of the United States, upon the order of the Secretary of the Interior, as soon as may be after the approval of this act, and a sum sufficient to make such payment is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

"Sec. 10. That all moneys received from or on account of said lands and timber under the provisions of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a special fund, to be designated 'The Oregon and California land-grant fund,' which fund shall be disposed of in the following manner: The Secretary of the Interior shall ascertain as soon as may be the exact number of acres of said lands, sold or unsold, patented to the Oregon & California Railroad Co., or its predecessors, and the number of acres of unpatented lands which said railroad company is entitled to receive under the terms of said grants and the value of said lands at \$2.50 per acre. From the sum thus ascertained he shall deduct the amount already received by the said railroad company and its predecessors in interest on account of said lands and which should be charged against it as determined under section 7 of this act; and a sum equal to the balance thus resulting shall be paid, as herein provided, to the said railroad company, its successors or assigns, and to those having liens on the land, as their respective interests may appear. The amount due lien holder shall be evidenced either by the consent, in writing, of the railroad company or by a judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction in a suit to which the railroad company and the lien holders are parties. Payments shall be made from time to time, as the fund accumulates, by the Treasurer of the United States upon the order of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided, however,* That if, upon the expiration of 10 years from the approval of this act, the proceeds derived from the sale of lands and timber are not sufficient to pay the full amount which the said railroad company, its successors or assigns, are entitled to receive, the balance due shall be paid from the general funds in the Treasury of the United States, and an appropriation shall be made therefor. After the said railroad company, its successors or assigns, and the lien holders shall have been paid the amount to which they are entitled, as provided herein, an amount equal to that paid for accumulated taxes, as provided in section 9 hereof, shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the United States, thereafter all other moneys received from the sales of land and timber shall be distributed as follows:

"A separate account shall be kept in the General Land Office of the sales of land and timber within each county in which any of said lands are situated, and, after deducting from the amount of the proceeds arising from such sales in each county a sum equal to that applied to pay the accrued taxes in that county and a sum equal to \$2.50 per acre for each acre of such land therein title to which is revested in the United States under this act, 25 per cent of the remainder shall be paid to the State treasurer of the State in which the land is located, to be and become a part of the irreducible school fund of the State; 25 per cent shall be paid to the treasurer of the county for common schools, roads, highways, bridges, and port districts, to be apportioned by the county courts for the several purposes above named; 40 per cent shall be paid into, reserved, and appropriated as a part of the fund created by the act of Congress approved June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act; 10 per cent shall become a part of the general fund in the Treasury of the United States; and of the balance remaining in said Oregon and California land-grant fund, from whatsoever source derived, 25 per cent shall be paid to the State treasurer of the State in which the land is located, to be and become a part of the irreducible school fund of the State; 25 per cent shall be paid to the treasurer of the county for common schools, roads, highways, bridges, and port districts, to be apportioned by the county courts for the several purposes above named; and the remainder shall become a part of the general fund in the Treasury of the United States. The payments herein authorized shall be made to the treasurers of the States and counties, respectively, by the Treasurer of the United States, upon the order of the Secretary of the Interior, as soon as may be after the close of each fiscal year during which the moneys were received: *Provided,* That none of the payments to the States and counties and to the reclamation fund in this section pro-

vided for shall be made until the amount due the Oregon & California Railroad Co., its successors or assigns, has been fully paid and the Treasury reimbursed for all taxes paid pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of this act.

"Sec. 11. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect; and any person, applicant, purchaser, entryman, or witness who shall swear falsely in any affidavit or proceeding required hereunder or under the regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior shall be guilty of perjury and liable to the penalties prescribed therefor.

"Sec. 12. That the sum of \$100,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture or otherwise, to complete the classification of the lands as herein provided, which amount shall be immediately available and shall remain available until such classification shall have been completed.

"Approved, June 9, 1916."

"Section 1 of this bill provides that the Southern Oregon Co. shall be paid the sum of \$232,463.07 for a deed, satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, reconveying to the United States all the right, title, and interests of said company in and to the lands now involved in the litigation pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, amounting approximately to 93,000 acres, said sum of \$232,463.07 being the value of said lands at \$2.50 per acre; said value of \$2.50 per acre being the value conferred by the granting act, which value the court decreed should be secured to the Southern Oregon Co.

"Section 2 provides for the payment of taxes, which, according to the above letter of the Attorney General, amount to \$408,846.61 for the years 1909 to 1916.

"While the Government is required to pay to the Southern Oregon Co. \$232,463.07, and for delinquent taxes \$408,846.61, total \$641,309.68, this sum is to be repaid to the Government from the sale of grant lands and timber, and in addition thereto 75 per cent of all other moneys received from said lands is to be paid into the Treasury of the United States. That the Government will be amply repaid is shown from the estimates of the value of the lands.

"Mr. S. W. Williams, special assistant to the Attorney General, having charge of the suit, testified in the hearings that the land grant is easily worth \$2,000,000; that the land has two or three billion feet of timber on it; that 'we have sold timber on 400 acres of this land at \$2 per thousand.'

"Ex-Gov. Oswald West, of Oregon, testified that \$3,000,000 would be realized from the grant lands.

"R. W. Marsters, county judge of Douglas County; B. F. Nichols and W. E. St. John, county commissioners; and George Neuner, district attorney, estimate the value of the grant lands to be double Mr. Williams' estimate, or \$4,000,000.

"On the basis of the estimate of Mr. Williams, special assistant, the Government would profit by the proposed adjustment in this bill more than \$1,000,000; on the basis of the estimate of the value of the grant lands made by the county judge and commissioners of Douglas County, the Government's profit would be over \$2,000,000 clear profit.

"Section 3 of the bill provides for preference rights to lessees of said Southern Oregon Co. and to settlers.

"The following letter from George M. Brown, attorney general of the State of Oregon, sets forth the claim of said lessees and settlers to preference rights:

"OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Salem, Oreg., February 14, 1913.

"Hon. S. W. WILLIAMS,
Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR SIR: I have read with much interest your testimony before the Public Lands Committee, and have just written to Representatives SINKOFF and HAWLEY in reference thereto.

"It is my belief that you intend to be absolutely fair in all your statements before the committee, but I think you are not fully informed as to some of the facts requested by the committee.

"This letter is for the purpose of attempting to point out the facts in reference to some of the settlers on the land and their failure to acquire title, as well as to the kind of a road that was originally constructed.

"There are settlers on this land who have settled upon the same in good faith, and there are lands situated along the road that are capable of cultivation, although much of the land in the Coos Bay-Roseburg wagon-land grant consists of mountain, rock, and forest. I personally know men among the settlers on the land who have dwelt upon the same for more than 30 years and have cleared valuable homes from what was once a dense wilderness. These people were persuaded that the company had to sell to them tracts of land in quantities not to exceed 160 acres at the price of \$2.50 per acre. The company did not sell and the Government took no action to enforce the covenant to sell.

"I can not speak for all settlers, but I know in some cases where they have lived upon the land, improving the same year after year, hoping and believing that the company would sell, and in order to protect themselves from ejectment they executed leases. By reason of these leases they have become tenants of the company. However, the truth is, these people settled upon the land in good faith, thinking that the United States would ultimately require the company to convey.

"You are familiar with the case of Nichols v. Southern Oregon Co., reported in 135 Federal Reporter, 232. I will state that Nichols is an old-time resident of Coos County, and relying upon the covenant that the lands were granted with certain terms contained in the granting act which restricted sales of such lands in quantities to single purchasers of not more than 160 acres and at a price not greater than \$2.50 per acre, tendered the purchase price for 160 acres of land included in the grant. Bellinger, district judge, held in said case that—

"These restrictions were mere incidents of the grant. . . . Whatever rights existed in respect to these restrictions belonged to the United States. No interest was created in the complainant. He is not a beneficiary in the grant, and he has no standing to complain that the State has violated its conditions in the manner in which it has disposed of the granted lands. That is a matter that can only be taken advantage of by the United States."

"I have also read your testimony as to the character of the road that was constructed by the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co.

"It is my conviction from information given by old settlers who were over the road soon after its construction that it was a good moun-

tain road. For some years freight was transported over the same from the tidal waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg. This could not have been carried over a range of mountains such as the Coast Range at the point where the old Coos Bay wagon road crossed unless a fairly good road had been built. However, I am not inferring that it was an ideal road. Nearly 20 years after its construction the State of Oregon and the counties of Douglas and Coos built another road leading from Roseburg to Myrtle Point, in Coos County, by way of Camas Valley, and in recent years this last-mentioned road has been the chief thoroughfare. This was true at the time you went over the old Coos Bay wagon road. For a number of years the principal mail route from Roseburg, Douglas County, into Coos County was by way of Camas Valley. Thereafter the Coos Bay wagon road, from Brewster Valley, situated in Coos County, over the Coast Range Mountains into Douglas County, became out of repair.

"From Brewster Valley, almost to the termination of the road, Coos County has in recent years regraded and planked the same.

"These lands have been upon the tax roll of Coos County for a great many years, and it would be a great hardship on the county to deprive her of the revenue derived therefrom, unless it is returned in some such way as is proposed by the pending bill. The same applies in some measure to Douglas County, but the greater portion of the lands are situated, as you know, in the county of Coos.

"Very truly, yours,

"GEO. M. BROWN,
"Attorney General.

"S. W. Williams, special assistant to the Attorney General, wrote concerning the preference rights as follows:

"616 JOURNAL BUILDING,
"Portland, Oreg., April 2, 1918.

"Hon. SCOTT FERRIS,

"Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
"House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR MR. FERRIS: I have been approached by a number of persons who are interested in the pending legislation, which provides for the settlement of the litigation involving the Coos Bay wagon-road grant in this State and the subsequent disposition of the lands by the United States. Some of these people have been living on the lands for a number of years, some have leased the lands and cultivated them, while others placed improvements upon the lands, perhaps without any lease; but, as I understand it, most, if not all, of them went upon the lands under some sort of promises from the officials of the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co. or the Southern Oregon Co. that lands could be purchased at a reasonable price. These promises, it is needless to say, the company has not kept.

"I have informed those who approached me that the bills now pending in Congress in regard to the matter contain a provision whereby those who have leased land from the Southern Oregon Co., or its predecessors for more than 10 years will be allowed a preference right to purchase the lands for \$2.50 an acre, provided that they are found to be of the agricultural class. I have also informed them that the House committee did not seem favorably impressed with this provision, and that I also understood that the Secretary of the Interior had reported adversely to it; but, in view of their insistence, I agreed to lay the facts before your committee.

"Mrs. Hester Harmon claims to have settled on lot 1 of section 13, township 28 south, range 12 west, 44 years ago, and has lived on it continuously ever since.

"Grove G. Swan claims an interest in the south half of the southeast quarter of section 21, township 28 south, range 11 west, having settled there in 1870. He has improved a part of one 40-acre tract.

"E. P. Mest claims to have settled in July, 1872, on 20 acres of land in section 21, township 21 south, range 11 west, and has continued to reside on the land, together with 120 acres he purchased from the Southern Oregon Co. Has paid rent to the company for the use of 20 acres, upon which a part of his building is situated.

"Mrs. Dora A. Krantz has possession of 40 acres in section 15, township 28 south, range 11 west, and has had it for 20 years. She has fenced and cultivated the land.

"T. G. Barker claims that his father settled in July, 1874, on the southwest quarter of section 5, township 27 south, range 11 west; that he lived there 25 years and in 1900 turned the land over to his son.

"Mrs. W. G. Robbins in July, 1913, leased 40 acres in section 7, township 28 south, range 12 west, from the Southern Oregon Co. She has improved it and made it her home.

"G. P. Miller had married into a family who had spent several thousand dollars in clearing and improving a tract of about 120 acres in the grant, lived on it for a number of years, and was finally ejected by the Southern Oregon Co.

"The above are but a few of those who, I think, rightfully claim to be entitled to equitable consideration when the Government comes to disposing of these lands. From what I can learn, there are perhaps between 50 and 100 others similarly situated. I see no reason why they should not be given a preference right to purchase the lands at \$2.50 per acre, provided that they also be required to reimburse the Government for the taxes it is to pay on these lands. In the first place, if the lands are entered under the homestead law, as they necessarily must be, the Government will receive only \$2.50 per acre from the homesteader, who will not be required to pay the taxes the Government is going to pay. These people who have spent time and money, and in some instances no inconsiderable amount, are certainly entitled to more consideration than one who has done nothing. I have talked with a number of them who seem to be perfectly willing to reimburse the Government for the taxes it may pay on these lands and in addition pay \$2.50 per acre in cash, while the homesteader will be allowed from three to five years to pay it.

"Of course, some of these people, those who have been actually living upon the land, will probably be given a preference right to homestead, but all of them have not lived upon the land. Some lived upon adjoining lands and others perhaps several miles away. I do not know just how this is, but I am reliably informed that all of those who have leased and improved the lands did not live upon them.

"I have written to my department in Washington, reporting the result of my inquiry into the attitude of the State and county officials here on that provision of the bill concerning the division of the net proceeds resulting from the sale of lands and timber in this grant, and I understand that ex-Gov. Oswald West, who represents the two counties directly involved, will be in Washington about the time this letter reaches there and will inform the committee in regard to the matter. I assume that my department will also take the matter up with you.

"I trust that you will understand the spirit in which I am writing to you in regard to the claims of these people who have been leasing and improving the lands on this grant. Some of them are very much inter-

ested in the matter and will lose what is to them a great deal unless some provision is made for their relief.

"If there is anything further that I can do in regard to any feature of the bill, please let me know. With kind personal regards, I am,

"Sincerely, yours,

"S. W. WILLIAMS,

"Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

"Section 5 of the bill provides that after the Government is reimbursed from the sale of grant lands for the moneys advanced to pay the Southern Oregon Co. and to pay the taxes the remaining proceeds from such sales shall be paid 75 per cent into the Treasury of the United States and 25 per cent to the treasurer of the county in which the lands sold are situated for common schools, roads, highways, bridges, and port districts.

"The bill as introduced followed the provisions of the act of June 9, 1916, above set forth, for the disposition of the Oregon and California railroad grant lands. This act gave 50 per cent of the proceeds to the State of Oregon and to the counties, 40 per cent to the reclamation fund, and 10 per cent to the Treasury of the United States.

"The committee amended section 5 so as to give the Government 75 per cent and the counties 25 per cent.

"In support of the allowance to the counties of 25 per cent for common schools, roads, and port districts it may be said: The grant lands are in Coos and Douglas Counties; 55 per cent of Douglas and 30 per cent of Coos County are now nontaxable, the nontaxable portions composing forest reserves and land removed from taxation on account of the reversion of the Oregon and California land grant by the Government.

"The reversion by the Government of title to the Coos Bay wagon-road grant, contemplated in this bill, will take from the tax rolls 93,000 acres, and consequently throw the burden of taxation on the remaining lands, now heavily burdened with taxation.

"Douglas County, only 45 per cent of which is taxable, on account of forest reserves and the reversion of the Oregon and California railroad grant, has now a bonded indebtedness of \$555,000 for highway construction; the port of Umpqua, in this county, has a bonded indebtedness of \$200,000 for harbor improvement. This county had in 1910 a population of 19,674.

"Coos County, which in 1910 had a population of 17,959, has an indebtedness of \$1,250,000, of which \$650,000 is a bonded indebtedness for the improvement of Coos Bay Harbor.

"The money expended by said counties in harbor and road improvements has enhanced and will continue to enhance the value of the Government timber in the forest reserves and reversioned lands, the bonded indebtedness for such expenditures will be a continuing burden on the remaining lands, and as the grant lands, hereby reversioned in the Government, may possibly remain off the tax rolls for many years, it seemed equitable to the committee that 25 per cent of the proceeds from the sales of the reversioned lands should be allotted to the counties for common schools, roads, highways, and port districts. In addition to the above expenditures for port and highway improvements, these counties are annually taxed for a fire patrol to protect the timber in said counties, including the timber on the grant in question and on other grants.

"The following statement of facts was submitted to the committee by the county judge, commissioners, and district attorney, of Douglas County.

"ROSEBURG, OREG., March 11, 1918.

"Hon. JOHN N. TILLMAN,

"Chairman Subcommittee of Committee on the Public Lands,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: Pursuant to the request of Hon. NICHOLAS J. SINNOTT and Hon. W. C. HAWLEY, Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon, we, the undersigned, duly elected and qualified officials of Douglas County, Oreg., wish to submit herewith on behalf of said Douglas County and its citizens a statement of fact for the information of the subcommittee on the Public Lands in connection with the consideration of H. R. 8625, which has for its object the disposition of the lands known as the 'Coos Bay wagon-road grant.'

"HISTORY.

"The Coos Bay Wagon Road Co. was a company duly organized for the purpose of building a wagon road from Roseburg, Douglas County, Oreg., to the tidal waters of Coos Bay, and primarily for the development of the southwestern part of the State of Oregon, and particularly for the establishment of commerce and communication between Roseburg, Douglas County, Oreg., and Coos Bay. The topography of the country which the road traversed was very rough, densely wooded, and very mountainous. The distance from Roseburg to Coos Bay, the beginning and terminus of this highway, is 61 miles.

"The Coos Bay Wagon Road Co. was composed of pioneer residents and business men of Roseburg, as follows: Aaron Rose, sr., J. F. Watson, Thomas J. Beale, J. N. Eberline, J. M. Arrington, D. L. Watson, S. Hamilton, and A. R. Flint.

"A number of these honored pioneers figured conspicuously in the development of the Northwest, and particularly of the State of Oregon. The character of these men and the purpose for which the organization was formed dispels and precludes any idea that they had any other purpose in view than the upbuilding of their State and community. The capital stock of this company was \$60,000. Like many business ventures, it proved to be more expensive than at first contemplated. Mr. J. M. Arrington, one of their number, had some knowledge of civil engineering and was also a mountaineer, and he was chosen as the civil and constructing engineer who selected the route for the location of the road. More than \$60,000 subscribed to the capital stock was expended before the completion of the road to the tidal waters of Coos Bay. Eleven miles of this road followed the Coquille River from the summit of the Coast Range of mountains, which divide Douglas and Coos Counties. A great portion of this distance was made by blasting rock from the side of the mountains along the river, and this proved very expensive construction. When it was completed it was a splendid mountain road, but its maintenance proved to be more expensive than its construction, for the reason, as stated before, of the very rough topography and the winter storms, which resulted in the destruction of much of it, and necessarily great portions of the road had to be rebuilt or repaired each year, and this proved the source of constant loss to the company. However, immediately after its completion mail, passenger, and stage routes were started, and considerable freighting was done over the road between Coos Bay and Roseburg. It served as the main highway between Douglas and Coos Counties for many years, and was kept up, in the main, by the company during this time. Afterwards the road was taken over, the part lying in Coos County by said county and the part in Douglas County by Douglas County.

"The whole history of the organization of this company and the construction of this road proves conclusively that its object was the development and building up of these counties and of the southwestern part of Oregon. The land grant which was made to the company did not repay the stockholders for the amount of money expended by them. At that time timberlands were of very little value, and most of this grant was composed of land chiefly covered by timber. The men who constructed this road did it honestly, and they intended to and did construct a highway which, when completed, was one of the best roads in Oregon, but the expense of maintaining the road was greater than the original costs of its construction. On the completion of the road, which was during the term of Hon. S. F. Chadwick as governor of Oregon, the governor himself personally inspected the road together with one or two commissioners appointed for that purpose. One of the commissioners, a Mr. William Jackson, was of Coos County. Upon their inspection and performance of the duty devolving upon them the road was accepted.

"All of these pioneers, to the best of our knowledge, are no more. However, for reference we may give the names of Hon. J. W. Hamilton, circuit judge of the second judicial district of Oregon, Roseburg, Ore., and a son of S. Hamilton, one of the company which constructed this road, and who has personal knowledge of every detail thereof, and Hon. Stephen J. Chadwick, associate justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, son of S. F. Chadwick, then governor of Oregon, and others, if your committee wish to make a further investigation of the facts herein stated.

"PRESENT CONDITION.

"The road is being used to-day, and that portion thereof from Roseburg to the Coos County line, some 20 or 22 miles, is in good condition. The greater portion of said road in Coos County is in first-class condition. However, the portion of 11 miles following the Coquille River is not in very good condition. It is being traveled and used and kept open, and automobiles by the hundreds traverse this road every summer. Some 15 years after the construction of this road a new road was constructed from Roseburg to Coos Bay, following a lesser gradient, and it has been used since that time, and we might say that the latter road traverses the more settled parts of Douglas and Coos Counties.

"AREA OF COUNTY.

"The area of Douglas County is approximately 5,000 square miles. Fifty-five per cent of this area is nonassessable, being that portion composed of forest reserves and lands removed from taxation on account of the reversion of the O. & C. Railroad land grant in the Government. Therefore 45 per cent of this county must carry the burden of the whole thereof.

"VALUATION.

"The valuation of this county is approximately \$28,000,000. A valuation of \$6,000,000 was taken from our tax rolls by the reversion of the O. & C. Railroad land grant; and by the removal from taxation of the Coos Bay wagon-road grant this valuation will be further reduced, imposing a still greater burden upon the remaining assessable property.

"ROADS.

"Douglas County has approximately 2,200 miles of road to maintain and approximately 2,300 bridges of more than 10 feet in length to keep up. Nearly one-half of this burden and expense of the construction and keeping up of these roads and bridges covers those which are adjacent to or through Government lands; in other words, nontaxable property. One hundred and five miles of the Pacific highway is located within this county. This is a highway of military importance; in other words, an interstate and an international highway. The highway from Roseburg to Coos Bay, of which some 40 miles is in Douglas County, is considered of military importance, and it requires thousands of dollars annually to keep it in repair, to say nothing of construction or improvement.

"BONDED INDEBTEDNESS.

"On June 4, 1917, the people of Douglas County voted a bonded indebtedness of \$555,000 for the construction or improvement of its main highways. The port of Umpqua, situated in the northwestern part of the county, bonded itself for \$200,000 for the construction and improvement of the harbor at the mouth of the Umpqua River. In addition to this, the various road and school districts tax themselves heavily annually to keep up the roads and schools in the county, to say nothing of the municipal bonded indebtedness of the various municipalities within the county. We merely call attention to these facts to show that by the removal of these lands from the tax roll and put in a condition where it will be years before they will be replaced upon the tax rolls of Douglas County a great burden is imposed upon the taxpayers and owners of property, which undoubtedly will inure to the detriment of the development of this portion of the great State of Oregon. The Coos Bay wagon-road grant is enhanced in value by the improvements voted by the people of Douglas County. Of the roads that are to be improved and constructed, a number of them traverse this grant. The port of Umpqua in its development of the harbor greatly enhances the value of the timber upon this grant. The State and county are required to tax themselves annually for a fire-patrol tax to conserve the timber upon this and other grants, the county in particular paying all of this tax, for the State taxes the county and most of the counties are required, in addition to the payment of the State tax, to pay one-third of the money expended for fire patrol within the respective counties.

"The valuation given at the hearing before the House Committee on the Public Lands is manifestly too low. We should say, conservatively, that the grant is nearly double the value placed thereon at said hearing. This wagon-road grant includes some of the best timber within the State of Oregon. It is nearly all on the coast slope and a great portion accessible to tidewater. Some of these 160 tracts that we have personal knowledge of cruise fifteen to sixteen million feet of timber. In addition to that a good portion of this land will be valuable when the timber is removed for dairy and grazing purposes. This is mentioned merely for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that the Government should not hesitate to administer the grant on account of losing money thereon.

"CONCLUSION.

"We think it is manifestly unfair to place any portion of the proceeds of this fund derived from the sale of this timber upon this grant or the lands thereof into the reclamation or any other fund. The State and counties in which this land grant is located have been burdened for years with heavy taxation. They will be burdened for years to come in carrying out the policy of caring for and protecting the timber thereon, and as a matter of equity and justice they should be entitled to all of the proceeds from the sale of said timber and lands over and

above the actual costs of administration by the Government. The State and counties have not been negligent in this matter. The whole history of the grant shows that the best of faith entered into the entire transaction, and we believe that as a matter of fairness, equity, and justice we are entitled to at least a substantial percentage of the proceeds from said sales for the construction of roads and the maintenance of the schools of the county and State in which this land is situated, and we trust that your committee will give due consideration to the facts hereinbefore stated. We would gladly send you the sworn statements if you so desire, but being at a great distance from the deliberation of your committee, we can not personally be present to urge our cause.

"Respectfully submitted,

"R. W. MAESTERS,
"County Judge.

"B. F. NICHOLS,
"County Commissioner.

"W. E. ST. JOHN,
"County Commissioner.

"GEORGE NEUNER, Jr.,
"District Attorney for the State of Oregon.

"Attest:
"[SEAL]

"E. H. LENOX,
"County Clerk."

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. From the Committee on Printing I report an original resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona reports from the Committee on Printing a resolution, which will be read.

The secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 452), as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] on January 29, 1919, entitled "Proceedings of the conference on the American merchant marine," held in the auditorium of the new National Museum, Washington, D. C., January 22-23, 1919, be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Arizona ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of that resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that Congress has enough printing of its own to do now without going outside and printing the proceedings of other bodies. If this manuscript is printed, I can not see why conferences held upon every public question in every part of this country should not also be printed. There is no difference whatever, except as to the subject matter.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should like to suggest to the Senator, inasmuch as he and I have for months and months made a very serious and earnest effort to keep all extraneous matter out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, although the Senate has refused to stand by us in that effort, that I am sorry to see the Senator object now to a matter that comes from the committee with a favorable recommendation. It is true that the committee has had no meeting, but it has been polled. The Senator from Utah was not seen—they did not see me until this morning—but the committee has been polled and every member of the committee except the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] has been interviewed, and they all agreed to the printing of the proceedings referred to in the resolution. Under the circumstances I did not hesitate to ask unanimous consent; but I wish to say here and now that if the Senator will stand with me again, and if the Senate will stand behind us, we will save the Government a million dollars next year in connection with its printing.

Mr. BORAH. Is the request for unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. BORAH. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes to the calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry with regard to the objection of the Senator from Idaho. Not knowing what his reason or purpose is, when he permits everything else to go into the RECORD without objection, I am at a loss to know why he objects to the printing of something which has been recommended in a report of the committee. I want to know whether or not it is in order for me to move that the resolution be considered?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if this resolution should be passed, the proceedings would not, of course, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; but I wish to say to the Senator now—and it will only take me a few moments, if the Senator from Idaho will not object—

Mr. LODGE. The resolution has gone to the calendar.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I objected for two reasons. In the first place there are certain matters which I wished to have disposed of this morning before 2 o'clock, and it seemed that the resolution of the Senator from Arizona was going to lead to debate. In the second place, I desire to say to the Senator from Arizona that he is mistaken when he says I have always permitted these matters to go into the RECORD. On the contrary, I

have voted with him and sustained him in every contention he has made in regard to such matters.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I do not think that there is any doubt about that; but I should like to say to the Senator that if he would confine his objection to matters which have not been favorably passed upon by the committee I would feel his support to be more effective.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This situation is perfectly plain. It is a report of a committee, and has to go to the calendar if there is objection. That is all there is to it.

JOHN A. GAULEY.

Mr. ROBINSON. From the Committee on Claims I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5471) for the relief of John A. Gauley, and I submit a report (No. 713) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. It is a very small claim.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to John A. Gauley, of Arlington, Mass., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,200, and said sum is hereby appropriated as compensation for personal injuries suffered by said Gauley in the course of his duties as an employee of the War Department at the Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.

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

OMAHA TRIBE OF INDIANS.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, on Tuesday last I entered a motion to reconsider the votes by which the bill (S. 3992) to investigate the claims of and to enroll certain persons, if entitled, with the Omaha Tribe of Indians was ordered to a third reading and passed, the bill having been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs. My motion was coupled with a request that the bill be returned from the House, and I understand it has been complied with. I should like to say that I have talked with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], who introduced the bill and who also reported it from the committee, and the action I am about to ask the Senate to take is entirely agreeable to him.

I am not expressing any opinion as to the merits of the bill, but it seems that the bill was reported without giving a hearing to one tribe of Indians who wished to be heard, and it is only for the purpose of giving them an opportunity to be heard that I desire the Senate to take the action I am about to ask it to take. I ask that the motion to reconsider be put, and then I wish to move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska that the votes whereby the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed be reconsidered.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

Mr. SHAFROTH. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 171) to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of the act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado, and I submit a report (No. 712) thereon.

Mr. President, this bill is identical with one which passed the Senate last January a year ago, the number of the Senate bill being 1555. I ask unanimous consent that the bill passed by the House, which, as I have said, is identically the same bill as that passed by the Senate, word for word, comma for comma, and period for period, be considered at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I told the Senate two years ago that when we limited the amount of money that could be expended in the Rocky Mountain National Park—and the only way the bill could have gotten through Congress at the time was by limiting the expenditure—there would be legislation proposed repealing that law, and, of course, that is what the bill now reported by the Senator from Colorado does. It merely means that hereafter the \$10,000 limit that was placed on expenditures for that park in the act creating it will be removed, and hereafter there will be no telling what amounts will be expended. That is the object of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state that this subject has been before the Senate a number of times, and twice has a bill on this subject been passed by the Senate, the last time being on the date given by me. It went over to the House and a Representative from Colorado secured a report on his bill, which is an exact copy of the bill which I had passed here in the Senate. The House bill is simply a substitute for the bill already passed by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; if there is any doubt as to the statement I have just made, I object and will ask that the bill go to the calendar.

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

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does the Senator insist upon his objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; if the Senator is going to doubt what I have said.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; nobody doubts what the Senator has stated. The object of this bill, Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an objection, and the bill has gone to the calendar.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will ask whether the Senator will withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. LODGE. I object. We have the conference report here on the revenue bill, which is to be disposed of as soon as possible, and I object to further discussion.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 5593) for the relief of certain officers in the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNOX:

A bill (S. 5594) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Warren, Pa., six German cannons or fieldpieces; and

A bill (S. 5595) to donate a cannon to the city of Trafford, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5596) granting an increase of pension to William C. Shaffer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 5597) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Apalachicola, Fla.;

A bill (S. 5598) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Quincy, Fla.; and

A bill (S. 5599) for the erection of a post-office building at De Funiak Springs, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 5600) granting a pension to Anna Shanks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 5601) to authorize the presentation of medals of honor, or other rewards for distinguished services, to women in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 222) extending until July 1, 1920, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. CALDER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 to examine into the question of the adoption of a zone system for the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment relative to the pay of civilian employees under the Navy Department on leave of absence, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salaries of teachers of group A, class G, including seven principals of graded manual-training schools in the public schools of the District of Columbia from \$1,000 each to \$1,200 each, etc.,

intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Pursuant to the notice I gave on yesterday, I submit a resolution and ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The resolution (S. Res. 451) was read and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved, That Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following:

"*Provided*, That with the beginning of the Sixty-sixth Congress no standing committee of the Senate shall consist of more than 17 members."

SCHOONER "HENRY O. BARRETT."

Mr. WEEKS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3123) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett*. It provides for the sending of a claim to the United States Court of Claims for adjudication.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the owners of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett*, rising out of a collision between said schooner and the U. S. monitor *Ozark*, off Five Fathom Bank Lightship, on the 19th day of April, 1917, for and on account of the losses alleged to have been suffered in said collision by the owners of said schooner *Henry O. Barrett* by reason of damages to and detention of said schooner may be submitted to the United States court for the district of Massachusetts, under and in compliance with the rules of said court sitting as a court of admiralty; and that the said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the whole controversy and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of the legal damages sustained by reason of said collision if any shall be found to be due either for or against the United States upon the same principle and measure of liability, with costs, as in like cases in admiralty between private parties with the same rights of appeal.

That should damages be found to be due from the United States to the owners of said schooner *Henry O. Barrett*, the amount of the final decree or decrees therefor shall be paid out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, provided that such suit shall be brought and commenced within four months after the passage of this act.

That the mode of service of process shall conform to the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled, "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the United States."

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

STEAMER "MAYFLOWER."

Mr. WEEKS. I also ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Order of Business 639, being Senate bill 2902, which is a bill of exactly the same character.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, we have passed four or five bills this morning by unanimous consent without having them read or anybody knowing what they are about. I do not believe the Senate ought to pass bills in this way. I think this bill ought to be read, anyway, before unanimous consent is given for its consideration.

Mr. WEEKS. I am quite willing that the bill shall be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower* and the claims of the passengers on board said steamer rising out of a collision between said steamer and the United States submarine *L-10* in President Roads, Boston Harbor, on the 11th day of August, 1917, for and on account of the losses alleged to have been suffered in said collision by the owner of said steamer *Mayflower* through damage to and detention of said steamer *Mayflower*, and by the passengers on said steamer by reason of personal injuries sustained in said collision, may be submitted to the United States court for the district of Massachusetts, the district in which said collision occurred, under and in compliance with the rules of said court sitting as a court of admiralty; *Provided*, That the said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the whole controversy and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of the legal damages sustained by reason of said collision, if any shall be found to be due, either for or against the United States, upon the same principle and measure of liability with costs as in like cases in admiralty between private parties, with the same rights of appeal: *Provided further*, That should damages be found to be due from the United States to the owner of said steamer *Mayflower* and her passengers, or any or either of them, the amount of the final decree or decrees therefor shall be paid out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *And provided further*, That such suit or suits shall be brought and commenced within four months after the passage of this act: *And provided further*, That the mode of service of process shall conform to the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

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

SALARY OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF NEW YORK.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2124) to fix the salary of the United States district attorney for the eastern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the salary of the United States district attorney for the eastern district of New York shall be at the rate of \$6,000 a year.

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

AMERICAN TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further bills or joint resolutions? If not, concurrent and other resolutions are in order. [A pause.] The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 444, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of California on the 10th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate United States soldiers should be withdrawn from Russia as soon as practicable.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, on the 12th day of December last I presented a resolution asking the policy of this Government toward Russia. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It reposes there safely and silently at the present time. To-day I have read, in the news reports that have come to us of the proceedings in the English Parliament, the statement of Lloyd George yesterday concerning the policy of the United States of America. I read in the statement of the premier of Great Britain yesterday that the United States no longer would send troops into Russia and no longer would extend any aid, substantially, in the matter of intervention.

I want to congratulate the United States, I want to congratulate the Congress of the United States, I want to congratulate the all-seeing eye of the United States Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations, that finally now we have learned from the lips of the premier of Great Britain, when such a resolution has been before the Senate since December 12 last, the policy of the United States Government with respect to Russia.

This policy, thus announced, I am very glad to commend. The action of the President in that regard, if his action be correctly described, I not only commend, but I am delighted that finally he has made plain thus, and even in this manner, exactly, what the United States in the future will do in its relations with Russia. Indeed, I reecho what was said yesterday by Lloyd George in regard to the Bolsheviks in Russia. I reecho every characterization that he then indulged regarding the men who are in control of that unhappy land and in regard to the policies they pursue. I reecho it with all of the adjectives, and would reecho it, if I were possessed of the power, with all of the eloquence that we will hear upon this floor, and that we have heard in the past, in denunciation of Bolshevik principles and in denunciation of those at the head of the Bolshevik movement in Russia.

At the outset of what little I have to say—because I shall endeavor to conclude very rapidly—I want to make it plain that the question that is involved in the resolution I have introduced here and that is before the body to-day—the mere expression of an opinion upon the part of the United States Senate—is a question that involves not Bolshevism at all, not the fantastic formulae of Lenine and Trotzky, not the massacres or the blood spilling to which they have resorted, not their rapine, not their plunder, not their assassinations. What we have involved in this resolution is an American policy for American boys, that deals with American blood, and the reason why I feel as I do upon this subject with all the force of my being is that by our supineness—aye, were it not invidious I would say by our cowardice—we are risking in Russia to-day 5,000 precious American lives without the hope of consummation of any policy of this Government, without the hope of benefiting in any degree any plan or any scheme or any purpose that may be entertained by our Government or by any man upon this floor.

The denunciation of Bolshevism is finally the refuge that those who oppose a resolution of this sort take in dealing with this subject. This is mere cuttle-fishing of the issue. We camouflage it because we dare not act upon the subject; camouflage it because, indeed, we dare not face the truth and do what we ought to do in behalf of Americans and American boys in Russia; camouflage it with that denunciation of Bolshevism and that denunciation of the formulas of Lenine and

Troitzky we have listened to in recent days; denounce Bolshevism as you will, in any fashion that you wish; I will agree with all that you may say in detestation of all that is transpiring in Russia. That is apart from what I am seeking to do. It is apart, indeed, from what is transpiring with American boys over there. It is apart from what ought to be the duty of the American Congress and what ought to be the duty of the United States Senate in passing upon a question of this sort.

I have listened here in the last few weeks to speeches by various eloquent Members of this body concerning the Bolsheviks and the horrible doctrine the Bolsheviks express. Do you know who are making Bolsheviks in this country? And I use the term not as a term which may mean a certain set of socialistic or anarchistic formulas but as synonymous with an unhappy, a discontented, and a rebellious spirit. Do you know who make Bolsheviks in America? You and I are making the Bolsheviks of this country when you and I, seeing the law violated, the Constitution rent and torn, dare not take our stand in behalf of American blood and American soldiers, who, without warrant of law and in violation of the Constitution of the United States, are killing and being killed in Russia to-day. That is the sort of thing that makes Bolsheviks, using the word in the aspect and in the characterization to which I have just alluded. When the men who are intrusted with the enforcement of the law, who have held high their hands and sworn that they would protect the Constitution of the United States, trample it under foot and permit boys of theirs to be murdered in Russia, in violation of that Constitution, that is the sort of thing, my Senators, that makes Bolsheviks in a nation, and that is the sort of thing that makes unhappy, discontented, and rebellious people.

Oh, you may say to-day that you can wage warfare without declaring war because you have confidence in the President of the United States. You may answer that you can kill and be killed in defiance of the law and the Constitution, because you know that your President, as he exists to-day, will do his full duty in the premises. Beware—take care—of the precedent you are establishing now. If you permit one President of the United States or one administration to wage war without declaring war, beware—take care—of what some other President of the United States, in whom you may not have the same confidence, and for whom you upon the other side may not have the same trustful, affectionate love, may in the future do.

And we here, when we violate this Constitution; we here, every time we have battered down one of the barriers that has been interposed by the law for the protection of individual liberty; we here, when we add another rent to the already tattered organic document of ours—we here are establishing a precedent now by which we may be plagued in the future, and by which that document that is sacred to all of us may in the future be set at naught.

The facts concerning Russia you all know; but they have been succinctly set forth recently in such a fashion that I dare read them to you so that you may know them, and then, if you wish, vote down this resolution or refer it again to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it may be bottled up for all time in the future.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I hope the Senator does not mean to imply that the Committee on Foreign Relations bottles up resolutions that are sent to it. This is the second time during his address that the Senator from California has referred in that way to the Foreign Relations Committee. Permit me to say to him that no resolution which has come to the Committee on Foreign Relations in recent months has received so much attention and consideration as the resolution to which he has referred, which he introduced, concerning our relations with Russia. I feel justified in saying that that resolution was considered at several meetings; that at the last meeting we were ready to vote upon it, but unfortunately only one Member of the Republican side of the Senate was there—because, I believe, of a Republican conference—and out of deference to the request of that Member a vote upon the resolution was deferred until the next meeting.

The Foreign Relations Committee is not in the habit of bottling up resolutions. The resolution of the Senator from California has received fair consideration; and if this resolution is referred to the committee, I can say to the Senator that it will receive fair consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May the Lord save this resolution if it shall receive the same consideration that the resolution of December 12 received at the hands of the Foreign Relations Committee!

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not making the statement that the committee will report it out. If the committee is opposed to it, the Senator certainly would not expect the committee to report it out; but I object to the term "bottling up" the resolution, which implies that we suppressed it.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from California will allow me, we took up the resolution of inquiry which the Senator introduced, and my memory was that we considered it quite fully, and that then the committee voted not to report it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Since we have entered into a discussion of that, I may say that it was amended in the first place by striking out the preamble, and I think there were other considerations presented for amending it still further. I think there was a tie vote on that particular proposition. I do not think I ought to go into details as to what was done with the resolution, but I do feel justified in saying that it received more extensive consideration than any other proposition that has come before the Committee on Foreign Relations in several weeks, and certainly the committee and the chairman are not entitled to the charge that they have suppressed it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I will accept the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska that the resolution introduced on the 12th day of December last, dealing with the lives of American boys in Russia, received extensive consideration from the Foreign Relations Committee. I am very certain that the mothers and the fathers of the boys who have been killed since December 12, illegally and without regard to the Constitution of the United States, are equally grateful for the very careful consideration that the Foreign Relations Committee has accorded unto this resolution since December 12 last.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senator will yield, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether it is the plan of the committee, if it does not decide to act favorably upon a resolution, to vote not to report it at all? I understood from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that the committee had voted not to report the resolution. If that is the policy of the committee, it seems to me that it is really bottling up the resolution by not permitting it to come on the floor of the Senate either with a favorable or an adverse report.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator's other resolution was brought up at the last meeting of the committee, and while a quorum was present one of the Senators representing the minority requested that out of deference to the Senator from California a vote be deferred until a larger attendance was present.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if it is the custom of the Foreign Relations Committee when a resolution is voted down or disapproved by the committee to permit it to die in the committee, and would that have been the fate of this resolution if the committee had failed to approve it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not able to say what the committee was going to do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What is the custom of the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I beg that I may be permitted to proceed, because my time is limited.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California has the floor and will proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I accept the explanation, of course, of the Senator from Nebraska. There remain of this session two short weeks. The resolution was presented to the Foreign Relations Committee December 12 of last year. Of course it has not been bottled up; I recognize that. It has reposed sleepily and sweetly, and very, very nicely in the bosom of the Committee on Foreign Relations, where doubtless it will remain until this session of Congress shall have been concluded, and will remain possibly—let us pray God it will not happen—until all the boys in Russia shall have been buried there. The speed and the haste that the Committee on Foreign Relations would have been compelled to display in bringing this resolution into the Senate within two months are a speed and a haste which I would not for a moment ask that that deliberate committee should employ. The speed and haste with which we continue to fight and to kill in Russia and continue to have our own killed there ought not for an instant to be imposed upon a committee in this body. The speed and haste which the Senator from Nebraska says do not constitute at all bottling up we will concede, for the purpose of the argument, will constitute active operation and deliberation by the distinguished Committee on Foreign Relations concerning this matter.

But beyond this, Mr. President, there is another proposition involved as well. The resolution calls for a statement of the policy by the United States Government concerning the liveliest matter, the most vital topic, that is existing in all the world to-day. During the period of time from December 12 until to-

day there is not a man on the floor of the Senate, there is not a representative of the Government of the United States of America, there is not anybody in power or in position who has said to the American people or said to the American Congress what is the policy of this Government toward Russia or defined it in any degree or in any aspect.

Very recently the Chicago Tribune sent a representative into Russia to ascertain the exact situation of our troops in the Archangel district. This correspondent sets forth the facts so succinctly and so well that I place them before the Senate as a basis of facts upon which the ultimate conclusion should be drawn. I read hastily this article:

The Tribune presents herewith the first of a series of cables from Frazier Hunt, giving the facts regarding the failure of the allied expedition to north Russia.

By Frazier Hunt, Vardo, Norway, February 1—

This, Mr. President, is the latest word from Archangel. This, Mr. President, is the latest statement of fact by an eyewitness of what has transpired in the Archangel district—

After two months spent in investigating the conditions in north Russia, where American troops are serving under the allied directorship, I can state the following facts:

First. The north Russia allied expedition has developed into a pitiful failure. It has failed to inspire confidence and loyalty and give real assistance to Russia. It has become a cesspool of jealousies, hatreds, mistakes, and shattered illusions. The different allies distrust one another, and the Russians distrust the entire expedition.

Second. The American troops were put under an absolute imperialistic command—

Oh, that does not appeal to us in this day here, I know! It is a matter of no consequence upon this floor.

I listened recently to a speech carefully prepared and judiciously uttered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I read the next day in the organ of the Democratic Party—the New York World—that by the delivery of that speech the Senator from New Jersey had stamped himself as a Bolshevik and should be investigated by a committee of the United States Senate.

I listened to a debate on this floor a few days ago concerning the embargo placed upon certain goods of ours by England. I listened to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] when he presented a particular resolution, and I endeavored to inform myself by ascertaining the facts from the utterances of distinguished Senators on this floor. I read only a day or two afterwards the ill-concealed inference in one of the New York papers that that resolution was dictated by German propaganda, and the inference was irresistible, too, that the Senator from Massachusetts had uttered his particular protest solely because he was the active agent of a German propaganda in this country.

I saw as well when I introduced this resolution regarding the boys in Russia the calling of those who advocated that resolution Bolshevik and all sorts of other epithets that are unnecessary now to state. The sort of intolerance now prevailing is that if a man upon the floor of the United States Senate utters an American sentiment by that very token he is called pro-German or Bolshevik or some other epithet that is sent to the country by the press, and perhaps the very epithets may be whispered upon the floor of this Chamber.

Oh, how far we have gone in this strange psychosis! We are moving to-day at a snail's pace in this body; but I want you to know the people of this country are emerging from that psychosis and by leaps and bounds have gone far, far beyond us. To be an American to-day with the people is again respectable, but in the minds of some distinguished gentlemen to be an American seems to afford an invitation for denunciation as Bolshevik, pro-German, or in some other outrageous fashion.

I will continue reading this statement of facts from Mr. Frazier Hunt:

Second. The American troops were put under an absolute imperialistic command, being handled in a way that was against every tradition of the Army and country. They were put to doing a king's business and to do whatever task was assigned to them by the British. American men and their ideals of right and fairness were entirely submerged through the un-American leadership.

LACK OF SPIRITUAL LEADERSHIP.

Third. The entire expedition suffered from a complete lack of spiritual leadership. Instead of being an ordinary soldier's job, this expedition required sympathetic understanding. It always has been more political than military. The original leaders thought themselves to be great soldiers and great diplomats, but they proved to be neither.

I will ask the Secretary if he will continue the reading of this article, proceeding with the fourth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Fourth. The expedition has lacked spiritual significance. Europe's war-tired men, sent here from the French battle fields, failed to appreciate the great revolution or sympathize with the unrest and the new birth that Russia is going through. Most of the allied soldiers, especially since the signing of the armistice, hated the job, despised the

Russians, and have no concern with the future of the country. The expedition, lacking this spiritual significance in men's minds, has become a mere fighting job to collect Russia's debt to Europe.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask permission that the entire article may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks without further reading, because of the limitation of time.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

Fifth. There is no enthusiasm even among the intelligent Russians in the north to assist the allies and fight the Bolsheviks. Everywhere there is a growing disgust against the expedition, especially against the British.

Sixth. The beautiful faith of the Russians for America is breaking under the manhandling by our forces under the foreign command. The American forces have been led by an American colonel when they should have had a major general. Within our own forces we lacked the right leadership, permitting the Americans to be placed under the limited control of foreigners.

AVOIDS THE CENSOR.

I have come out of Russia to write this. The censorship that has crawled back into its hole in most of the world still wears the iron heel of war days in the north. The American public has been fed pretty stories of the gentle glories of this "Help Russia" expedition, but the facts are that a mess has been stewed and has been kept for the cooks themselves.

America, whose ideals of honor are at stake and whose sons are being sacrificed, has the right to know these facts. In north Russia the expedition has become a dismal comic opera. Here in the north, in a district that never was violently Bolshevik, where the allies had many friends at the start, and where, since the first days there have been unlimited opportunities to advance confidence and gain respect here, with everything their own way, the allies have failed utterly.

DISTRICT OF PEOPLE GROWS.

To-day in Archangel, Murmansk, and the other cities of the district there is growing dissatisfaction against the way the expedition has interfered in local Russian affairs. Every phase of life within the district is controlled by the allies and dominated by them.

The Russians frankly resent this. They will tell you openly that they, and not the outsiders, should determine the exact form of government and pick the leaders. To-day if a Russian fails to follow the ideas and opinions of the allied leaders he is classed as a Bolshevik with the possibilities of jail to keep him silent. Only such men as conform with the foreigners' ideas last in the local government.

The foreign military are actually and undeniably interfering in local affairs. They are dominating every department, forcing their own ideas and judgments against the wishes of the north Russian provisional government. Martial law has been established, placing the foreign military above the local authorities. All this reflected against the avowed motives of the allies.

"Are the allies coming in to help Russia or themselves?" the people ask. "Are they going to force their ideas of government upon us or merely help us put down the Moscow government so we can have our own fair, elective government? If that great allied force comes into Russia, would they insist on us accepting their ideas of policies, as they have done in Archangel?"

MIXED IN INTERNAL AFFAIRS.

This is the real test of the whole idea of intervention, and the people of north Russia have the right to ask it. As far as they are able to tell by experience, military intervention means interference with the internal affairs. Practically all of the Russians resent this. They reserve the right to let their political development take its own course. It is difficult to understand the question until the facts are grasped that the whole country is seething with unrest. In the land there are a hundred and one pet theories, ideas, and beliefs, all of the adherents striving to put forward their remedies. Then into this boiling mass is stuck a bayonet, instead of a spoon, and this new outside foreign cook, whose receipts are not wanted, whose ability is questioned, whose sincerity is doubted, shouts, "Try my brand of cooking. You need it, try it, or I'll stick you with a bayonet."

This is exactly what has happened in north Russia. One particular outside nation forced their ideas of life, liberty, happiness, government, justice, censorship, and everything on the Russians, and they have been imperialistic, old-fashioned, Old World ideas.

VIEW OF ONE RADICAL.

Recently one of the sincerest Russian revolutionists in Archangel, who has given years of his life to bring about an original revolution, said:

"Thousands of honest anti-Bolshevik radicals throughout Russia are fearing the course that the intervention may take more than they fear the Bolsheviks. We prefer the present Moscow government to the return of terrible reaction. As far as we can judge, certain of the allies now are working toward breaking the heart of the whole spirit of advancement in Russia and want a heavy-handed dictatorship established, so that life and business can go on under the old imperialistic conditions."

"If the allies really want to help us, why don't they help us in a straight military way and with food, but let us decide our own political future within ourselves?"

FORCED TO MAN CARS.

The American troops are being used by a foreign high command for internal interference. For instance, on September 3, on the night before the American troops landed in Archangel in force, the provisional government was kidnapped by certain Russian militia people and spirited to an island in the White Sea. This bore, without question, the silent approval of certain elements of the allied high command, and in many circles is said to have been instigated entirely by them.

The American ambassador forced the return of this government, but the workmen of Archangel went on strike as a protest. It was a pure political strike, but the first job the American troops were assigned to was the undignified, unwarranted, and un-American job of manning the street cars, breaking the political strike.

At every minute of the time since then the Americans have been under the complete and absolute control of the British high command. The American officers have been submerged and overshadowed.

HOW BRITISH TOOK COMMAND.

In the early days of the intervention it had been expected that the Russians would flock to the allied colors by the thousands, and several hundred extra British officers, most or all of whom bore service and wound stripes, resulting from long and honorable service in France, were sent out with the idea of training and officering the unborn Russian Army. But the army failed to spring up, and the officers were left high and dry without work.

The 5,000 American troops came as a Godsend to them. The vast forest front, covering some 50,000 square miles, was divided up in a number of districts, and over each always was a British officer. Every order of any kind had to come through the British command. The rations were British, the equipment was British, and the expedition was British.

The Americans were doing their fighting in small groups with, at the most, their own platoon or company commanders over them. In certain instances the tiny groups of Americans actually were under the British sergeants. It simply didn't go. The hard feeling popped up and grew. The same conditions prevailed with all the other members of the expedition, and before long hatreds, jealousies, and distrusts were engendered which it was impossible to correct.

HOW THE AMERICANS FELT.

All the time the Americans felt they were doing a job for certain nations, helping to collect their debts and reestablish their commercial supremacy. Part of this trying condition was brought about through the lack of proper spiritual leadership in the high allied command and part through the lack of proper leadership within the American forces themselves. This put the whole expedition on a false basis and it was reflected through the leaders down to the lowliest private.

Many of the military advisers on the Russian question had been men who went through the revolution. They had been too close to the pain and anguish of the birth of new Russia to catch the significance. They had been too concerned in keeping Russia in the war to care for anything else. The very bitterness engendered by the Bolshevik's act of signing peace has kept them from thinking clearly and accurately.

These men, with the former commercial men whose Russian business suffered from the war and revolution, have made the chief corps of the allied advisers. Their hatred against the Russian revolutions has been so violent that they have seen only blood in the Russian red-flag freedom. Add to these the professional soldiers, who have often been hard and uncompromising, and you have the types who have tried to lead an expedition which, first of all, demanded intelligent, sympathetic understanding instead of steel bayonets. Their policy has been blunt, inconsiderate, tactless, and often cruel. They have set up governments and then tried to knock them down when they didn't knuckle sufficient.

ARREST DISTRICT GOVERNMENT.

There are Russians to-day in the district who are being hunted and hounded because they have gone against the high command. Recently an entire Zemstvo government in one outlying district within the allied control was arrested and brought to Archangel because they were too radical for the local allied taste. American soldiers did the actual job of assisting in this arrest.

Hand in hand with this lack of spiritual leadership goes the expedition's lack of spiritual significance to the officers and soldiers. In the first place, most of the British, French, Italian, and Serbian soldiers making up the expedition were war weary. They were sent to the north district, understanding it was to be an easy, safe work of guarding ports. Instead they found themselves fighting hundreds of miles away from the ports, down some railroad line or up some river.

Vague rumors came to them of a great British-Russian deal at stake. Other rumors told of tremendous debts which Russia owed to Europe that must be collected. The avowed reason for the original entrance at Murmansk was the threat of the White Finns, under German leadership, to turn the ice-free ports of Murmansk and Petching, on the Murman coast, into German submarine bases. This was outlived when the expedition started to Archangel under the slogan of guarding the great war supplies about to fall into the German hands. Reaching Archangel, the foreign soldiers found no supplies. This old, hard-ridden theory of guarding the supplies at Archangel lasted through hundreds of columns of propaganda, even long after the American troops had landed a month later.

HATE TURNS ON RUSSIANS.

From the start the expedition lacked the thrill of the drive that a great, honest, stated purpose would have given. The majority hated the job and transferred their hate to the Russians. They had no concern for them and did not try to understand the tremendous question the country was facing to discover the solution. They carried on in a half-hearted way, riding roughshod over the feelings of the natives and acting much more like conquerors than invited guests.

Then on November 11 the word was flashed that the armistice was signed. So these foreign soldiers, who had been fighting for four years and now were up here in frozen Russia, wanted to quit fighting and go home. They did not care for Russia, and they wanted to get out of the cold, unhappy climate and go back to their families. They no longer cared a whoop for the expedition. Their eyes were turned westward. But they had to stay on, so, being spiritually unled, they figured out their own theories on the intervention.

SUSPECT A COLLECTION AGENCY.

"Sure; we all want something out of this. That's understood," a British officer said to me not a week ago.

"America doesn't," I answered proudly.

"Cheerio, tell that to the Russians," he answered.

These soldiers can not be blamed for considering that this expedition is Europe's great collection agency. They have not honestly been told differently. The blame goes back to the home Government for failing to make an early, clear, and honest statement of the Russian policy. The war-tired, weary, heartsick soldiers of the world needed a spiritual surge, and they weren't given it.

Many question if there can ever be any enthusiasm for a Russian expedition if a big one be decided upon. Certainly there can be no enthusiasm unless there be an understanding of the real question at stake.

RESULT OF PRESENT SYSTEM.

This same lack of sympathetic understanding has developed and fostered a growing suspicion and hate among many of the Russians. The breaking down of Russian trust, the interfering with local affairs, the crushing of the spirit of unrest that is the hope of the country, the backing of certain reactionary interests against the new spirit of independence through political advancement is adding to this distrust.

The allies, the Russians point out, are visitors whose performance is poor guarantee for what will happen if a great intervention program is decided on.

HOLD FAITH IN AMERICA.

Back of it all, for America, is the beautiful faith Russia's peasant millions have for America. The bearded mouljks far inland, who have never seen a railroad and don't know the world is round, tell you they do not know what Russia needs, but that America does, and that she will help. This is something the new world has in its national possession that is priceless. Here, thousands of miles away, are millions of simple, ignorant peasants who can not read or write who look to America to lead them out of darkness.

Such a faith swings the idea of intervention and interference high above the commonplace ideas of money, power, or national advancement. It is a sacred thing, demanding honesty and sincerity. We must help, and we must find the right way. We must look straight at the great Russian revolution and its present phase. We must not be frightened at the sound of the word bolshevism and hide our heads or hold stupid hatreds. We must keep faith in a world that is tired, heartsick, blind from exhaustion and hunger.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is one other very brief article that I wish to read, which is published in the Detroit papers of February 5, and is a letter from Sergt. James Berberian, who is serving at present in Archangel. His letter says:

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.

AUXILIARIES MUTINY.

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.

We heard when first these troops were taken into Russia the solemn assurance given by the United States Government that we entered Russia not to take any territory, not for territorial aggrandizement, not to interfere with any local government, but merely to aid. The very statements that were then made were false in fact and were given to lull not only the Russian people into a false security but to lull the American people as well.

We heard then upon the floor of this Chamber that our soldiers were there to guard supplies. The answer is the fact as related by Mr. Frazier Hunt in this article read to-day, and the answer is in the fact that any time we could have obtained those supplies and at any time have taken them out, but to advance into the interior a couple hundred miles, more than 200 miles in some instances, to destroy governments there and set up our own was, of course, not an interference with Russia or with the Russian government, as we said when first we entered that unhappy country, but it was a mere undertaking friendly to them and in their aid.

We have heard these and other excuses offered—none official, Mr. President; none from our Government at all—but we have heard excuses of varying degree of protecting the Russians over there who are friendly to us. The answer is in the facts, and the facts are opposed to every contention that has been made either on the floor of the Senate or by way of semiofficial channels.

We are in Russia because we were forced in there, in the first place, against the will of the President, I am very glad to say. We are in Russia for no good at all to ourselves or the Russian people. We are in there carrying out a purpose that is foreign, I am perfectly confident, to the purpose of the President of the United States, and, thank God, we have learned to-day from the British premier finally that the President of the United States probably will not proceed in this unusual, this vicious, and this criminal course in that land.

I trust that the news which has come to us is true; but why in this great democracy, why with this great Foreign Relations Committee, can we not learn for our own people, from those who govern us presumably not as masters but as parts of a great democracy—why can we not learn from them first hand exactly what the United States Government intend to do and just exactly what it has done in the past?

England was compelled through her prime minister to tell her people. The representative of foreign affairs there told his people exactly what was his purpose and what has been England's design. In France, Pichon showed France's purpose and France's design. We boast of our liberty; we boast of our freedom; we prate of our democracy and of making other nations of the earth safe for democracy as well; and we, Mr.

President, of all the nations on earth that are in Russia to-day, know nothing about what our Government is endeavoring to do or why our boys in that semi-Arctic clime are being buried beneath the snows.

Oh, Mr. President, the Senate, with all its glorious traditions of the past, with all its past independence, with all that which has made American life so beautiful in the past and which has given us our hope and inspiration for the future, it is this thing against which I inveigh and against which I cry out; and it is for this reason, that this Senate ought to have dignity enough to know or even to express an opinion that I present this resolution after the failure of the Foreign Relations Committee to report the resolution of December 12 of last year. Why should we not know? Do you understand, sir, or do you not care?

Back there in Michigan are 5,000 mothers and fathers, sweethearts and wives—15,000, indeed—who have been holding their meetings, preparing their organizations, begging and praying that they may know concerning their loved ones across there in arctic Russia, and we who represent them have neither the courage nor, indeed, the appropriate conception of our own position to enlighten those mothers and fathers and sweethearts and wives in the State of Michigan regarding their own. Why not? You may not agree with me in respect to the policy to be pursued. That is far from the question. You may believe that one policy or another ought to be adopted by this Government in reference to Russia, but for the love of heaven and upon the oaths we took as Senators of the United States upon what theory do you fear to face the truth and to learn the facts concerning your Government's activity in Russia? Is there no appeal in these men and women and these girls who sit there in Michigan's cities and towns who have all they have on earth across there in Russia?

Oh, Mr. President, is it possible that if I had annexed to the resolution a hundred thousand dollars' worth of copper wire or a million dollars' worth of steel rails we might have had tremendous interest and enthusiasm and immediate action on it, and we might have had an expression instant and indignant of the opinion of the Senate of the United States; but because we deal only with 5,000 human lives, with the blood and the bone of the inarticulate mass of citizens of our country, because we deal only with those boys whom we conscripted for war with Germany and then in violation of the Constitution sent into war with Russia, because finally it is only our humanity with which we deal that we can get neither expression of opinion from the Senate of the United States nor report upon the resolution from the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. President, these men who are over there to-day appeal to me. I am speaking of them, and of them alone. I am speaking as an American, an American who cares more for one American boy in the snows of Russia than for all of those you feed with such enthusiasm with a hundred million dollars, who are unknown to you.

I listened to the debate upon this floor when we were proposing to appropriate a hundred million dollars to feed an unknown mass in Europe, located no man knew where, to be distributed no man knew how, and I thought of the heat and the enthusiasm of Members upon the floor of this Chamber in behalf of that hundred million dollar appropriation, and then I thought of freezing Americans 220 miles from Archangel, standing in mud and snow and swamps, standing there deserted and forgotten by the Government of the United States. It is for these men that I appeal here.

Oh, talk not to me of bolshevism and of its evils and its horrors; do not deny here to these men, so far as you can express it, an opinion because you hate something over there. Forget your hate for a moment and see if there is not room in your heart for a little love for American men in American uniforms fighting, they know not why, upon a foreign soil and being buried in unnamed graves.

In conclusion, Mr. President, just one thing more. If I were to stand upon a soap box on a street corner, or were I to go to Poli's Theater and say what is said in what I now read, you would want to investigate me, and perhaps expel me from the Senate of the United States. Listen, please, to the words I read:

I want to say a word about Russia, or not so much about Russia as about our attitude toward Russia. I hold it as a fundamental principle, and so do you, that every people has the right to determine its own form of government; and until this recent revolution in Russia, until the end of the Czar's reign, 80 per cent of the people of Russia never had a "look in" in determining who should be their governor or what their government should be. Now, I am for the 80 per cent. It is none of my business, and it is none of your business, how long they take in determining it. It is none of my business, and it is none of yours, how they go about the business. The country is theirs. The government is theirs. The liberty, if they can get it, and God speed them in getting it, is theirs.

Do you recognize these words? Ah, my Democratic brethren, have you ever heard them before? These are the words of Woodrow Wilson, spoken in relation to Mexico; and, in reading them, I have substituted Russia for Mexico. In that respect, and in that alone, have I made any alteration. Is that your creed to-day, my Democratic brethren, or do you repudiate it? If that is your creed, my Democratic brethren, what are you doing over in Russia now? If that is the creed that you follow, and if this pronouncement is yours and you believe in it, why will you not stand here with me, instead of obstructing and opposing, and pass a resolution containing the mere expression of opinion that, as soon as practicable, these boys should be withdrawn from Russia.

One word more, Mr. President, and I am done. I reiterate again and again that I am here appealing simply as an American—and, under the Providence of God, it is time for Americans to speak in this country—I am here appealing only for American boys, imperiled by our supineness and our cowardice in the past. I am appealing only for these mothers and these fathers and these sweethearts and these wives who, with anguished hearts, stretch out their hands to the Congress of the United States and who have thus far appealed in vain. For them I appeal to-day. It is as an American for Americans I speak, for an American policy, and for American khaki-clad boys who are sacrificing their lives in the snows of Russia.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only desire to say a word in regard to the Foreign Relations Committee, for I think the condemnation of my friend from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has perhaps been a little sweeping.

I entirely agree with his resolution of inquiry. I thought it ought to have been adopted. It was sent to the Foreign Relations Committee, and in justice to the committee it must be stated that it was taken up immediately after the 12th of December, as I recall the meeting of the committee. The resolution was discussed, but a majority of the committee were against reporting it at that time. I was in favor of reporting it, and so were many other members of the committee. I believe that inquiry ought to have been made. I wish I could think that the passage of a Senate resolution of inquiry addressed to the State Department would have saved a single life, but the committee did not neglect the resolution. The reason the resolution has not appeared here is that there was a majority of the committee who were not in favor of bringing it here.

Mr. President, I wish to say a single word about our relations to the condition of affairs in Russia. When the war was going on with Germany, the situation before the great advance which began on July 18 was very dark. The Czechoslovaks were making their great march across Siberia. I thought then, and I still think, that we ought to have sent help to those men at once. We were then at war. I felt very strongly, however, that if we were going to intervene at all we should have intervened effectively; we should have sent sufficient troops for that purpose. We delayed for six months, and then finally sent a very small body of troops to Vladivostok.

In the Archangel-Murmansk expedition, when that was undertaken, the war was going on; the Germans were advancing northward and were threatening Finland. It was a military movement. There, again, I thought action was justified by the allies and by the United States to meet the German advance. In my mind, it had nothing to do with the Russian Government. But again, as, I am sorry to say, has been characteristic of both England and the United States in past wars, we only intervened a little. We had much better have stayed out than to have intervened in a weak way, as we did.

The war came to an end on the field of battle. The war is not over but the hostilities ended. The danger of the advance of Germany through Finland ceased, and from that time it has seemed to me that it was the business of the United States and the business of England, though England's duties do not concern me, but it was the duty of the United States to take those troops out. They were too many to be sacrificed wantonly and uselessly, and they were too few to be effective.

I have no intention of discussing the question of the Bolsheviks in Russia. Their government seems to me as foul a government as ever cursed a country. It is not only cruel; it is not only a government of the most autocratic kind, not representing the people, for the first thing they did was to discard the constitutional convention which had been elected by the people; not only does it rob, pillage, and murder, and use the product of its robbery to maintain a mercenary army, but it is, in addition, what is perhaps worst of all, a stupid and a weak government. The government of the French Revolution, whatever its cruelties may have been, was enormously effective; but the present government in Russia is cruel, tyrannical, ineffective, and weak. Its activities are shown chiefly in an en-

deavor to spread its doctrines in other countries, and those activities are not to be met by trying to meddle with that government in Russia.

I do not regard it as our business to set up a Russian government; let them have what they have got; but I do object very strongly to their invading the territory of people like the Estonians, the Livonians, and the Lithuanians, who desire to be free and to establish a decent government; I object very much to their interference with those governments or with Poland, which is struggling to establish itself as a nation with free and ordered liberty. Those people should have our support.

But, Mr. President, none of this touches our being in Russia against the Bolsheviks with a small force—too small to effect anything—without any sign that there are any Russians who have the nerve and the courage and the power of cohesion sufficient to help us. As matters stand now, it seems to me, on the surface, a pure waste of American lives in those Arctic regions.

I was gratified this morning, of course, to get some information for the first time as to the policy of our Government in regard to Russia through the medium of the prime minister of Great Britain. The source is perhaps unusual as a method of giving information to the American Congress, but I have no doubt it is authentic. I am glad to see that some decision has been arrived at; that, as we are not disposed to make any of our dealings with Russia effective, we can at least take our men away and save their lives. I understand that the soldiers of Great Britain and the soldiers of France are quite as unwilling to go there as we are to have our American soldiers sacrificed in northern Russia, and I should be glad to see them one and all withdrawn. I think the statement of the prime minister of Great Britain, declaring that to be the policy of the President, ought to hearten the Senate sufficiently to express an opinion on the matter, although I am afraid any opinion we might express would be of little avail.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, it is my purpose to ask that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, notwithstanding the serious indictment which the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has brought against the committee for inaction.

I was glad to hear the Senator from California finally commend the policy which the President of the United States has adopted in this international matter. I have felt from the first that the Senator's agitation of this question was premature and was in the nature of a tempest in a teapot.

We went into Russia, as the Senator from California well knows, as a military matter, as a military necessity. We went in there on July 1 last, as I recall, or possibly in June. When the armistice was signed and took effect on the 11th of November, it was not in the nature of things, it was not within the propriety of military policy, to withdraw at once all American forces. We could not even withdraw our forces from France, even if we possessed the ships to do so. The armistice was merely a suspension of hostilities for the purpose of making an endeavor to arrive at permanent terms of peace.

As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has said, we went into Russia as a matter of warfare against Germany, because Germans were on Russian soil, because there was a great menace that in that country the hundreds of thousands of German soldiers and the other hundreds of thousands of German prisoners would get practical control of Russia in the face of a manifest weakness of any Russian government. When the armistice was signed it certainly would have been a reckless policy instantly to withdraw troops from Russia.

As a matter of fact, since that time there has been an insignificant amount of fighting. So far as our soldiers are concerned at Vladivostok, there has been practically no fighting for months; they are simply there marking time and waiting for the progress of the conference in Paris. So far as the body of troops is concerned which is at or near Archangel, there has been a little fighting, it is true, and some losses, it is true; but I am sure that if the Senator from California were a military man and confronted with the problem of what to do with the forces that went in there for military purposes he would realize that it would not be possible instantly to withdraw those soldiers, and that the proper time to withdraw them would be when an international agreement had been reached between the United States and the associated nations that went in there.

We did not go in alone; we went in as the result of an agreement between Great Britain, France, and, I presume, Italy. It would create a perfect anarchy and disorder for us to withdraw our troops without first securing an agreement with the other countries, even if in military policy it were proper to do so.

Mr. President, it is very evident that the policy of the President has been to hold out a friendly hand to the people of Russia. Even the Senator from California has been compelled to admit that the President of the United States has been the one man in powerful position, who at all times has endeavored to encourage the Russian people. It was the President of the United States whose policy it was, first of all of the great powers, to recognize the overthrow of autocracy and the establishment of a provisional government. It was the President of the United States who sent a friendly message to the Soviet congress which met in Russia in March, 1918, about a year ago. Let me read again this friendly message which the President sent:

May I not take advantage of the meeting of the congress of the Soviets to express the sincere sympathy which the people of the United States feel for the Russian people at this moment, when the German power has been thrust in to interrupt and turn back the whole struggle for freedom and substitute the wishes of Germany for the purposes of the people of Russia.

Although the Government of the United States is unhappily not now in a position to render the direct and effective aid it would wish to render, I beg to assure the people of Russia, through the congress, that it will avail itself of every opportunity to secure for Russia once more complete sovereignty and independence in her own affairs and full restoration to her great role in the life of Europe and the modern world.

The whole heart of the people of the United States is with the people of Russia in the attempt to free themselves forever from autocratic government and become masters of their own life.

That was the utterance of the President of the United States to the Russian congress of Soviets in March, 1918.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what class or faction of the Russian people we are now engaged in fighting—those to whom the President sent this letter and to whom those assurances were sent?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Russian Soviet is the form of government that prevails all over Russia.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand the Soviet form of government very well; but I want to know if the people to whom the President addressed that loving note are the ones that American soldiers are now shooting and being shot by?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Many of them are in cooperation with the Americans, with the French, with the British, and with the Japanese. From Vladivostok to the Ural Mountains—5,000 miles, inhabited by millions of people, and through which runs the great railroad of Russia—comparative peace and quiet prevail under the government of the Russian Soviets to-day, and they are at peace with the few soldiers of the United States and associated nations that are there. Wherever the forces of the associated and allied nations are to-day in Russia there is comparative quiet and regular government of the Russian Soviets.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before I am interrupted again, I want to read the reply which was sent by the Lenine-Trotsky dictatorship in Petrograd to this friendly assurance, this sympathetic message from the President of the United States. I want to put it in close connection with the President's message. Here is the reply:

The all-Russian Congress of Soviets expresses its appreciation to the American people, and first of all to the laboring and exploited classes in the United States for the message sent by the President of the United States to the Congress of the Soviets in this time when the Russian socialist Soviet Republic is living through most difficult trials.

The Russian Republic uses the occasion of the message from President Wilson to express to all peoples who are dying and suffering from the horrors of this imperialistic war its warm sympathy and firm conviction that the happy time is near when the laboring masses in all bourgeois countries will throw off the capitalist yoke and establish a socialist state of society, which is the only one capable of assuring a permanent and just peace as well as the culture and well-being of all who toil.

Mr. President, that reply was practically an insult to the American Government and to the President of the United States, who represented the American people. It was practically an effort to breed in the United States trouble for the American Government, which was carrying on a war. It was German propaganda endeavoring to arouse the socialistic and anarchistic element of the United States to oppose the Government of the United States. It was practically an invasion of the United States and an attempt to arouse rebellion here; and I want to say that that document is enough to condemn the sort of government which the Senator from California appears to be the champion of here upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I will not permit the Senator from Nebraska to indulge in any such misrepresentation of what I have said as that in which he has just indulged. I am

not the champion of this government that the Senator describes. The Senator from Nebraska, if he has followed my remarks, knows that full well. Such a statement I brand as utterly without foundation in fact, and the Senator has misapprehended and misunderstood every effort of mine here if he insists upon any such statement. But I say to the Senator, conceding the government there to be all that the Senator says, declare war on it if you want to. Why do you not? Why are we not manly enough to stand here in the presence of our people, and, if we hold such views as the Senator holds, why are we not manly enough and courageous enough to say, "We will declare war upon this government of the Soviets and upon Lenine and Trotzky," instead of murdering our boys over in Russia without a declaration of war?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is a fair question, and I will answer it. We are not declaring war nor making war on the Lenine and Trotzky government because it is not our affair. In spite of that message, insulting as it was, the President of the United States has remained the great champion of non-interference in Russia, and he is holding that place to-day, and he is making that fight to-day in Paris. He has only recently brought Great Britain and France and Italy to a point where they have agreed with the United States to send delegates to meet this Bolsheviki government in conference at Princes Islands, and the Senator knows that. The Senator knows that the President of the United States is not proposing to make any war on this government.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I know the fact that we are making war; and no amount of specious argument can convince the American people that when you kill in fighting and you are killed in return, when armies go forth in battle array and indulge in shooting one another down, it is not warfare. What is it, if it is not warfare? And if you speak as you do concerning these people, and claim you have the right to shoot them down without any declaration of war, how do you justify meeting them to-day at all?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I have stated that we went into Russia as a military necessity, because Germany at the height of the war was gradually reducing Russia through the Bolsheviki government of Lenine and Trotzky to the position of an assistant in the war. To say the least, Russia was a sort of political "no man's land." The Germans were there. We had the right to oppose them there, and for that purpose we went there. We were making war on Germany, and the Lenine-Trotzky government had become the tools of Germany. We had the right to go there. Now, we expect to get out. The Senator can see that it is the policy of the President of the United States as soon as possible to bring those soldiers out of Russia. The Senator can see that the President of the United States has brought Great Britain and France and Italy to the point where all are to have a conference with those Russians at Princes Islands; and I will predict now that one of the first conditions agreed upon at that conference will be the cessation of hostilities, and another result will be the retirement from Russia not of the United States alone but of all nations that went with us into Russia. When they come out, they will come out as they went in—together. When these nations come out, the terms of withdrawal will be that there will be no butchery of those Russians who have been cooperating with our soldiers. It would be indecent for the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan to withdraw their troops suddenly or prematurely and leave those who have been cooperating with us there to have their throats cut.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator state whether or not he considers that we are engaged there now in warfare against Germany?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is as much warfare against Germany as we engage in when we are occupying the bridgeheads of the Rhine. Technically it is warfare. There is no blood being shed on the Rhine, but there may be yet.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will query him no further. That sort of logic I leave, and leave it, I hope, in the RECORD just exactly as it is expressed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not any doubt in the world, Mr. President, that the gas shells which have been used by the Bolsheviki soldiers to shower upon our American soldiers were made in Germany; and the Senator believes so, too.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska further yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have no belief upon any such subject, and I do not care a rap for the sort of argument in which the Senator is indulging; but his misrepresentation of a moment ago about this particular government over there, what he takes me to task for, is not because he thinks that I have any sympathy with the Bolsheviki government, but because I am making an American fight for American boys. It is no longer fashionable in some places to do that; but our people understand it, and with them now to be American is becoming fashionable again.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will not charge the Senator with being Bolsheviki, because the very fundamental doctrine of the Bolsheviki is the rule of the majority, and the Senator is determined to have a minority rule of the Senate. He criticizes a committee, when there is a majority against him, for not reporting his resolution. He criticizes the Senate now, when a majority on both sides, I will venture to say, are against him, for not passing this resolution. He is not Bolsheviki at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska further yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, let us have a vote upon this resolution, then. That is all I am asking.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We will have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; you want to take it back to the Foreign Relations Committee, and we will never have a vote. Let us stand up here and vote upon the resolution. That is what I am asking. Will the Senator join me in that, and let the majority rule?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I expect to move to have it referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Ah, but the Senator wishes the majority to rule. Let the majority of the United States Senate now rule, and let them vote upon this resolution, and I am content.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator is not entitled, any more than any other Senator, to have his measures passed upon without reference to committees. It is the custom of the Senate to refer measures to committees, and I am going to ask that that be done in this case.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If I understand the Senator from Nebraska correctly, he and the junior Senator from California believe that the President's policy is to withdraw our troops from Russia. That is what this resolution favors. Now, if I understand the situation correctly, the President has frequently stated that he was speaking for sentiment in the United States. Now, if he is in accord with the resolution, and if the United States Senate is in accord with it, why not express that now in terms that we are in favor, under the circumstances, of withdrawing our troops from Russia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, that same argument might be used for every measure that comes before the Senate. The Senator might argue that it should not be referred to a committee. All that I am contending for at the present time is for the reference of the resolution to the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But, Mr. President, this matter has been before the committee a long time.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; not at all.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Well, a similar matter has been. It is all one great question—the Russian situation. What are we going to do in the situation that confronts us? What is the duty of the Senate to-day?

• If the Senator will permit me, I feel very strongly with regard to the facts that have been disclosed by the Senator from California so far as they affect Michigan; and yet I trust that I am big enough, or think I am, even to subordinate some of the interests of Michigan if such a course were in the interest of the great cause in which we are engaged; but I have been unable to obtain facts in reference to our continuing our troops in Russia. I know that what the Senator has said is true as to their going in; but that purpose has ended. The Senator himself admits that the President is in favor of withdrawing them. He has stood alone. Why not let the Senate raise up its hand and support the President in that great view that he has taken? Not to do so seems to me inexcusable neglect on our part; and I can not agree with the Senator that this action is premature on the part of the Senator from California or any other Senator, because we are working in the dark, and finally we have got to pass upon these treaties. If we have some clearly defined ideas, we should express them in the Congress and in the country now.

That is my attitude with reference to this matter.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I sympathize with the Senator from Michigan, because I realize that his State has furnished by far the largest quota of troops now in the Archangel region, and I realize that there is strong pressure from his constituents that those men shall be brought back; but there is also strong pressure for bringing back the hundreds of thousands of soldiers that we still have in France. The mere difficulties of getting ship space to bring them back, the mere difficulties of bringing them back from the Murman coast and from Archangel in the midst of winter, as the season is there now, are great enough to cause some pause.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But, Mr. President, that excuse has not been offered by anybody. The only excuse we have had has been that we must wait on the pleasure of the President in connection with the peace conference; that he is in command. We are reading in the press every day that our associate armies that went over there with our boys are being withdrawn, but our boys are there, and we are unable to obtain the slightest information as to what their condition is.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the Senator has not read that the troops that went in with the troops of the United States are being withdrawn without the concurrence of the United States.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Oh, but the Senator thinks he has so read.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be obliged to the Senator if he will state how, and when, and where.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Why, it is almost a matter of daily occurrence that we read something in the papers about what France and England and Japan are doing with their troops. Maybe it is unofficial, but we have to depend upon the newspaper reports for all that we know; and this resolution has been introduced for the purpose of obtaining official information. That is all that we asked for in the beginning—to know what the facts are.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the Senator is mistaken. The pending resolution is not that resolution.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But the pending resolution is what the Senator from Michigan wants. Let us support the President by passing it promptly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think, on the other hand, that the passage of the pending resolution would be a decided mistake. We are in there in concurrence with Japan, France, Great Britain, and I suppose also Italy. That concurrence is so binding that when Japan sent in an excessive number of troops, the attitude of the other countries was such that Japan has withdrawn that excess, so that the troops she has remaining there at this time are only those which she was called upon to send in by the original agreement.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Just one question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If this resolution shall be agreed to as an expression of the opinion of the Senate of the United States with reference to our duty in withdrawing our troops from Russia, does not the Senator think, if there is not a good reason for bringing our boys back from Russia, the President will possibly, or very probably, give the Senate that reason, and in that way we will get officially information about conditions there? The information thus obtained will most assuredly do no harm and may result in our being able to give the American people, especially those whose loved ones are serving in the war in Russia, suffering the hardships of the winter, and meeting the dangers of battle—in my judgment, in violation of the Constitution of the United States and without the least semblance of authority of law—information which the Senate has a right to elicit from the President, which we hope will give some comfort and consolation to the mothers, fathers, wives, and brothers of the brave boys who are being sacrificed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The answer to that question is that this pending resolution calls for no answer from the President and in the very nature of things would receive no answer from the President. As the Senator has said, this resolution is merely an expression of opinion. It could do no possible good; it would not hurry by five minutes the return of any American boy from Archangel or from the Murman coast. It would simply be an expression of opinion of the Senate, which is not informed as to the military reasons for keeping the troops there. It would be an act of the Senate which would probably be subject to misconstruction on the other side of the ocean. It would seem to foreign statesmen to be an act of the Senate questioning the wisdom of the President. It would seem to be an act of the Senate apparently protesting against cooperation between the United States and the other nations with regard to the presence of troops in Russia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution shall go over without prejudice in order that we may have a majority determination of it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made, and the resolution goes to the calendar.

THE REVENUE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask the Senator from Florida, who has charge of the unfinished business, if he will not agree to lay it aside temporarily in order that we may finish the consideration of the conference report?

Mr. FLETCHER. I was in hopes that the conference report would be concluded before this time. How much longer does the Senator think it will take?

Mr. SIMMONS. My impression and my assurance is that we shall probably be able to dispose of it in a little over an hour.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will then ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the revenue bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from a business man of my city to which I ask the consideration of the Senate. It is as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., February 10, 1919.

HON. WILLIAM CALDER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Now that you have passed the largest tax bill the world has ever known, taxing business to the limit of all it can stand, as, for instance, the candy company in which I am interested out of its earnings of \$1,000,000 must pay \$700,000 in taxes, and a few of us in interest must lend them a good part of this to enable them to do so, but in this instance I am not complaining for these profits were largely war profits, and, as you know, I am committed in favor of the 80 per cent excess-profit tax; but what we do object to is the unnecessary continuance of these extravagances.

As late as last December an automobile company in which I am a shareholder had trucks taken from it by the Government which it had sold to needed domestic buyers, and now we are told the Government has 60,000 trucks to sell. Well, by all means sell them and get it over with, if these and other merchandise are not salable abroad or can not be sold back on some reasonable terms and price to their manufacturers or arrangements made with them to be sold for account of the Government.

As a business man, as well as Senator, am sure you will agree with me that this merchandise should be disposed of as quickly as possible and not carried, accumulating expense, as a continual menace to business. This, I understand, is what Gen. Goethals thinks should be done and is asking for an appropriation for \$60,000,000 for that purpose, which I hope will not be granted.

The public is greatly appreciative of what you have already done in calling attention to the scandalous use of public funds, and trusts this important matter of resales may have your attention in the hope that those in charge may show some part of the ingenuity in saving that they have in spending.

Yours, very sincerely,

E. T. BEDFORD.

I call that letter to the attention of the Senate in connection with some observations I contemplate making on this measure.

Mr. President, it is impossible to enact a measure taxing the people that is equitable in all of its provisions, and this bill does not break the rule. In fact, because of its purpose to raise \$6,000,000,000 it will work greater hardship than any tax bill ever enacted before. It is to be regretted that a revenue bill can not be passed that will deal fairly with all concerned, but with divergent views existing between the two Houses and the Treasury Department as to the methods of taxation that should be followed a situation has been brought about resulting in some of the provisions of this bill being so drastic as to be really destructive. In both the House and the Senate there has been a disposition, a natural disposition, to tax the war contractor and the so-called "profiteer." That there has been some war "profiteering" goes without saying; but in an effort to catch and tax the real profiteer we are running down the business man who has made no vast profits as a result of war.

There are men who have made some money manufacturing war supplies that this bill will bankrupt. There are other business concerns that have not been manufacturing anything for the Government, but upon whom this bill will bear very heavily.

In discussing the last revenue measure I proposed the enactment of a uniform sales tax on merchandise, and I know that in the preparation of this measure the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] advocated the enactment of legislation of this character, which, if properly worked out, would have relieved the business community from the almost destructive burden which will be imposed by this measure.

And, then, with an income tax levied justly, we would have a simple system of taxation which would have worked out equitably and would not stifle industry, as the pending measure will in many lines.

I am much concerned about preserving the business of the Nation. We hear much to-day of reconstruction and employment for our soldiers returning from Europe and our workmen who have been laid off from their war employments. But we do not stop to reason out that in stifling business by overtaxation we take away from the soldier and the workman the opportunity of employment. Is "reconstruction" to be nothing more than a theory, or are we to follow a sensible plan that will stimulate industry and make labor, not jobs, at a premium? The whole country to-day is alarmed at the business outlook. The demands of war have practically destroyed our business fabric, and many lines of industry must start all over again. Some Members of this very body have insisted that the war should be paid for within the next few years. I differ with these gentlemen. If this war is to be a lasting advantage to the Nation, then those who have not been asked to shed their blood must be called upon to make some contribution to the cost. I am certain there will be no great hardship for those who come after us if we extend over a period of many years the raising of the money to pay for war costs.

The profits of war made a few men rich. As a result of war, however, business generally suffers, and after such a great war as we have just come out of there is bound to be a readjustment of affairs that will pinch in some quarters.

Our bonded indebtedness on December 31 totaled \$20,811,000,000 and all of our war obligations have not yet been canceled. It seems to me, Mr. President, that this Nation, if it hopes to avoid unusual business depression, must do everything in its power to stimulate the wheels of industry. The Senate has already voted during this present session an appropriation of \$200,000,000 as a contribution to the building of roads. We will be asked in a few days to appropriate \$750,000,000 for battleships and cruisers for our Navy. The Food Administrator has asked for \$1,200,000,000 to make up the difference between the world price for wheat and the Government's guaranty. The Shipping Board will, I am informed, ask us for several hundred million dollars to continue its program. From every department of the Government there comes demand for increased appropriations.

I understand that for this calendar year at least \$750,000,000 more will be asked, to be taken from the Public Treasury, to operate the railroads. Billions of dollars are yet to be expended to liquidate our war obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury indicates that \$10,000,000,000 more bonds must be issued, in addition to the money to be raised from this tax bill, to pay our war debts.

Where will all of these immense expenditures leave us? Is there no stopping point? It seems to me that the time has come for the Congress of the United States to devote itself to conducting the Nation's business in a businesslike way. No private concern could long exist with such inefficiency in its management.

As an example: The other day I received a letter from a gentleman who had visited Nitro, the great ordnance plant at Charleston, W. Va. He informed me that over a million dollars' worth of lumber was lying out in the mud and fast being burned up or stolen by the people of the neighborhood. While he was there 15,000 bales of cotton were exposed to the weather without any apparent immediate need for it, and that more cotton was coming in every day by the trainload.

We hear these things every day. There seems to be a lack of intelligent appreciation of the fact that all of these things must be paid for by the taxpayers of the Nation. Mr. President, we have got to get down again to first business principles. We must see to it that a system is followed by which the greatest economy can be had in the management of our affairs.

Is it not possible for the executive departments of the Government to determine just how much will be needed to run this Government for a period of years, including the interest on our bonds, and then estimate just how much it will take to liquidate these bonds, extending their payment over 30 or more years? If this is carefully done, the cost of government can be materially reduced; and the business men of the Nation will appreciate the fact that we are endeavoring to meet conditions as they should be met, and will resume their business activities.

I think there is much cause, Mr. President, for apprehension, and I can not quarrel with the men who have helped to make this country what it is, when they stand aghast at the need of real intelligent appreciation of the country's needs. Our crops last year were far in excess of what we were able to consume, and this year's crops bid fair to be greater. It is also true that the bowels of the earth hold untold riches in coal, oil, and ore, and that the undeveloped portions of this country make it possible that under all conditions we can take care of a population in America many times the number of people we have here to-day.

But we have been through a great war, in which, because of the lack of a comprehensive plan, we have spent vast sums without regard to its real value; and, now that the war is over, we must take account of stock and go on to days of careful expenditure. Let me warn the Senate that the people of the country are bearing their limit in the matter of taxes, and that this measure, no matter what may be said in its defense, will be destructive of many lines of legitimate endeavor.

In the years to come the great political campaigns will be made upon economy in the conduct of the Nation's business. The American people are tired of inefficiency and indifference to waste, and wherever this is found in public office those responsible for it will be retired to private life. The country has a right to demand an understanding of its business problems on the part of those charged with management of the Government and a careful expenditure of the people's money.

The party which does not understand this sort of management of the Nation's affairs will not long remain in charge of the country's business.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

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

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

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

Baird	Gore	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Gronna	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Henderson	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Smoot
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Spencer
Culberson	Kellogg	Overman	Sterling
Cummins	Kendrick	Page	Sutherland
Curtis	Kenyon	Penrose	Thomas
Dillingham	King	Pittman	Thompson
Fernald	Kirby	Ransdell	Trammell
Fletcher	Knox	Saulsbury	Walsh
France	La Follette	Shafroth	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Sheppard	Wolcott
Gay	McCumber	Sherman	
Gerry	McKellar	Simmons	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-two Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The Senator from Utah will proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if it were not for the fact that when this conference report passes, and I have no doubt but what it will pass, and the bill known as the revenue bill is signed by the President and becomes a law, there will be imposed upon the American people the heaviest burden of taxation and at the highest rate of taxation ever known in the history of our country, or of any country in the world, I would not rise to address the Senate. It also comes at a time, Mr. President, when the people have been called upon to subscribe most liberally to bond issues, not only for the purpose of paying the obligations and debts of our country but for advancing billions of dollars to other countries that with the United States have been engaged in the war.

If the bill, when it becomes a law, would raise sufficient money to pay the running expenses or indebtedness of our Government for the next two years, I would congratulate the American people and say to them, "It is the very best thing that could be done, irrespective of the injustices and discriminations the bill contains."

It is estimated that the bill will produce for the taxable year 1918, based on the business of that year, \$6,000,000,000. Mr. President, I am positive that with the relief provisions as provided in the conference report that will be a part of the law it will not nor can it produce \$6,000,000,000. If there is raised under the law \$5,300,000,000, that is the limit that can be raised.

I say that, Mr. President, because I have to the best of my ability examined most carefully into the details of the legislation. It is true that we have to estimate as to what effect the relief provisions will have upon the bill, but with only a limited and small amount estimated for them, I am convinced beyond the question of a doubt that the amount I have named is all that the bill will raise.

This seems to me an appropriate time to analyze, in as brief a manner as possible, the financial condition of our country, to

let the people know just what obligations we are under as a Nation; just how we are to meet them and to prepare them for the demands that may be made upon them not only for this year but for years to come.

While the war was on and enthusiasm and patriotism were unbounded in all parts of the country it was easy to appeal to the people to save and to economize, and by that saving and economizing to purchase the obligations of the Government as they were offered by our Treasury Department. The people of America are to be congratulated upon their splendid responses. Never in all the history of the world have a people shown such generosity and such liberality as have the American people in donating to all the causes connected with this war. It was not one call on behalf of the Red Cross to which everybody responded most willingly, but we had calls for relief from England, from France, from Italy, from Roumania, from Poland, and from nearly every country in Europe, except the central powers, who were directly involved in war against this country. Those calls for assistance were for the blind, for the maimed, for the starving, for the babies, and hundreds of other causes. Untold millions of dollars were collected in this country for those purposes. All honor to the American people—not to one class, but to every class from the richest to the poorest, from the most exalted to the humblest—for their wonderful response.

Now that the war is over and people are beginning to settle themselves in the line of endeavor which they intend to follow hereafter, and as their obligations, which were mainly created through their liberality, become due, in many cases pressing them, I am fearful, Mr. President, that it is going to be somewhat hard in the future not only for the business interests of the country but for the people generally to meet the demands that must be made upon them.

Every endeavor should be made by every Senator and by every Representative to check legislation which may be extravagant or which will have for its object the spending of the people's money for any purpose whatever that can be safely postponed. I warn the Senate now that unless that is done the people of the United States are going to demand an accounting of us. And, unless we can clear our skirts, I do not think that we shall be in public life for many years longer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with what the Senator from Utah has said; and in view of certain statements which were made yesterday I have taken occasion to look up the record, and I want to call the Senator's attention to what that record shows, in so far as his own course in reference to expenditures is concerned.

I find that the Senator from Utah has introduced in the Senate at this session bills calling for appropriations of \$1,003,645,690, or as much as the entire expenditures of the Government before this war. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that if we are to practice economy it seems to me that we should do so in this—

Mr. SMOOT. Well, I thank the Senator for injecting that statement into my remarks; but seeing that he has done so, I desire to call his attention to the fact that the bill naming a billion dollars for road building was simply the lending of the credit of the Government of the United States to the States of the Union. It was not an appropriation, nor would it have cost the Government one cent in the end. The Senator from Tennessee, however, did not want such a plan; he wanted the money to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States with which to build roads. All I desire is that these roads shall be built by the States and that the Government shall lend the States its credit, and that credit within 50 years will afford returns sufficient to meet every dollar of the cost of the roads built, less the interest to be paid on State bonds issued for that purpose. There was not a single dollar to be advanced unless the bonds of the Government were sold and when advances of a similar amount should be placed in the Treasury of the United States of the bonds of the States to which the credit was to be extended—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Now, if the Senator will wait he will later have all the time he wants to discuss the bills I have introduced.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do so. I agree with the Senator from Utah that we ought to practice economy; but it seems to me, in the light of the Senator asking for an appropriation of over a billion dollars, it would be well for him to consider—

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah has not asked for an appropriation of a billion dollars. He has asked that the Gov-

ernment should lend its credit to the States in order to enable them to build good roads.

Mr. McKELLAR. But they were to be obligations of the Government of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. I decline to yield further. I am not going to be drawn into this controversy. I have something to say about the conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to put the figures into the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator may put them into the RECORD, if he desires to do so, but not in my speech.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not want to annoy the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator wants to interrupt me upon any question that I am discussing, I am perfectly willing to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood that the Senator was discussing extravagance.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there will be maturing obligations of the Government between this and March the 15th of over \$800,000,000. For that reason the pending revenue bill should become a law at the earliest date possible, in order that the returns may be made by March 15, and under the provisions of the law the first payment, or one-quarter of the amount to be collected, is to be paid when those returns are filed.

I notice that there are also outstanding certificates of indebtedness, which have generally been sold throughout the United States to banks for the purpose of paying the daily expenses of the Government, amounting to nearly a billion dollars. Those certificates of indebtedness will be taken up as soon as sufficient money is raised by taxation or by the sale of bonds.

It is estimated that the obligations of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, will be \$18,000,000,000. Mr. President, I say now they will be more than \$18,000,000,000. In order to meet those obligations with the sale of bonds already made, and calculating that we shall raise \$6,000,000,000 from the pending revenue bill, we must of necessity, to meet them, have another liberty or victory loan, as it may be called, amounting to \$6,000,000,000.

In this connection, Mr. President, I desire to say that the total expenditures, exclusive of the public debt, but including loans and investments, from April 6, 1917—the day that war was declared upon the Imperial Government of Germany—to January 31, 1919, but 13 days ago, amounts to \$26,509,703,828.39. The total receipts from taxes from April 6, 1917, to January 31, 1918, amount to \$6,040,355,523.17.

The bond issues, including the first, second, third, and fourth liberty loans, amount to \$16,966,938,000, and the \$6,000,000,000 that no doubt will be offered by our Government this coming April and which no doubt will be taken by the people and the banks of the country, will make the bond issue to June 30 of this year, in round numbers, \$23,000,000,000.

I take it for granted that no one will question the fact that the obligations which the Government of the United States must meet for the year beginning July 1, 1919, and ending June 30, 1920, or the coming fiscal year, will be \$10,000,000,000. How are we providing to meet those obligations? I digress here long enough to say that \$10,000,000,000 will not cover the appropriations that will be made and the demands that will have to be met by our Government for that year. But what provision are we making to meet the same?

This bill, Mr. President, when it becomes a law, proposes to raise by taxation \$4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1919-20. It will not raise that amount; it would not even raise that amount if business for the business year 1919 should be as good as it was for the year 1918. If profits should be as great in 1919 as they were in the year 1918, the bill will not raise \$4,000,000,000; but is there a man in all the United States who would even suggest that the profits for the year 1919 will equal those of 1918? Mr. President, I know of whole lines of business which made exceptionally large profits in the year 1918 which will not make sufficient to pay ordinary dividends during 1919; and when this bill becomes a law, under the exemptions that are given and under the relief provisions incorporated, those whole lines of business in this country will not be compelled to pay one cent of taxes for 1919. Then, tell me that we are going to raise \$4,000,000,000 from this bill. It is impossible.

How shall the necessary amount be raised? There is only one other way, and that is by selling bonds. I might add there is another way, namely, by amending the law, but I doubt whether that can be done in time. So I want the American people to know that when this impending proposed bond issue is disposed of, amounting to \$6,000,000,000, it will only take care of the obligations under which the Government rests up to and including June 30, 1919, or the present fiscal year; and if the obligations of the Government for the coming fiscal year amount to \$10,000,000,000, we might just as well know now—and better now, perhaps—that there must be sold for that year at least \$6,000,000,-

000 worth of bonds or else we must convert the obligations of foreign countries to us into money, and with that money pay the running expenses of our Government.

Mr. President, I have prepared a bill for that purpose. I think action along that line should be taken, and I am going at this time to read the proposed bill—it is not long—so that the Senate may see just what I have in mind in the way of legislation. I say to Senators that we must begin at once to secure revenue from any and all sources that are within our power; and as we hold some \$8,300,000,000 of foreign obligations, drawing the same rate of interest as our liberty bonds are drawing, if there is any way of converting them into liquid assets for our Government, that is one of the first pieces of legislation that ought to be passed by Congress. I think this proposed bill, if it should become a law, would accomplish that result. The proposed bill reads as follows:

Within 20 days after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall negotiate and arrange with the Governments of Great Britain and France, Kingdom of Italy, Kingdom of Belgium, Kingdom of Roumania, and other governments whose obligations are held by the Government of the United States, through their duly accredited representatives to the United States, all of whom are indebted to the United States in large sums of money by reason of loans made to them from time to time by the United States, that such loans be converted into marketable and salable securities, either bonds or debentures, with coupons attached, negotiable in form, payable in dollars and in lawful money of the United States, either to bearer or the registered holder of same, having a maturity of not less than 5 years nor more than 25 years, and bearing a rate of interest of not more than 6 per cent per annum or not less than 5 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, payable in dollars in lawful money of the United States, which bonds or debentures shall be divided into denominations of \$1,000, \$500, \$100, and \$50, lawful money of the United States.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to indorse on each and every such bond, debenture, or obligation, payable as aforesaid, a guaranty on behalf of the United States Government, guaranteeing to bearer or the registered holder of said bond, debenture, or obligation the payment of the principal of said bond, debenture, or obligation, together with the interest accrued thereon from time to time until maturity. Said obligation may contain a redemption privilege at par and accrued interest from and after a date agreed upon between the Secretary of the Treasury and the government or governments issuing such obligations through their accredited representatives; that the said bonds and debentures may be redeemed in the following manner:

When the Secretary of the Treasury shall receive from the foreign government or governments issuing such bonds, debentures, or obligations the principal and interest due, on or before the date fixed in the said bond, debenture, or obligation for its redemption, he shall advertise the fact that the said bonds, debentures, or obligations will be paid, together with the accrued interest, on a date mentioned in two newspapers published in the principal cities of the United States having a population of over 250,000, and on and after the date mentioned in such notice the interest on said bond, debenture, or obligation shall cease. The coupons only up to the date of the redemption period shall be attached to said bonds or debentures.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to offer the said bonds or debentures for sale at a price of not less than par and accrued interest from the date of issue.

The bonds and debentures shall be printed and engraved in the United States of America, in the English language, at the expense of the foreign government or governments issuing the same, and shall be signed by the ambassador or an accredited representative of such foreign government to the United States having such power.

That no act of a foreign government shall relieve the United States from its guaranty.

Then, Mr. President, I provide a sum of money for carrying the provisions of the measure into effect.

I think that if such a measure or some legislation similar to it were enacted the obligations which the Government now holds in the form of notes—for that is all we have—could be sold in the open market, not only in this country, but in all the countries where there is money to invest in securities of this character. I take it for granted, of course, that now would not be a very good time to dispose of those obligations; but I think that many of our institutions would buy them, particularly so if our banking laws were changed so that they could be taken as security by the Federal Reserve Board and Federal reserve notes issued thereon, just the same as our own Government notes are treated. In this way, Mr. President—providing, however, that the obligations were all sold, and that from the pending bill we raised \$3,000,000,000 instead of \$4,000,000,000—it would be possible for the Government of the United States to pay their obligations for the coming fiscal year without issuing any further bonds of our Government. We must remember, however, that with the bonds that are to be sold in April of this year, together with the liberty bonds that have been already issued and sold, the total amount will be, as I said before, \$23,000,000,000; and in case we do not dispose of these foreign obligations in the form I have designated, or some other form, there will be added to that \$23,000,000,000 for the coming fiscal year at least \$7,000,000,000 more.

I notice that there was in the Treasury of the United States on February 11, 1919—that is only two days ago—a credit of \$1,325,862,440.73. When the President of the United States signs the urgent deficiency bill, the report on which was adopted here this morning, repealing certain appropriations that

were made for the years 1917–18 and 1918–19, amounting to over \$15,000,000,000, there will not be one single, solitary cent more in the Treasury of the United States than there is to-day.

Mr. KING. There will be less, because we will have spent some of the money that is in there now.

Mr. SMOOT. During the day; yes. But from the mail I receive from all over the United States I gather that the understanding has gone forth, and it is absorbed by all classes of people, that when we repeal the \$15,000,000,000 of appropriations made that \$15,000,000,000 goes immediately into the Treasury of the United States, and therefore there is no necessity of passing this bill. Why tax the people when \$15,000,000,000 are immediately turned back into the Treasury of the United States? Mr. President, there is not a cent turned back.

I have received pleading letters from all parts of the United States to defeat the conference report on this bill and allow the taxes to be imposed under existing law. It was stated by one of the Senators the other day that these appeals came from the big interests of the country. Ah, Mr. President, I wish that that were true. We could dispose of it very quickly then. But I want to say to you that this bill is burdensome beyond measure upon the small institutions of this country. They are the ones that are pleading for its nonenactment. They are the ones that will suffer most. Yet I think it is best to have the country know the true financial situation of its Treasury, and then I believe that the people of the United States will with a great deal more readiness pay the taxes imposed.

I recognize the high cost of living to-day, and I have wondered how soon the scale of advance will cease and the downward tendency will come. Mr. President, it is not going to come until the circulation of money begins to decrease in the United States. Senators, do you know what it is to-day? Do you know why these inflated prices have mounted as high as they have? Take up a statement of the Treasury Department almost any day, and see for yourself. I hold in my hand one dated February 1, 1919; and what do I find? Let us go back to 1880—we can all remember that far back—and what do we find our circulation per capita was? \$16.92. What do we find to be the circulation per capita on the 1st day of January, 1919? \$55.76—almost four times as much.

Where does this increased circulation per capita come from? How has it happened? Why, let me call your attention to this one fact alone—that at least \$27.50 of that increase of the circulation on January 1 of this year comes from the fact that Federal Reserve notes to the amount of \$2,630,662,112 have been issued. It is true that we held against those notes on that same date \$910,731,705 in gold.

In answering my letters in relation to the pending revenue bill I have stated my attitude upon it. I am not going to repeat it to-day, because I stated my opinion of it, and the changes that I would have made in it, when the bill was under consideration in the Senate. I thought when the bill passed the Senate that the relief provisions were very broad and sweeping, as was referred to by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. As it is reported now, they have been strengthened rather than weakened.

I now refer to the provision which imposes a tax of 80 per cent upon the net income of every corporation which derived in such year a net income of more than \$10,000 from any Government contract or contracts between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, both dates inclusive. That provision is entirely new. It was not acted upon by the House nor by the Senate, and when I first read it I could hardly believe my eyes. Why, Mr. President, this provision is not going to affect thousands of businesses in this country that ought to have paid, between the dates named, the highest possible rate of taxation. They have no contracts with the Government of the United States, but they have furnished the goods to a contractor, some of them, at prices that were unjustifiable, and their profits have been exceedingly high. Can you tell me why they should not be taxed, simply because they have no contract with the Government? I can not understand why that limitation was made.

The provisions as to amortization and net losses and obsolescence are about the same as they were when the bill passed the Senate. I notice that in a few cases they have been changed to make the bill, I think, plainer in terms, so that there could be no misconception on the part of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in favor of the taxpayer. The Senator from North Carolina covered those questions quite thoroughly in his discussion, and therefore I shall not go into the matter further.

I thought that the Senate provision imposing taxes on insurance companies, as it finally passed the Senate, should have remained in the bill. Under the provisions of the Senate amendment to the House bill there could be no escape from taxation. It was so perfect a plan that it did not make any difference

whether it was a large company or a small company, they all paid in the same proportion. But the way it is reported there will be discrepancies between companies doing the same class of business, and in many cases where the same amount of business is done with the same profits, one paying nearly double what the other pays in taxes. That should have been avoided, and could have been, but we are told that the House conferees would not yield, and that Senate amendment was lost.

In the case of estate taxes I really thought that the plan adopted by the Senate could receive no objection from the House, unless perchance it was as to the rates imposed. The House provision penalizes the man who has a large family. The Senate provision provided that the tax should be imposed upon the amount received by each beneficiary. Suppose a man dies leaving his estate to five children, and his estate is valued at \$500,000, or \$100,000 to each of the heirs. Under the House provision the whole amount is taxed at the highest possible rate, yet it is to be divided among the five children. Why should those five children be taxed upon a combined estate, when each of them has only one-fifth of the estate? All that they ought to be taxed is upon the amount that they receive from the estate. In other words, the provision as it stands is penalizing the man who has a family. It is penalizing the children. It never ought to be. Some time or other it will be changed, notwithstanding it failed in conference.

There is one provision that has been put in the bill in conference that I think is a just one, and that is this: Partnerships doing business were not taxed the same as corporations doing the same business; and I have in mind now one partnership the members of which, if this relief provision had not been amended by the conference, would have been compelled to pay nearly \$1,000,000 more in taxes than if they had been a corporation and had done the same business, sold to the same customers, and the profits were the same.

Mr. KENYON. How is that taken care of?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator asks me how that is taken care of. I will say that the conferees inserted a provision in the bill allowing partnerships to incorporate within a certain limited time; and if they do, they are taxed the same as corporations are taxed doing a similar business.

Mr. President, I, of course, never was enamored of the consolidated returns. In some cases there is no doubt but that they ought to have been allowed to make, and an injustice would be done unless they were allowed to make, a consolidated return. But reflecting over the whole United States, and taking into consideration all of the business, I am afraid that there will be a greater injustice done by allowing these consolidated returns than there would be if they had been prohibited. The House provided a specific prohibition against them, but the House yielded to the Senate, and the provision reported in the conference report is a modification of even what the provision was when it passed the Senate.

I am not going to discuss the zone system, Mr. President. I had no faith from the beginning that it was going to remain in the bill. I saw it go in the bill, and at the same time I felt that it was going out before the conference report would be returned to the Senate. In fact, before ever the conferees met, before ever there was a date set for the meeting, I saw in the public press what purported, at least, to be a statement of one of the conferees that if it remained in the bill there would be no revenue legislation; or, in other words, every Senate amendment in the bill could be agreed to but that amendment must not. I suppose the conferee had a right to make that statement. I frankly admit that I am not in the least surprised that it is out of the bill.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. MOSES. That being the case, may I ask the Senator what has become of the sacred principle of majority rule, to which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] so eloquently referred this morning?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that in conference reports the majority do rule in what they yield to and what they do not. The Senate agreed to the amendment. A majority included it in the bill. Then a majority of the conferees allowed it to go out.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him one moment on that point?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. Of course, the Senator from New Hampshire will realize that each side only has one vote in a conference, and

it is not a question of a majority of 10 conferees; it is a question of an agreement on the point at issue.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will also admit, however, that if there are three conferees on the part of the Senate and three conferees on the part of the House, and two of the conferees of the Senate and two of the conferees of the House sign the report, the conference report can be made.

Mr. PENROSE. Oh, of course. That is a majority of each side; but it has to be either a complete agreement or a complete disagreement upon the point in controversy. It is not a vote of the majority of all present.

Mr. MOSES. I hope the Senate conferees are not making a confession here that they were terrorized by one of the House conferees.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not think they were terrorized, Mr. President. I think, however, that one of the conferees on the part of the House had made up his mind that the zone amendment should not remain in this bill, just as he stated to the public press, and it was sent broadcast.

Mr. MOSES. That furnishes an illuminating example of how to get legislation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. While I agree with what the Senator from Utah says about one of the conferees, I think it fair to say that that conferee, in his expression of opinion in opposition to this particular amendment of the Senate, was supported by two of the other conferees, making a majority of the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not doubt the statement made.

Mr. PENROSE. And further than that, if the Senator will permit a further interruption, as the Senate amendment was a change of existing law, when a deadlock was reached it was clearly the duty of the Senate to recede under all the rules governing a conference.

Mr. SIMMONS. That would have been the rule, provided it had been demonstrated that a failure to recede would result in the defeat of the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to say, however, if the Senator wanted to pull that old rule on me, that I am perfectly aware that that is one of the understandings between conferees; but if that was the case I can pick up this bill, and I can go through it almost from the first page to the last and find that it was not put into force.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that this particular amendment affecting second-class rates was an amendment which was more exhaustively debated in the Senate than any other amendment the Senate added to the bill? It was an amendment that produced a close division of opinion, and it was decided by a record vote, as I remember, not only by a division but by a call of the yeas and nays. It seems to me that the Senate might have had an opportunity to pass upon it again to determine whether the conferees should recede or not, inasmuch as this was an amendment which affected a very great number of interests, a very large number of people, and an amendment which provoked a sharper division than any other amendment which the bill contains. We are told that it went out because of a newspaper publication a few days before the meeting of the conferees, and that one conferee insisted that there should be no legislation at all if that particular amendment were retained.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that when the existing revenue law was being discussed by the Senate and when that bill was before the body the same identical amendment was offered to it, and the Senate overwhelmingly adopted the amendment. It went to conference, and it went out in just exactly the same way.

Mr. MOSES. Then it is apparent that the last expiring kick of some statesman is as effective as his most vigorous efforts when he is in full possession of his strength.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know that I fully appreciate the observation of the Senator from New Hampshire. So far as the conferees on the part of the Senate are concerned, there was absolutely no division between us as to this particular amendment. There was practically no division upon the part of the House conferees in opposition to the amendment. The two Houses locked horns on this proposition from the very beginning. The conferees on the part of the Senate exhausted every possible means of securing favorable action upon it.

I agree with the Senator from Utah in his statement that this was among the last provisions in the bill acted upon. The matter came up repeatedly during our deliberations, and we always found the same disagreement with respect to it. It was retained as one of three or four other amendments which were in ultimate dispute between the conferees; and upon those three or four amendments, upon which we had made but very little progress toward an agreement, we deliberated for a very long time. I think we consumed toward the close a day and a half in controverting those three or four amendments. Finally, we reached a conclusion as to all four of them at the same time.

So everything that it was possible to do on the part of the Senate conferees to save this amendment was done. I do not think there was a more ardent advocate of this proposition in the Senate in reference to this matter than I was myself, and I think I can say that with reference to every one of the other Senate conferees.

Mr. SMOOT. I thank the Senator for the statement he has just made. I never doubted but what he had done so. But, Mr. President, I knew that every one of our conferees wanted this bill to pass, and I believe I knew that the whole bill would be sent to the bone pile rather than to have the amendment incorporated into the law.

I would like to see the whole question of second-class mail matter taken up by the Post Office Committee, and I admit that that is the proper committee to handle it, and thrash out the whole question, and do it before the 1st day of July, 1919, if possible; and if not possible, at the earliest possible date thereafter.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to the imposition of additional taxes upon second-class mail matter, but I am opposed to the quoting of a report that was made some years ago showing the cost of handling it, and I say now that it was based upon a false calculation.

Mr. MOSES. Is the legislation attempted to be sustained by the Senate conferees also based upon that false calculation? Is the whole structure based upon a foundation that has no truth in it?

Mr. SMOOT. The report is based upon a foundation in which there is no justice. There is not a Senator who does not know that you can handle a ton of second-class mail matter for less than you can handle a ton of first-class mail matter, not only in the cost of transportation over the railroad lines, but in the distribution of it. If we are to raise the rates, let them be raised, but for heaven's sake do not chop this country up into zones. No other civilized country does it. I feel mortified as a citizen of the United States when I am told that from my own State a magazine can be sent to the farthest end of India for less money than it can be sent from my State to an adjoining State. You can not defend that.

As I said, if there is to be an increase, let the rate be increased, and let the policy of all other civilized countries and that our own country has followed up until July 1, 1918, be pursued, that the information carried through the public press shall be carried to all parts of the country and to all citizens thereof at the same rate.

Mr. President, I do not feel like taking the time of the Senate any longer. All I am going to do is to plead with the Senate to study the financial condition the United States is in, to study the obligations that our country must meet, and, if possible, learn how they are to be met and oppose any legislation proposed that has a tendency to place burdens upon the people by way of taxation, vote against it, and let us get back to normal conditions as quickly as possible.

Mr. SHERMAN. May I inquire of the Senator about the deliberation of the conference committee on a matter that I think affects very materially the revenue?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. There will be no war profits after a while. Just when they will cease no one can definitely state. The excess profits depend upon private enterprise, upon the returns that can be had upon invested capital, and the industry and the ability of the managers of the business.

Did the conference committee take into account the fact that the Government appears to be retarding private enterprise so as to reduce the excess profits? I have had a number of requests, some complaints, I can say to the Senator, from very large industrial centers in the Middle West, where they can not get freight rates that will enable them to live, where their business can not be conducted at anything but a loss, where they can not conduct some of their business at all, where crushed stone, building brick, and road material is to be used, because the freight rates are at a figure where they can not without losing money engage in the business, and sometimes they are unable to get any freight at all.

Then, again, on the seacoast, in certain port cities, the manufacturers find where they have an export business or are importing certain lines of what to them is raw material they can not bring from Spain or Cuba that material needed in their manufacturing because they can not get freight rates. The freight rates were under contracts when the war began. Private steamship companies were commandeered, and the contracts were enforced. The contracts were made with an idea of transacting business at a fair margin of profit. Of course commandeering the ships ended the contracts. The ships are now in the hands of the Shipping Board of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, taken from private owners. These contracts are suspended. Now, in the coast cities the big manufacturers, some of one kind and some of another, can not get freight rates except at war figures. Great Britain has reduced her freight rates by one entire horizontal reduction of 66 2/3 per cent.

Men come to me who are managers of large enterprises and say that unless the ocean freights are reduced they can not get their raw materials to make pay rolls or to make excess profit. So at both inland and at port cities we find the same difficulty.

Has the Senator or the conference committee considered—of course we can only approximate—that unless the Government shall do some of the things that will resurrect private enterprise some of the revenues are bound to turn up less than we think?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that the conferees could not take into consideration the freight rates that would be imposed on the shippers of the country by the Railroad Administration. The Senator was out of the Chamber when I referred to what the profits, in my opinion, would be of the calendar year 1919, the present year, upon which the taxes would be imposed. The report upon the bill intimated at least, if it did not virtually state, that the bill would raise \$6,000,000,000 on the business of 1918, then the amendments that were offered to the bill providing for the imposition of taxes the following year—1919—would raise two-thirds of that amount, or \$4,000,000,000. If the bill should raise for 1918 \$6,000,000,000, and, by the way, it will not raise it, but if it should, no man will say that it would raise \$4,000,000,000 under the business that will be done for the year 1919.

I do not want to go over that question again, but unless business should be wonderfully improved from what it has been since last November after the signing of the armistice, unless it begins immediately to improve rapidly, we will not collect under this bill if it is the law much to exceed \$3,000,000,000.

The Senator from Illinois points to the railroad rates as affecting some industries in his State. I received a telegram only yesterday calling attention to the fact that the rate upon low-grade ore from a certain mine in Utah to the smelter before the Government took the railroads over was \$1.75 a ton and now it is \$4 a ton. It was a low-grade proposition, and they find themselves now, with copper at 18 cents instead of 26 cents, in a position where they must close down entirely or have a change in the freight rate. They do not get enough out of it to pay the freight. That is only one instance. I can cite to the Senator hundreds of such cases.

There will have to be a rearrangement of the rates charged at present for freight, or else untold numbers of businesses will suffer. It was all very well, and nobody objected to them paying the higher rate while they were procuring for the products a high price. Not long ago they were paying 11 cents a pound for lead. What is it to-day? Five and one-fourth cents a pound, yet the freight rates are the same as when the price was 11 cents.

I do not know what is going to be the result in the end, but I do know that the business of the country can not go on as it has been going. I do know that the high cost of living in this country must change. I also know that the American industries can not pay the rates of freight nor pay the salaries they are paying to-day, with the taxes that are imposed upon them and will be imposed upon them, and compete for the markets of the world. I know there must be a reconstruction.

I hope that the loyalty and the patriotism of the American people as a whole will recognize the fact that capital and labor must be brought closer together, that one will take the other into their confidence and figure out just what can be done, and that all, if possible, yield a little, and let us get business again running under normal conditions and have a happy people and a prosperous country.

So, Mr. President, I think the statesman of to-day has before him questions of the most serious nature to solve. I think if the statesmen to-day bring this country through the perils into which it is passing they must think more of country than they do of party, and if ever wisdom was needed by mortal men it is needed at the present time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I have not followed the details of this measure, but there are certain features of the bill that seek to collect a large amount of revenue. That along the line mentioned by the Senator from Utah I have been very much interested in, because of the effect it will have on the Treasury, as it is directly connected with the bill.

Another and a much more important effect will be on the business enterprises of the country, not only what is ordinarily included in the term "business" but the agricultural and mining enterprises that are now finding it very difficult in many places to run at a profit.

What concerns me is the condition in which I find many business enterprises. I will take one that is not from my own immediate country. A very large manufacturer of fertilizer at an Atlantic coast port had been shipping from Europe a quantity of raw material. It developed that the supply could be obtained in one of the islands in the Caribbean Basin. That supply was developed by private enterprise until it furnished all the plant needed. They had a contract with a steamship company for the transportation of the material. Until the steamships were commandeered it could be done at a fair profit. It would justify the conduct of the business and would make some excess profits as a source of revenue. It belongs to that class of corporations in which all beyond a certain profit that is stipulated in the bill or in the old law would be considered excess profits, and it would contribute a very large sum of the money to the public receipts. With the commandeering of the ships the contract ended. The Government assumed operation of the boats, and it was no longer possible for the company to obtain its ocean carriage.

The Shipping Board still has all that tonnage. It and the Emergency Fleet Corporation acting together have authority to return the ships to the private owners. That is a matter of discretion. They could do so now, possibly, although technically the war is not ended and will not be until the peace treaty is ratified in this Chamber.

There is no way of obtaining anything like adequate ocean freight rates under present conditions. Those rates are maintained by the Shipping Board at the war figures, not the figures that were provided for under their contract, on which the company intended to do business in the future, but war figures of that high type that belong to all war figures. There is no readjustment possible unless by and with the consent of the Shipping Board.

So this and other enterprises situated in a like way find themselves disabled from transacting business. How many, if a census were taken, that are engaged in export or import business there would be I am unable to say. I know that coming to my table there are very large numbers of them that already have made their embarrassments known. So we are greatly concerned in finding whether the Shipping Board will be justified in returning the steamships to their private owners. If that were done, then freight rates become matters of private contract.

I purposely selected from a number of high-priced rentals and merchandise the letter which I had inserted in the RECORD this morning. The Housing Corporation, which is a Government agency, is returning to the private owners in the city of Washington property in order that the landlord may rent it out at war rents.

The extreme celerity with which property can be returned to landlords and the very great delay in returning steamships to their private owners, while one is of much greater interest than the other, indicates that the Government departments need coordination. The property is returned by the Government to landlords so rents can be raised. Merchant ships would be returned by the Government to the owners so rates could be lowered. They do not pull together; they do not think alike; they do not act alike. If there is a reason for returning property in Washington to the landlord and the owner to rent, then there is a reason why, in a much larger way, the shipping ought to be returned to private steamship companies in order that adequate rates may be made. In the last instance rates would be lowered, and the Government does not act. In the first instance the rent is raised, and the Government acts promptly. That is particularly interesting, Mr. President, when Great Britain has cut all her rates by 66½ per cent on ocean freights. If the company or companies along the Atlantic coast are to compete in the sale of their products with the countries of Europe, and especially Great Britain, they must have a freight rate on the ocean equal to that given by the English ships or by the English Government; otherwise it spells extinction in a very short time.

I wish to continue at some length on this subject, Mr. President; but in order to accommodate the chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. SIMMONS], if it is agreeable, I will

yield the floor and continue my remarks under some other head.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, for personal reasons, is very anxious to have final action upon this measure to-night if possible; and I should be very glad if the Senator from Illinois would now suspend his remarks until a later occasion, in order that we may dispose of this bill before adjournment to-day.

Mr. SHERMAN. I shall be very glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think we ought to have a quorum present before disposing of a matter of this importance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Johnson, Cal.	Martin, Ky.	Sherman
Baird	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin, Va.	Simmons
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Jones, Wash.	New	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Kendrick	Nugent	Smoot
Curtis	Kenyon	Page	Spencer
Fernald	King	Penrose	Sutherland
Fletcher	Kirby	Pittman	Swanson
France	La Follette	Pollock	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pomerene	Thompson
Gay	Lewis	Ransdell	Townsend
Gerry	Lodge	Robinson	Trammell
Gronna	McCumber	Saulsbury	Warren
Hardwick	McKellar	Shafroth	Weeks
Henderson	McNary	Sheppard	

Mr. LEWIS. Let me at this time announce the absence of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], all three being engaged on committee work.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is still confined to his house by illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, for fear that there will not be a record vote on the adoption of this report, I desire to state that I could not support the bill when it came from the committee; I voted against it in the Senate, and I shall be obliged to vote against the adoption of this report.

I recognize the importance of having a large sum of money with which to meet the expenses of the Government. I realize that those expenses are not going to be very materially lessened during the next year. I voted for some measures of the committee as emergency measures after we had practically completed the bill, containing many provisions which I did not like. Then, the new proposition of injecting the same system of taxation into 1920 was presented to the committee and passed by a strictly party vote. I think it is a most serious question. I think that all we have a right to do is to legislate for the present necessity; that is bad enough, and we know little enough about it. We have learned some things since we reported the bill and passed it through the Senate which would have influenced us in framing a new measure at this time. We shall learn a great many things before the expiration of the present fiscal year and in time to act more intelligently upon next year's revenue bill.

I know it is useless for me to occupy the time of the Senate in opposition to this report, but I feel that this is my only opportunity to express my views concerning and my opposition to the measure. I hope that there will be a roll call upon the adoption of the report, but, if there should not be, I desire it understood that I shall vote against the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. I send to the desk and ask to have read a resolution with reference to the printing of the revenue bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution submitted by the Senator from North Carolina will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 453; S. Doc. No. 385), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, as agreed to in conference and passed by the Congress of the United States be printed as a Senate document, and that as many additional copies as can be obtained for \$500 be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

STATEMENT OF BILLS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR SMOOT.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in my colloquy with the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] this afternoon I referred to certain figures, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of the remarks I made at that time.

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

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] yields to me for a moment, and I ask the attention of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I wish to refer to him and comment on his remarks made a few moments past.

Mr. President, the morning hour closed at 2 o'clock, while the debate was on concerning the disposition of the resolution of the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] touching our troops in Russia. During that debate the eminent Senator from Massachusetts, if I heard him correctly, made reference to matters that should have been responded to then and there, but which could not be for lack of time.

The Senator from Massachusetts, I fear without intending to do so, intimated to the country at large that the policy of the United States respecting the course in Russia had to be learned by American Senators from the premier of Britain, Mr. Lloyd George; and the able Senator said that, so far as he was concerned, he, for the first time, learned of the policy of his own country—this, our country—from these pronouncements of the English premier.

Mr. President, I fear that that statement, not being understood by the public as being an observation made rather parenthetically in a debate such as we had this morning, will be assumed to mean a charge on the part of the able Senator from Massachusetts that this country has to look to England to ascertain the foreign policy of the United States, particularly as to the present difficulties. If once those who have respect for the able Senator from Massachusetts and who attach importance to all utterances from him should really believe that we had ever gotten into such a position that we could not guide ourselves, and took our guidance from England or any other foreign land, there would arise in the United States from a most respectable quarter of our citizenship a revolt and feeling of resentment. Such a declaration, if accepted on its face, would rob the President of the United States of the confidence of his countrymen, which, above all times in the world, he needs now. It would infuse into the minds of thousands of very worthy people of this country the idea that the United States has surrendered its policy to England and allowed England to direct the course and to suggest the policy, and then, when suggested, and only when suggested by England, is it adopted by the United States.

Mr. President, I am sure the able Senator from Massachusetts will say to the country that in a matter where the allied council had authority to act, as, for instance, touching the sending of troops into Russia while we were at war, and for which, as the Senator from Massachusetts said, there was justification and legitimate reason, however much subsequent events might have changed his opinion as to what should be done now, he will admit, for instance, that when the allied council had taken a step in unity it was natural that any one of that council should thereafter speak as to what the united council did. That in the case of France, Britain, and the United States Lloyd George should assume to say what was the policy moving the council simply as spokesman of a trinity of powers equal one to the other, the United States, Britain, and France. If we know that Mr. Lloyd George has assumed to speak the policy as to Russia of the allied council, including these three countries, let us recall that President Wilson has been permitted to speak the policy of these

three respecting the league of nations, and therefore on the basis of the charge of the Senator from Massachusetts might be charged in the Parliament of Britain with having directed the policy of England, which, certainly, I trust the President of the United States would never intrude himself to do or assume that this country every empowered him to do.

Sir, for himself, I freely say that if I thought Lloyd George, as an officer of the British Government, the premier of its legislative chamber, and the director of British governmental policy, had assumed to speak the policy of the United States ex cathedra of his own volition and held out to our country that he had been licensed to do so, here in my place I would dispute his authority; I would deny his power; I would repudiate his assertion. But I will not assume that he has ever done such, or that he could be so lacking in diplomacy or wanting in manners as to attempt such.

Therefore, Mr. President, as I know the eminent Senator from Massachusetts did not mean to have his country gain that impression, and feeling that they would gather it from his remarks, I think the correction is due to have it understood to what extent Mr. Lloyd George spoke. He spoke as one of the council, speaking of the policy of the council, and, while it comprehended the United States, it was not an assumption on his part to speak the sovereign policy of this country.

Again, sir, the President of the United States spoke the policy of this country in so far as he could, as read by the eminent Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] this morning; and that policy not having been changed by our country, the allied council was the only source anywhere to speak of any war policy now existing. It was the only source through which that policy could come.

I respectfully make these suggestions at this time that we might not have a misunderstanding on the part of any of our countrymen drawn from the remarks of the eminent Senator, who is too good a scholar in the affairs of his country not to know the facts, and too much of a patriot to mislead his Nation concerning them.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I doubt if anybody misunderstood what I said. I did not say that we had to turn to Mr. Lloyd George. I said, as a matter of fact, we had learned from him what the policy of the United States was. His language as given in the paper was this:

"If troops were to be sent to Russia, who should send them? America," he said, "would send neither men, money, nor material."

He was not uttering the opinion of the allied council; he was telling us what the policy of America was, and I have no doubt he knew it—not that he was dictating it; I made no such suggestion—but that he had information which we did not have, and I was very glad to get information from any source.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I think it will be apparent that Mr. Lloyd George did, as I sought to point out, make denial of the charge that seems to have been made from some source that America singly was attempting to intrude itself into these affairs by sending men, troops, and money for such purpose of assault, such as the eminent Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] this morning drew from some matters he read. It is apparent that what Mr. Lloyd George did was to deny that America as America had done such thing, clearly conveying, I think, to all of us the knowledge that what was done, for whatever reason it was done, was, of course, the act of the allied council.

Mr. LODGE. He did not say what America had done and did not deny any charge. He said:

America would send neither men, money, nor material.

I suppose he got his information from the President when he was in Paris.

Mr. LEWIS. Of course, whatever supposition both the Senator and myself indulge is a matter for which we have to take responsibility to ourselves, but I think we now clearly understand the record.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, perhaps I may be permitted to do the unusual thing of referring briefly to the bill before the Senate. Before the reading of the bill is begun it may be appropriate to call the attention of the Senate very briefly to the nature of the bill; and in doing so, in order to save time, I will ask Senators to consider the report which is filed in connection with the bill, and which is quite full. It embraces the report of the House committee also on the same subject.

It will be seen that this is the annual river and harbor appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, and its enactment at this session is necessary in order to maintain existing improvements, to continue work upon improvements heretofore authorized and not completed, and to adopt new projects or modifications which are essential to meet the demands of transportation and commerce. The bill takes care, therefore, of the maintenance of projects already completed, so that the work will not go to waste and we will not lose the benefit of what has been done in respect to those projects which have been completed. Then it takes care of continued improvements upon projects which have already been adopted, which are under way, and which it is deemed necessary and advisable or needful, in any event, should be continued. There are some new projects included in this bill, all told about 75, I believe. There have been reported to Congress 200 projects which have been approved by the Chief of Engineers upon the recommendation and findings of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the district engineers, and the division engineers throughout the country. From that list of over 200, or thereabouts, the House committee selected some 70 projects. The Commerce Committee of the Senate has added, as I recall, about five projects to those selected by the House committee, and they were selected upon the basis as mentioned in the House report, as follows:

In the selection of new projects the committee have been particularly studious and critical. No new project is included which had not been reported by the Chief of Engineers. Each report was examined and supplemented usually by later information from the Chief of Engineers. Full and free discussion was encouraged during the committee deliberations. It is believed that a full investigation by the Members of the House will induce agreement with the conclusions of the committee.

It will be recalled that we have not had for the last two years a river and harbor bill that covered more than the maintenance and continued improvement of existing projects and such few additional projects as were considered necessary for the prosecution of the war. The two bills immediately preceding the pending measure were enacted during the stress of war. For obvious reasons, as the report shows, it was deemed necessary in those bills to curtail and reduce to the limit appropriations for maintenance and further improvement and to confine the new projects to such as were associated with the progress of the war. This policy was applied to both of the preceding bills. So that now we have extended the improvements to some extent so as to include new projects which, although not absolutely necessary for the prosecution of the war, are meritorious projects recommended by the engineers and needed for the proper development of our transportation facilities.

The Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1918, comprised in three volumes, which I have here and which is accessible to every Senator, gives information as to all the items of this bill, in addition to others which have been heretofore adopted and are under improvement, together with a statement as to the financial situation respecting each item, the amount heretofore expended, the amount now available and still on hand, and the amount needed to prosecute the work for the next fiscal year.

This bill is intended to provide means for carrying on these public works for the year beginning next July and ending June 30, 1920. The amounts in the bill may be summarized under these heads, as follows:

For existing projects, for maintenance, the House bill carries \$3,183,000. The amendments reported by the Senate committee change that to \$3,707,300.

For further improvement and maintenance—that is, for prosecuting the work and for maintenance where the project has not yet been completed but is under improvement—the amount carried by the House bill was \$6,840,200. The amount carried by this bill as reported from the Commerce Committee is \$5,809,400.

On one project, that of the Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, Philadelphia to the sea, we reduced the amount carried in the House bill \$1,500,000. That was done for the reason that the amount already on hand, heretofore appropriated and now available, together with the amount which we provide in this bill of a million dollars, will be all the engineers can possibly use for the next year; so that we felt justified in reducing that item, not by way of diminishing the work or lessening the improvement or changing the project in any way at all, but because, as I have said, the amount already available and on hand for that project, together with the amount which we provide in the bill, will be all that the engineers can economically use. So that there is reduction in the item of improvement and maintenance made by that change in the bill.

For further improvement the House bill carries \$8,028,300, while the amended bill carries \$12,288,300.

As to the new projects I will say that these items are increased upon the recommendation of the engineers, because

since the report came in in December, 1918, they have seen the need of additional funds with respect to certain projects, and have recommended an increase in the amounts they submitted in their report to the House.

The new projects are, generally speaking, modifications of existing or old projects. Some are entirely new, but most of them are of that character.

For maintenance, the House bill carried \$187,000, and the bill as reported carries \$187,000.

For improvements under the head of new projects, those I have last mentioned, the House bill carries \$8,725,844, and the bill as we report it carries under that head \$10,460,364.

For examinations, surveys, and contingencies, the House bill carried \$150,000. The bill as we report it carries \$250,000, upon the recommendation of the engineers that they will probably require more than this \$150,000 to make the surveys provided by the bill. They are not sure that they will need the additional \$100,000; but in order to be safe they have recommended it, and the committee has accepted it upon their recommendation. Of course, if they do not need the entire \$250,000 for carrying out this part of the measure, making surveys and investigations and examinations, then it will not be used, and it is made available for the next year; but we thought it safe to do as they advised in that respect, because they better understand the nature and extent of the work which they will have to do, and it would be unfortunate if they found themselves, toward the latter end of their work, in a position where they did not have enough funds to prosecute the efforts to make these surveys and examinations as required in the bill.

So that the total carried by the bill as it passed the House was \$27,114,344, and the bill as the committee reports it here now, with these amendments, carries \$32,702,364. This, it will be granted, is a very moderate appropriation for this great work; and I trust that there will be no delay in passing it as soon as possible, in order that the bill may be completed and these appropriations may be provided for the work during the next fiscal year.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KELLOGG. I notice by the report that some \$10,000,000 of this appropriation is for new projects. Did the committee consider the proposition of the present cost of making those improvements as compared with the estimates at the time they were made?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator that those are projects which have never been under way at all. They have never been adopted by Congress heretofore.

Mr. KELLOGG. There were estimates, I suppose, as to the cost of those projects?

Mr. FLETCHER. The estimates for them were made some years ago, and some of them several years ago. We have considered that under present conditions there would be an increase in the cost, perhaps, over those estimates, and the bill takes care of that.

Mr. KELLOGG. There must be an enormous increase over those estimates, if they were made several years ago.

Mr. FLETCHER. In some instances, according to the advices and recommendations of the engineers, that is not the case; they have not advised that it was necessary to increase the amounts beyond their former estimates. In other instances, they do advise that it will be necessary to increase their former estimates.

Mr. KELLOGG. Was any discretion given to the Secretary of War as to going ahead with a project if the increased cost was 100 per cent or more?

Mr. FLETCHER. The committee has considered that matter, and where that sort of a situation arose we have not attempted to adopt the enterprise; and I will state that the decreases recommended by the committee amounted to \$2,000,000. The increases are shown by a comparison of the figures which I have mentioned; and a good portion of the increases recommended by the committee will be found under the two items of the Ohio River, construction of locks and dams, \$3,000,000, and the Allegheny River, Pa., construction of locks and dams, \$1,000,000, making a total increase as to those items of something like \$4,000,000, which accounts very largely for the increase of the Senate provisions over the House bill.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator please tell us what the new projects are that were put in the bill by the Senate committee? As I understand, there were five.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there were five. I have not taken the trouble to examine the bill in that respect.

Mr. KENYON. How are they shown? Are they shown in the bill by the italics?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes. All the amendments put in here by the Senate committee are shown in italics.

Mr. KENYON. And how much does that amount to? Can the Senator say?

Mr. FLETCHER. As I glance over the bill before me, the new items added in the Senate bill are as follows:

First, the Passes at the mouth of the Mississippi River, some \$550,000, which was recommended very strongly by the chief of engineers in the hearings before our committee. That item was not presented to the House because developments have occurred there at the mouth of the Mississippi which make this improvement necessary, and the engineer recommended it very strongly and insisted on it, and so we put it in the bill. Of course there is no need to say that the Mississippi River is a very important commerce bearer, and it ought to be taken care of. There has been some shifting of the channel there, and there will be some danger of erosion and destruction of former work unless this item can be taken care of.

Then the next new item, as I have it before me, is the Houston Ship Channel, Tex. That item is new, put in by the committee upon the recommendation of the engineers. These reports came in after the bill was under consideration by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House. We will deal with those in detail as we reach them, if it is desired; but I will state as to the Houston Channel that local interests are putting up just one-half of the entire cost of the improvement, which seems to be a very liberal contribution on the part of local interests. If the local community is willing to spend half as much as the entire improvement will cost, it would seem to be a pretty good indorsement of the merit of the project.

The other items added are the Ohio River, construction of locks and dams—

Mr. KENYON. Is that continuing work on the Ohio River?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is continuing work. I will say to the Senator that the total amount of the Ohio River project which has been adopted by Congress will be found to be as follows:

The total expenditures to June 30, 1918, amounted to \$46,235,306. The amount estimated to complete the project is \$23,265,488. The outstanding liabilities and contract obligations are \$3,587,320.

Mr. KENYON. Was that to be carried along at the rate of \$5,000,000 a year, or was any amount specified? My understanding of that in the past was that it was \$5,000,000 a year. This amount seems to be \$3,000,000. I am not urging that it be increased, of course.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, if the chairman of the committee will permit me, I will state that in the act of 1910 this project from Pittsburgh to Cairo was formally adopted, and it was understood that it would go on at the rate of about \$5,000,000 a year until completed, and since then it has been carrying \$5,000,000 a year. The only reason why we did not give it \$5,000,000 this time was because there was a very large sum of money on hand; the engineers had not been able to expend the money, on account of the war, which had taken so many of their skilled men. They have quite a large sum on hand, and that is why we did not give them the full amount this time.

Mr. KENYON. That is the reason why it is now \$3,000,000 instead of \$5,000,000?

Mr. RANSDELL. Yes, sir; that is the reason. They wanted to go on particularly with three or four locks, and we gave them that amount. They urged it strenuously upon us. In fact, although at first they thought they could get along without anything, they came in finally with a supplemental estimate asking for \$5,000,000.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if the Ocklawaha River item was put in by the Senate or by the House?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was put in by the Senate.

In the case of the Allegheny River there is a new item of \$1,000,000.

For Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis., there is an increase by the Senate committee of \$9,000.

For Erie Harbor, Dunkirk, and Buffalo Harbors, there is an increase of \$125,000.

The increases are shown on page 4 of the report. Just which ones of those are new projects, of course, can be readily ascertained where the item provides for the improvement in accordance with House Document So-and-so.

The item for Brunswick Harbor we increased so as to complete it, according to the recommendations of the engineers.

The Ocklawaha River item was inserted in the bill by the Senate committee amendment.

In the case of Sarasota Bay, Fla., there is an item of \$92,000 to complete the project.

Hackensack River, N. J., is a new project calling for \$88,000. Point Judith Harbor of Refuge, R. I., \$17,500, is a new project.

Pawtucket River, R. I., at a cost of \$29,720, is a new project.

Beginning with Tenants Harbor, Me., which will be the first amendment we will reach, the committee increased the amount appropriated by the House so as to complete the project. It is a small item; and the committee, as they felt with regard to several other items in the bill, felt that it was not advisable to send a dredge there to partially do that work when the whole work could be completed within a very reasonable limit. The original estimate for that improvement was \$12,500; but under present conditions the engineers thought it might require as much as \$18,750 in order to complete it, and so we provided for that, and increased the House provision by the difference between \$12,500 and \$18,750. So with some of the other items as we go through the bill. In some instances the House bill would provide for the completion of certain projects on the basis of the estimates originally made, some of them three or four years ago. We changed the words "for completion" to the words "for improvement" where we kept the figures heretofore reported; and when we put in the words "for completion" we changed the figures to correspond with the estimate of to-day. That is the explanation of the change in the item of Tenants Harbor and some of the others.

Mr. KENYON. Can the Senator enlighten us a little as to the item on page 7, the Delaware & Chesapeake Canal? Is that a new item in the House?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is a new provision, but we made no change in that item in the Commerce Committee. It was adopted by the House. As the Senator will recall, the former bill carried a provision for an investigation and study of that canal, and its probable cost, and whether it would be the part of wisdom for the Government to acquire it.

Mr. KENYON. I remember that.

Mr. FLETCHER. The reports made to the House committee upon the subject, which are available—and I shall be glad to go into that matter in detail when desired—are in favor of the Government's acquiring that canal at the figure of \$3,000,000, and the House therefore provided for it in the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if that report is found in House Document No. 196?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that is the number.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee has inadvertently made an erroneous statement. He states that this bill carries an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for obtaining that canal. Of course, I only have to call his attention to the fact that the figures are \$2,514,289.70, and practically \$500,000 is for maintenance or for new work.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely. I meant to say that the total appropriation was \$3,000,000.

Mr. KENYON. Is that exactly correct? The \$2,514,289 is to be paid for the existing canal; but the appropriation of \$3,000,000 is to cover that item, and also to bring about a depth of 12 feet. What I should like to know is, where is the report of the War Department to be found? Is it included in House Document No. 196, or was a separate report made to Congress?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I may say that I am very familiar with this project, as the Senator knows—

Mr. KENYON. I know the Senator is.

Mr. SAULSBURY. But I can not tell by the number. I have not just at hand here all the reports that have been made upon this particular project, but I will have them to-morrow morning. I have them all bound up, and I can refer to any document. There have been so many reports made favorable to this project that I am not able to distinguish them by number. From the wording of this clause in the bill I should say that that was undoubtedly the report of the engineer which favored the acquisition of that canal and its deepening to 12 feet.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that the report I was interested in was the report of the War Department favoring the acquisition by the Government of this canal. Is there not such a report in existence?

Mr. SAULSBURY. There is; and I can refer the Senator to that, if he wants it, right now.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to have the Senator do so.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think the report to which the Senator refers is Senate Document 14, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session. The letter transmitting the report, signed by the Secretary of War, is dated March 11, 1915. That was made pursuant

to a resolution introduced in the Senate and adopted by the Senate October 8, 1914.

Mr. KENYON. That will be found in Senate Document No. 14, will it?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I can not tell the Senator. I can furnish him with a copy of the report, if he desires it.

Mr. KENYON. I should be very much obliged if the Senator would do so.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have a number of copies, and I shall be very glad to furnish one to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator, now that he is on the floor, whether this canal as it now exists is in use?

Mr. SAULSBURY. It is; and about a million tons of commerce pass through it annually and pay tolls.

Mr. LODGE. What is its depth?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Boats of 9 feet draft, 23 feet beam, and 220 feet in length can pass through it. There is a double line of steamers, for example, through this canal, day and night steamers, in the summer time, and night steamers in the wintertime, between Baltimore and Philadelphia.

Mr. LODGE. So that it is in use?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Oh, absolutely; and about a million tons of freight a year pass through it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask to have the bill read, in accordance with the agreement.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Florida if he will be willing, as we reach different amendments that we may want to consider, to have them go over until tomorrow morning?

Mr. FLETCHER. I shall be very glad to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill for committee amendments.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 2, line 4, after the words "third session," to strike out "\$12,500" and insert "\$18,750," so as to make the clause read:

Tenants Harbor, Me.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 12, Sixty-second Congress, third session, \$18,750.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to say that he would simply have the bill read at this time, and let all these amendments go over without taking action upon them.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; the understanding was that any amendments that it might be desired to have go over would be passed over.

Mr. SMOOT. In order to save time, I think the Senator had better allow the amendments to stand, and just have the Secretary read the bill, so that we can simply refer back to the amendments.

Mr. FLETCHER. The formal reading of the bill has been dispensed with, and we are reading it now for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I ask that this amendment go over, and I should like to ask that all the amendments may go over.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then there is no use in reading the bill now. The formal reading was dispensed with.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the formal reading has been dispensed with, but the third reading has not been. What I thought we would do was to read the bill through, and when we reached amendments just ask to have them go over, and then all we would have to do would be to refer to the amendments.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is there any objection to this first amendment, for instance? The House item calls for \$12,500, and we find that in order to complete the improvement it is necessary to have \$18,750. The whole purpose is to make one job of it. Instead of going there and doing a part of the work, at a cost of \$12,500, we want to complete the job for \$18,750.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, certainly; I know the object of the amendment. The amendment was made just the same as all the other amendments that the committee has put in. If it were a House provision, then we could discuss it; but if it is amended now we can not offer an amendment to it without reconsidering the action on it. I do not see that the Senator is going to gain any time by it. I would not ask that the bill be read again. I thought the Senator wanted to get the bill read to-night, let these amendments go over, and then simply take up the first amendment to-morrow morning and discuss it. It seems to me we would save time by doing that.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was hoping that we could dispose of certain of the amendments to which there would be no objection whatever as we went along and go through the bill to-night; but if the desire is—

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that what I want to do is to save time. There is no need of commencing discussing this one little amendment here. What I have to say I will say about them all. I do not expect to get any of the amendments changed; but in what I have to say upon the bill I should like to discuss the whole measure, and I thought to-night we could get through reading the bill very quickly, so that all we would have to do then would be to take up the first amendment to-morrow.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well; let us have the bill read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then if an amendment is objected to, or if it is desired to have it go over, let a Senator say so.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes, on page 2, line 10, to strike out the word "Completing" and to insert "For maintenance, \$2,000; completing," so as to read:

Gloucester, Beverly, Salem, Lynn, Plymouth, and Provincetown Harbors, Mystic, Malden, Weymouth Fore, and Weymouth Back Rivers, and Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Mass.: For maintenance, \$2,000; completing improvement of Weymouth Fore River, \$183,000.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of that amendment on lines 10 and 11. I do not exactly understand it. Some 12 harbors and rivers in my State are mentioned, and then come the words "For maintenance, \$2,000." Is that supposed to be the entire sum necessary for all maintenance in all those harbors and rivers?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is all that the engineers reported as necessary to maintain them.

Mr. LODGE. That \$2,000 covers them all?

Mr. FLETCHER. It covers them all; but some of them will not need any at all. By naming them all together the engineers will have the power to use this amount wherever it may be needed most, and the engineers reported to us that that was all that would be required to maintain all those improvements. Some of them will not need any, but there are probably one or two that will need the whole \$2,000.

Mr. LODGE. As it was worded by the House, they named all those places first; and then there is one item reading "Completing improvement of Weymouth Fore River, \$183,000." That is a very large and important improvement connected with those great yards there.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; that is quite an important project.

Mr. LODGE. But the House gave us nothing for those first harbors.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; quite true. They were simply lying there, but there was nothing given for them. The committee, upon consulting the engineers, were advised that some money might be required there for maintenance, and would be required for some of these projects, but that some of them would not need any, and a few might need a little; so that the entire amount was covered by the \$2,000 for maintenance.

Mr. LODGE. They simply took a small sum so that they might have something if they happened to need any maintenance?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I think there was a considerable sum already to the credit of those items.

Mr. LODGE. That may well be.

Mr. RANDELL. I know that there was a considerable sum to the credit of most of these items. I do not remember positively as to that one, but there was quite a good sum to the credit of most of the items.

Mr. LODGE. It was almost impossible to get labor at that time, and I dare say that there was a sum there.

Mr. RANDELL. I think the Senator will find that there is quite a good sum to the credit of these consolidated items.

Mr. LODGE. And I suppose that money can be used as a continuing appropriation?

Mr. RANDELL. It certainly can. Under the provisions of the general law it remains to the credit of these items, when once appropriated, until by act of Congress it is returned to the Treasury.

Mr. LODGE. Until it is covered back to the Treasury?

Mr. RANDELL. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I only wanted to understand that. I have no doubt it is quite enough. The important improvement is the Weymouth Fore River, which I see is provided for by the House.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the principal item. The Senator will find, as suggested by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], that under Gloucester Harbor, Mass., for instance, there is \$3,900 now available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, my attention was diverted for a moment. Was the amendment calling for \$183,000 acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the amendments, under the agreement, have gone over.

Mr. LODGE. All right.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill.

Mr. KENYON. I ask the Senator from Florida if the amendment of the committee regarding the Hackensack River, on page 5, line 17, has been agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. That goes over. I do not see why we can not act on amendments that are not objected to.

Mr. KENYON. Let that amendment go over.

Mr. SMOOT. Why not agree now that we will begin to-morrow morning and take up the amendments, and then the bill need not be read through? We can consider the bill as read now, and all amendments to be passed over, and then to-morrow morning we can take up the bill immediately and begin with the first amendment and let whatever discussion is to be had on it take place then. There is no need of taking the time here to-night to read the bill or the amendments. I understand that an executive session is desired.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we can conclude the reading of the bill in a very few minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will ask that all the other amendments go over.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let the Secretary finish the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was continued, and was interrupted by.

Mr. LODGE. There appears to be some misunderstanding. Of course, this reading of the bill does not cut off amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; it does not cut off amendment and it does not agree to any amendments of the committee.

The reading of the bill was resumed and concluded.

STATEMENT OF BILLS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR SMOOT.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] asked unanimous consent to insert some figures of some kind at a place where he indicated in my remarks. I understood the Senator to ask that the figures be placed in the Record. I have no objection to that. I do not know anything about the figures, and I do object to having them put in my remarks without knowing what they are. They can be placed in the Record in the regular order. The Senator's interruptions will appear in my remarks, but I do not know anything about the figures he desires to have put in the Record. I ask the Senator now to request that the figures be put in the Record, and not in my remarks.

Mr. McKellar. During the colloquy between the Senator from Utah and myself I had before me at the time a statement of the various bills that have been introduced by the Senator from Utah calling for appropriations. These bills aggregate \$1,300,000,000, and then some more. In addition to that there is a bill proposing to appropriate 1,000,000 acres of land in Utah for those purposes.

The Senator from Utah had taken the Democratic majority very severely to task for extravagance in appropriations.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is wrong in that.

Mr. McKellar. Oh, yes; he did.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is wrong.

Mr. McKellar. He called attention in his speech to this extravagance and called upon everybody to join in having greater economy. I called the attention of the Senator to the fact that he had asked for appropriations during the present session of Congress in an amount practically as large as all the appropriations for all the purposes of the Government before the war. At that time I offered to read them and the Senator said that they could go into the Record, and I understood that they could go in the Record right there. There seems to be a difference of opinion about it. If the Senator does not want his own acts to go into the Record in his speech, that is a matter for him; I am not going to insist on it; but I want the facts to be understood.

I am not criticizing the Senator for introducing these bills. The Senator is a very vigilant Senator; he is a very active Senator; and I have no objection to his introducing the bills. I am sure he did it in the line of his duty. As I said, I do not criticize him, but the only thing that I did criticize was that the Senator himself ought not to be critical of others in the Chamber when he himself had asked for what I believed to be larger appropriations for his State and for matters in which

he was interested than any other Senator in the Chamber. My recollection is that there are about a dozen considerable appropriations for public buildings in his State and for various other purposes, for all of which, it seems to me, the Senator should be commended; but while he is to be commended for looking after the interests of his State, he ought not to criticize other people under the same circumstances, who have not offended quite so much, as it seems to me, in the matter of asking appropriations of the National Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator desire to have the statement inserted in the Record?

Mr. McKellar. I asked that. If he objects, and if he does not want the public to have the facts about it in his own speech, of course I am not going to insist that it go in at any particular place, but I ask unanimous consent that those figures may come in now as a part of my remarks. I have not them before me; I have sent for them; they are in the Reporter's office. I had no idea that there would be any trouble about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Smoot introduced the following bills, for the purpose and in the sums set opposite the number:

S. 84. Military academy, Utah-----	\$2,000,000
S. 85. Government munition factory, Utah-----	1,250,000
S. 96. Granting to Utah 1,000,000 acres of land for public roads (not included).	
S. 974. Public building at Price, Utah-----	50,000
S. 975. Public building at Park City, Utah-----	10,000
S. 976. Public building at Nephi, Utah-----	50,000
S. 977. Public building at Cedar City, Utah-----	50,000
S. 1613. Publishing names of Revolutionary soldiers-----	10,000
S. 2702. Bill to reimburse Susan Sanders-----	18,000
S. 5073. Road bill providing for the issuance of bonds to the amount of-----	1,000,000,000
S. 5447. Public building at Spanish Fork, Utah-----	35,000
S. 5449. Public building at Eureka, Utah-----	35,000
S. 5450. Vernal, Utah-----	50,000
S. 5480. Park City, Utah-----	75,000
S. 8696. Indians-----	12,690

Total-----1,003,645,690

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that I never called attention to a single bill introduced by a single Democratic Senator. I called the attention of the Senate to the amount of actual appropriations made, not to bills introduced, and I appealed to all Senators and I appealed to Congress that from now on we should begin to save and to stop every appropriation it is possible to stop.

The Senator from Tennessee refers to the billion dollars for road building as an appropriation asked for. The Senator is unfair in such a reference. It does not do him justice.

As far as the appropriations for public buildings in my State are concerned, we have five public buildings in the whole State, and there were four or five where the amount appropriated was held up for some four or five years because of the fact that the appropriation was not large enough under the conditions to construct the building as planned by the Treasury Department. These were increases asked by the department.

I care nothing as to what bills may be entered into the Record that I have introduced. That is public property already. But the idea of asking to have inserted, without reading, into a Senator's speech some figures or a statement is something that has not happened before in the Senate that I am aware of. I have no objection at all to the Senator putting anything in the Record in his own speech. I never do object to that. I am perfectly willing to stand upon my record as to economy or any other public question that has been before the Senate since I have been a Member of this body.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, the Senator says that I am unfair. I think that is a little far-fetched in this matter, because I certainly tried to be entirely fair. I am not objecting to the Senator putting his remarks in my speech. The Senator declined to let me put this matter in at the time, and I asked then for consent to let them go in. If he did not want them given out to the Senate or spoken of in the Senate while I was on my feet and waiting to read them, he could decline to do that, but he stated that they might go in the Record. Of course I assumed that they could go in the Record then and there at that place, but if the Senator objects to it, very well; I will not ask that that be done.

Further than that, I am not criticizing the Senator about public buildings in Utah. If he introduced bills for that purpose, I have no doubt they needed them there; but what I did want to call attention to was that he was undertaking to show that the majority have been very extravagant, and if we had listened to all of the proposals of the Senator from Utah I think we would probably have been just a little over a billion dollars more extravagant than we have been.

The Senator mentioned the fact that I voted for the road bill, which I did; but that was for \$200,000,000, and the road bill proposed by the Senator from Utah provided for an appropriation, or, rather, a guaranty, which is exactly the same, of just \$1,000,000,000.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Tennessee to understand distinctly that I was not speaking in his time; and I have not injected anything into his speech. The Chair recognized me and I spoke in my own time, just the same as I am doing now.

The Senator knows that there is quite a difference between a guaranty of a bond and an appropriation. I introduced the bill referred to as a substitute for the \$200,000,000 proposed to be appropriated, and the Government was not to advance the money except as upon the sale of bonds to be repaid by the States, which is quite a different proposition than an appropriation.

Mr. President, the Senator's interruption was not in answer to anything which I said. The Senator's interruption was in answer to what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] said on the floor the day before.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; if the Senator will yield, it was purely in answer—and the record of his speech will show that it was purely in answer—to the charge that the majority had been extravagant.

Mr. SMOOT. I say to the Senator right now he can not find the word "majority" in the speech.

Mr. McKELLAR. You can not find the word "majority," but you can find the fact that you were charging those who were in power—and the majority in power—with extravagance; and that is what my interruption was aimed at.

Mr. SMOOT. Again I say that the Senator can not find in the speech that I mentioned the "administration" or "the party in power." Those words were not in the speech. I appealed, as I said, to all Senators, and not only to the Senators and to the Congress, but I appealed to the people of the country, to save, the only way by which we can meet the coming obligations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, February 14, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 13, 1919.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, Judge Advocate General, to be Judge Advocate General with the rank of major general for the period of four years beginning February 15, 1919, with rank from October 6, 1917. His present appointment will expire February 14, 1919.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 13, 1919.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder to be Judge Advocate General.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Joseph T. Carruth to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

Frederick M. Hedger to be register of the land office at Walla Walla, Wash.

Nathaniel Campbell to be register of the land office at Portland, Oreg.

POSTMASTERS.

TENNESSEE.

B. Hampton Moore, Halls.
Gordon B. Baird, Obion.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 13, 1919.

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

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

Oh Thou, to whom our minds and hearts are known, cleanse us from selfishness, which is the root of all evil; that we may be wise, broad, generous, noble in all our intercourse with our fellow men; that the trend of our life may be toward the ideals in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

DEPORTATION OF ALIENS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

PRINTING OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON REVENUE BILL.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I asked a unanimous-consent order that 14,000 copies of the conference report on the revenue bill be printed in pamphlet form. The Speaker asked me if the conference report had been agreed to by the Senate. I said yes. I went over to the Senate just before I asked for that order to see whether the Senate had passed the revenue bill. The Senate had adjourned, but I met a distinguished Senator and asked him whether they had passed the conference report on the revenue bill, and he said yes, and that the Senate had then adjourned. I find that the Senate has not yet passed the revenue bill, but probably will do so to-day. Perhaps I should ask unanimous consent now to rescind that order until the Senate agrees to the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to rescind the order referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

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

H. R. 15140. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

DEPORTATION OF ALIENS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have read by the Clerk a telegram that I have received.

The Clerk read as follows:

ABERDEEN, WASH., February 12.

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We urge upon you and all our Senators and Representatives the great necessity of congressional action, looking to the early deportation of all persons who surrendered first papers in order to avoid the draft. To such men the United States has no duty of protection. They unjustly hold positions and jobs to which soldiers, sailors, and other good Americans are entitled. Their continued presence in this country must have a very bad moral, social, and industrial influence on our people. Please deliver copy to other Senators and Representatives.

J. M. Bowes, L. L. Maley, A. Emerson Cross, Roy C. Sargent, C. E. Bartlett, M. D.; W. H. Tucker, J. W. Young, Commissioner Second District; C. E. Ale, I. P. Callison, G. A. Solberg, John Tenwick, A. F. Douglas, R. H. Falconer, T. B. Darragh, W. G. Hopkins, John P. Morgan, J. J. Ryan, William Irvine, S. J. Stieglitz, E. F. Barker, T. J. Thomas, J. A. Johnson, Ed. R. West, Watson West, J. G. Kaufman, Charles Elmer, D. M. Bowes, R. Conrad, Emil Pfund, Tom H. Blyth, C. P. Blyth, Carl Beckebauer, John B. Orton, James A. Hood, Ed. Dolan, S. K. Bowes, A. W. Barkley, W. J. Patterson, Frank Porter, J. B. Bridges, W. A. Rupp, J. W. Clark, John J. Carney, W. O. McCaw, E. A. Moreck, John C. Lewis, P. A. Bertrand, A. M. Bendetson, J. S. Waugh, A. M. Middleton, E. C. Miller, C. M. Weatherwax, Neal Cooney, Chas. McDermott, L. G. Humbarger, J. J. Kaufman, W. J. Egerer, Dr. O. R. Austin, B. B. Averill, Dr. C. E. Chamberlain, Harry Phipps, T. B. Breuner, Dr. E. B. Riley, Tom Douglas, John Wilson, C. T. Scurry, L. P. Dudley, Wm. Donovan, T. J. Elson, F. G. Jones, Otis D. Hall.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that one person in every ten in the United States is not a citizen of the United States; in view of the fact that to avoid military service a great many of these aliens forfeited their declarations of intention to become citizens; and in view of the fact that neither the courts nor the people can in good faith

accept such persons in the future as citizens, I sincerely hope that Congress will enact legislation looking to their deportation. If the countries from which these undesirables came refuse to receive them back, then we can refuse henceforth admission to all persons from those countries.

I hope the Rules Committee of the House will quickly authorize consideration of the immigration suspension bill recently reported from the committee of which I have the honor to be a member. I hope that a clause covering in these first-paper draft evaders can be added. I hope that the deportation of undesirable aliens will proceed rapidly. I hope the United States will make progress with the house cleaning that the war has demonstrated we need. We should be rid of all non-Americans among us who either can not or will not become citizens. We should be through with their languages. We should be through with the philosophies they bring, the revolutions they preach.

An ounce of Ben Franklin's maxims is worth a ton of Karl Marx's theories. Mr. Speaker, I am not a brother to the Japanese and the Hindu, nor am I a brother to the anarchist and the nihilist, nor can all of the internationalism that can be preached from all the high places of the world make me one.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is a Government of the people and by the people, but it must be a Government directed by its own people, and not a Government directed in any part whatsoever by those who come among us not to help sustain our Government but to wreck and tear it down. Nor can we keep among us, to be citizens at some future time, those who declined the call to shoulder arms alongside our own true citizens, both native and adopted.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15835) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate be concluded within one hour, with the statement that those gentlemen who have asked for time and who have not yet been given time may have time extended to them liberally under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate be concluded in one hour, and that in the meantime those who have asked time in which to make speeches can extend their remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, unless it is understood that the extension of remarks shall apply to the bill, and shall simply be an extension of the Members' actual remarks, I shall object.

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object, I will not object if the last part of the request is not included in regard to extension of remarks. Others have spoken, quite a number of Members, and they have spoken on everything from socialism down, and if those who have not been privileged to speak and who have asked for time are permitted to print on anything they want to talk about, then I shall object to any extension at all.

Mr. KAHN. I tried to get the gentleman from Missouri yesterday.

Mr. DYER. I am not complaining. I was not able to be here after 6 o'clock.

Mr. KAHN. I said I would yield him time if he would come on the floor.

Mr. DYER. I was not able to be here after 6.

Mr. KAHN. It was before 6 that I sent for the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. It does not make any difference about that. The question is whether the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] is going to get unanimous consent.

Mr. DYER. If he will modify his request, I will not object.

Mr. DENT. In what way?

Mr. DYER. To confine it to closing general debate in an hour.

Mr. DENT. Then, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be closed in one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate be closed in one hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Judge SAUNDERS of Virginia, who was presiding over this committee, does not seem to be here. The

gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] will please take the chair until Judge SAUNDERS gets here.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15835, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. BANKHEAD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the annual Army appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is recognized.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not attempt at this time to speak of the wonderful victories won by the American soldiers in this war. Others have done that admirably on this floor during this debate. Suffice it to say that one of the brightest pages of American history has been written by the men of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the National Army, cooperating together as the Army of the United States in the struggle now happily ended, I hope.

Americans will always be proud of the wonderful work accomplished by these soldiers, many of whom had been trained only six months before they entered the battle lines. I can remember, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, when general officers would appear before us and tell us without cracking a smile that you can not make a soldier inside of three years, and that if you could take a man and train him for five years it would be very much better than if you took him for only three. But in this war the United States showed the world that under a conscription law we brought such material to the ranks and to our colors that in six months the soldier could go up against the shock troops of the German Emperor and lick them to a finish. [Applause.]

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question in this connection—just for a question?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. But the gentleman admits that while the boys can be trained and do the work it is necessary to have a certain number of men to keep up with the scientific side of it, such as the chemical and air service, liquid fire, gas, and so on?

Mr. KAHN. We must have commissioned officers, who must make military work a life study, and for our noncommissioned officers we must always have a fair number of trained enlisted men.

Mr. LAZARO. Yes; to keep up with the progress of military science.

Mr. KAHN. We must have a Regular Army force for the Philippine Islands, for Hawaii, for the Panama Canal Zone, for the Mexican border, for Alaska, and for those places where we have international agreements.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman think it makes men any better to draft them than it does if they volunteer?

Mr. KAHN. No; I do not think it makes men any better; but you can raise armies under the draft and you can not raise them by volunteering.

Mr. GORDON. Well, we raised a million by volunteer enlistments.

Mr. KAHN. That is a matter that we fought out long ago. This war was finished by the people of the United States inside of a year after our soldiers got on the field of battle. We would not have had more than a million men on the field of battle if we had depended on volunteers.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Has the gentleman found that it makes men any worse to draft them?

Mr. KAHN. That question answers itself. We had as good an Army and probably a better Army than we have ever had before at any time in our country's history.

Mr. LAZARO. Just one more question.

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield any more.

Mr. LAZARO. Relative to the draft.

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield just now. I want to make my statement then I will yield. The American soldier needs no apologies. Indeed he has covered himself with glory, and we are all proud of him. The men in France have accomplished work that seemed impossible at the time they started in. The English and the French had had three years' start, and yet in the fighting that went on during the last months of the war the Americans had the difficult positions in the line. And at that I by no means want to be understood as disparaging the work of our cobelligerents. That fight through the Argonne Forest alone has probably never been equaled by any troops

of any country in the world. At Chateau-Thierry and at Cantigny the American soldier showed such valor and made such a terrific fight that it established a standard that all the men in our uniform in France felt that they would have to live up to, and they did live up to the standard that was set upon those early fields right to the end.

It is the wish of everybody in this country that the men shall be returned as speedily as possible. The question of shipping is a very important one in that regard. Even when we had the assistance of England and France in the matter of tonnage, we were able to take over at the very utmost 300,000 men a month. That was when our transportation facilities across the ocean were at their highest. England will have to transport the Canadians, the Australians, and the New Zealanders back to their homes. And there is no gainsaying the fact that she is putting back some of her ships into the usual channels of commerce. We can not have the same amount of English shipping for bringing our men back to this country that we had when we were taking them to the other side. And yet it is the hope of the Military Committee, and I believe of the War Department, that by the end of the next fiscal year practically all of our troops now in France will have been returned to this country.

Mr. MANN. By the end of the next fiscal year or by the end of this fiscal year?

Mr. KAHN. By the end of the next fiscal year. This bill provides the appropriations for the next fiscal year, and I feel confident that no effort will be spared to bring back the men from the European fronts by July 1, 1920. This bill appropriates for that force. It provides for their pay. This appropriation contemplates an average during the next fiscal year of 500,000 men. We have been told that we will have over a million men on the other side on the 1st of July of this year, and that gradually that number will be reduced, so that there will be an average of 500,000 men to pay during the year. Now, the bill provides for voluntary enlistments of 500,000 men, part of them for the Regular Army, part of them under the act of May 18, 1917; and I imagine that the War Department had in mind the very condition that arose in the Spanish-American War, when the men who had volunteered in the State organizations and were sent to the Philippines began to clamor to be returned to this country. After that war had been concluded there was an insurrection in the Philippines, as you all remember, and the maintenance of a temporary army there became a necessary matter. So Congress enacted a law allowing the formation of regiments of United States Volunteers. Many of the men who were then in the Philippines volunteered under that law, and decided to see the thing through before they returned to this country. I imagine that this law will have the effect of bringing to the colors voluntarily a great many men who will be content to remain on the other side to see this thing through. That, I take it, is the sole purpose of the temporary character of the legislation; namely, to bring back all those who want to come back to this country as speedily as possible, men who were drafted to go over there, men who were in the Regular Army and were sent over there, and those who volunteered to go over there; but the end that is sought by the provision in this bill is to let every man who wants to continue over there until definitive terms of peace are signed to remain there of his own volition.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. But the effect of this bill is not to do that. This bill, as I understand it, provides for a volunteer Army of 500,000 during the next fiscal year. Is that correct?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yet on the gentleman's own statement the conscripted army will probably not be returned to the United States until the end of the next fiscal year, so that there will be in France or in Europe American soldiers who were conscripted during that fiscal year. There is no provision in this bill requiring the return of the conscripted soldiers nor requiring the making up of the army of occupation from volunteers. That is left entirely to the War Department.

Mr. KAHN. The act of June 15, 1917, has a provision that the soldiers must be returned from the European front four months after peace has been declared.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I want to answer the gentleman's question. That is in another law, a deficiency appropriation bill, as I recall. Under that provision the army of occupation will have to be brought back four months after definitive terms of peace have been declared.

It may be some time before these terms shall have been agreed upon, but I can not conceive that it is going to take a full year and a half, or practically a year and a half, before that eventuates. My idea is, and it is only a guess, that definitive terms of peace will be agreed upon within the next three months. That is what I believe. I think after that the boys will be brought home in large numbers, because that will be at a time when it is easiest to transport men across the ocean. I feel confident that this present Army will be out of existence practically within seven or eight months after the next fiscal year begins; that is, in the early part of 1920.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do not wish to bother the gentleman, but I want to develop one point. Does the War Department say that an army of 500,000 men for an army of occupation is sufficient for the fiscal year?

Mr. KAHN. The War Department does not know how many men they will have in France in the beginning, but probably a million and a half, and thereafter—

Mr. McCULLOCH. What I want to know is, Does the War Department say that an army of 500,000 men is sufficient for the next fiscal year?

Mr. KAHN. I think so; they state that an average of 500,000 men is sufficient.

Mr. McCULLOCH. If an average of 500,000 men is sufficient, what is to prevent the War Department from developing the voluntary army and bringing the conscripted soldiers back to their homes?

Mr. KAHN. Because there is no law at present on the statute books authorizing them to get volunteers. We are trying to pass this law for that purpose.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The point I want to develop is why not provide for the discharge of the conscripted army, if an Army of 500,000 volunteers is sufficient? There is no provision in the bill that does that. You are leaving it to the War Department, and I would like to have the gentleman tell the House why there is not a provision for demobilization of the conscripted army in this bill if 500,000 volunteers are sufficient?

Mr. KAHN. Because that has been enacted into law in another bill, and there is no use in enacting it twice.

Mr. McCULLOCH. It may be a year and a half before the treaty of peace is signed. The Senate may take six months on it, and you are going to keep an army over there until the treaty of peace is signed. The reason I am asking the gentleman these questions is that I expect to offer an amendment dealing with that subject.

Mr. KAHN. I am giving the gentleman the best information I have, and I for one feel that the War Department will respond to the sentiment of the people of this country that the boys should be brought back as speedily as possible and will carry out the law.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman's own statement is that it is going to take until July, 1920, to do it.

Mr. KAHN. It may take that time, but it may be possible to do it within that time. Of course, the amount of shipping will have a great deal to do with it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I propose to offer an amendment requiring it to be done within two months, or that they be discharged within two months. I do it on the gentleman's statement that an Army of 500,000 men will be sufficient.

Mr. KAHN. Of course, nobody can prevent the gentleman from offering his amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that, as far as the Military Committee is concerned, and to no one else, has the War Department made a statement as to the number of men that will be required to be kept in Europe until the peace treaty is signed; that we have no information on that?

Mr. KAHN. I stated on the floor yesterday that the President of the United States is in Europe negotiating with the plenipotentiaries of the various countries of the world for a peace treaty. Our country leaves to the Executive the making of peace agreements. The Senate, of course, has to ratify, but does any gentleman on this floor undertake to say now to what policy the President of the United States is going to try to commit his country in this present state of affairs? I am not in his confidence, and I do not think any man in this House is in his confidence. We have to hope for the best, and we hope and hope again that he will see to it that our boys are brought home as speedily as possible.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I want to suggest to the gentleman from California that while we are waiting and trying to find out what the administration wants in regard to bringing the boys home, they are dying like pigs from criminal carelessness of the War Department at Brest.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman realize that neither the President nor anyone else can tell us what the peace council is going to do; that that is a matter for the nations to agree upon?

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman is absolutely correct in that. Of course, we know in this matter the President is alone responsible until the treaty has been agreed upon. Then the Senate steps in and has to do its share of the work.

The purpose of this legislation, then, I say, is to give us a force of 500,000 men to do the work which will be necessary for our soldiers to do in the next fiscal year. The Committee on Military Affairs limited the force outside of the Regular Army to a one-year enlistment term. In the meantime we hope that we will be able to formulate an Army reorganization bill fixing a military policy for this country that we trust will stand for many years. There is no denying the fact that we were in no state of preparedness when this war began.

It has cost us billions of dollars and thousands—yes, tens of thousands—of lives. I sometimes feel that if we had been prepared we would never have been drawn into this war. It is cheaper to prepare in days of peace than to wait until an enemy defies your rights and practically makes war upon you. That is how we got into the war. I have stated that many a time on this floor. I did not vote for the war resolution primarily because we wanted to make the world safe for democracy or for humanity. That was an incidental consideration. I voted for the war because I wanted to protect American rights, and I am ready at any time, if need be, to fight for American rights. [Applause.] We can not maintain our position as a great nation unless we are prepared to do that. My opinion is that we can get along with a comparatively small Army if we will adopt the principle of universal training in our reorganization program. It is the most inexpensive system. Under a universal-training law we could train our young men when they arrive at the age of 18 years for a period of six months, from April to October. We showed in this war that a training of that length of time gives us a force that is effective, dependable, and valiant.

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

Mr. KAHN. In just a moment, if my friend will permit me. Such a force would give us, in my humble opinion, a much more vigorous, a much more virile, race of young men. Reference was made in this debate yesterday, by one of the gentlemen, to the condition of the health of the young men of this country when they went to the cantonments. To my mind that is a serious matter, a very serious matter.

The statistics of the War Department show that out of a thousand young men who went to the training camps, young men who came from the homes and the firesides of this country, 271 out of 1,000 had venereal diseases. It was an appalling condition of affairs, and if that condition had continued for another 25 years it is probable that we would have become a nation of moral degenerates; physical incompetents, and cowards. This training will teach our young men to take care of themselves physically, if it does nothing else, and in that alone it will be worth every dollar that will be expended in the training. It will teach the young men of this country respect for law and order and constituted authority, and in that respect the training will make for a much better citizenship. It will teach the young men self-reliance, initiative, and how to cooperate in teamwork. It will do more than anything else to break down sectionalism in this country, and that is what we need mighty badly right in these United States. The men of the South do not begin to know the men of the North, and the men of the North do not begin to know the men of the South. They do not understand each others' difficulties, because they do not know them. By bringing the men from all sections together in the training camps they will come to know each other better than they ever have known each other in the history of the country. It will make for true democratization, because the rich man's son will be in the barracks with the poor man's son. They will begin to respect each others' views as they never can under present-day conditions. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to think, although the gentleman is much better posted with reference to military affairs than I am, that the time for the propaganda of universal military training is passing. I think that the experience that the people have had recently is such that we do not want any more militarism in this Nation of ours.

Mr. KAHN. I deny that universal training will work for militarism.

Mr. RUCKER. Let me say—

Mr. KAHN. Oh, I can not yield for a speech. I thought the gentleman wanted to ask a question.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman does not yield, I shall take my time after a while and pay my respects to his views.

Mr. KAHN. That is all right. The gentleman certainly has a right to do that; but I respectfully inform the gentleman that I have only a limited time—

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, I shall not press the gentleman. The matter will not stand argument, of course.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to read two lines that bear on the subject the gentleman was being asked about, about bringing the soldiers home, from Secretary Baker?

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will permit me to develop this matter a little further, I will be glad to yield to him. I want to say to my friend from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER]—and I would like to yield to everyone—that there are a few matters that I desire to bring to the attention of the House at this time, and I only have a limited amount of time in which to do so. I deny that universal training will make for militarism. The gentleman probably believes that it will, and therein we differ.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, the gentleman said that he believed it would.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, the gentleman said that he believed it would make for militarism. I do not believe it will. I believe it will give us a much more efficient citizenship. I believe, if anything, it will crush in this country the desire for militarism. I feel that the young men, when they get that training, will never feel that they want to go to war; but it will give them a training which will make for sturdier manhood in this country at all events, and it will be worth every dollar it will cost. And then, finally, there is no nation in the world that will ever want to try conclusions with us if we adopt such a policy. The trouble is and has been that we never have been prepared at any stage in our history for our wars. In this very war we were fortunate in that the French and English were able to hold the lines for us after we got into the war until we were able to get ready. That was our salvation. The enemy could not attack us, but countries do not generally wait until a nation prepares to defend itself; they make the attack when they think the time is opportune and the country to be attacked is least prepared. The safest way to prevent attack is to be able to repel it when it is made, in my honest opinion. I do not believe that this is the end of war, much as I should like to see it so. This war has made the entire world sick of war. But after every other great world war the people were heartily sick of war and hoped that there might never be another. We are simply passing through the same experiences that the other nations of the world have passed through at the end of every other great war. We hear a great deal of a league of nations these days. That is not a new proposition.

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

Mr. KAHN. In a little while, if the gentleman will contain himself.

When we read history, we find that leagues of the cities of Greece that called themselves republics were formed so as to be able to defend themselves. And yet they were constantly attacked and made war. Coming down through the ages we find this idea of nations consolidating or confederating to prevent war a matter of common discussion. In 1623 the first serious proposition of which we have a record of modern nations combining to defend themselves was submitted by one Emeric Crucé. His plan was very complete and it challenged the attention of the world at that time. Only two years later Grotius, the great writer on international law, issued a treatise on the same subject, and later on, in 1634—and, mark you, practically during all of that time the world had been at war—the Grand Design of Henry IV, as it was called, was promulgated. It was hoped that nations could be brought together in a great league to avoid war. Nothing came of these propositions, and yet man did not stop. He wanted to avoid war, and he still hoped on and toiled on for universal peace. In 1713 the Abbe St. Pierre, who had been one of the peace commissioners at Utrecht in Holland, wrote a treatise which was taken up seriously by all the countries and was finally practically adopted by the Holy Alliance in 1815. That proposition had one idea that appealed to the monarchs of Europe, and that probably is why they considered it seriously. It undertook to keep them on their thrones and proposed to protect them against revolutionists. The reigning family of every State in Europe was to be kept on the throne of that State by his neighbors in case there should be a revolution.

They tried to carry out such a league. It miserably failed. Now, I do not know what the ideas of the plenipotentiaries at the present time may be on that subject. We read conflicting reports in the newspapers. Now you see it, now you do not; it is one thing one day and another thing another day.

There has been no concrete project put forth, so far as I can recall, by the President. I feel that most of the people of this country hope that war can be avoided by these negotiations, but I have an abiding faith that the people of this country will not agree to any treaty of that kind that will deprive this country of one jot or tittle or iota of its own sovereignty. [Applause.] I imagine that the people of this country will not agree to allow their sons to go to Turkey, for instance, to police that country and make the people of that nation behave themselves. [Applause.] As I take it, the American people want their sons to come back from Europe as speedily as possible [applause], and I take it for granted that the people of this country will not want to send another army into Europe if they can possibly avoid it.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman think that the provision in the peace treaty which is being strongly urged over there prohibiting compulsory military service in the nations would infringe upon the sovereignty of this or any other nation?

Mr. KAHN. Well, I frankly confess the proposition of compulsory military service is one that I do not know much about, so far as it is being treated over there. I know that England, which is reputed to have made the suggestion, had to come to compulsory military service in order to get men to fight this war. England's life was at stake, and she knew that she could only save her life by compelling men to serve in her army.

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

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I did not want to interrupt the gentleman at an improper place, but the Secretary of War, with respect to bringing the Army back, used these words:

Our Army is still 2,000,000 men abroad. We are bringing them home as rapidly as we can. The War Department is giving more attention to getting men home than to any other subject. Every available means of transportation is being acquired and used to its capacity.

Mr. MANN. That is a newspaper article—

Mr. POU. It is the statement the Secretary of War made before the Rules Committee. That statement is entirely gratuitous.

Mr. KAHN. He made a similar statement or a statement to that effect before the Committee on Military Affairs. Of course, the matter of tonnage is a very serious one, and upon the solution of that problem will depend in the final analysis our ability to bring the men back.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I will.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is a very patriotic Member of this House and is one of the best posted Members we have. Now, the gentleman was for war against Germany and was for the draft, therefore this war is our war as well as theirs. Now, what I would like to have the gentleman tell us is this. The armistice has been signed, but the peace treaty has not been signed. Now, what should we do over there until the peace treaty is signed?

Mr. KAHN. Well, I can only give my opinion, and my opinion—

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman stated the boys ought to come back as speedily as possible, and I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. What should we do over there, what is our duty over there until the peace treaty is signed?

Mr. KAHN. Frankly, I want to say to my friend from Louisiana that the newspaper dispatches which we see day after day do not seem to give much information. As I said at the outset, one day they tell us one thing and another day another thing. Now, I imagine that it should be the duty of this country at least to wait until the treaty of peace is signed before we finally determine our course, because during the period of the armistice we never can tell what is going to happen. We see in the papers now that Germany seems, through her commanders, to have expressed herself to the effect that she never will submit to a humiliating peace. Now, I do not know what that means. If it means they intend to resume fighting, I imagine it will be a small matter to lick them thoroughly and march our boys into Berlin. [Applause.]

But nobody can tell whether they will try it or not until they are put right to the test or the issue is raised. And, therefore, just as a policeman is necessary to guard the peace in our cities, we have got to have a police force in the shape of soldiers, who

will be ready to take care of eventualities until the treaty of peace, at least, is signed.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman would not think much of a policeman who would arrest a man and say to him on the way to the jail, "You go and report to the jailer, and I will go home."

Mr. KAHN. That is not the question.

Mr. LAZARO. I was trying to get the gentleman's idea of what our duty is over there.

Mr. HARDY. Is not the gentleman trying to carry the idea that it is not best to hang up the hose until the fire is out, as was said by a gentleman the other day?

Mr. KAHN. I think so. I think, with as large a force as we have on the other side, there is not much danger. With the Germans deprived of their flying machines and their submarines, I doubt whether they are a serious menace. I take it for granted that Germany will not be much of a menace if she tries to violate the armistice. And yet it would be folly to remove all your force until definitive terms of peace are decided upon.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I will.

Mr. DENISON. I understood the gentleman from California to state awhile ago that according to his idea of military training he would have the young men of the country go to camp and train for six months when they became 18 years of age.

Mr. KAHN. Exactly.

Mr. DENISON. Do I understand that is the gentleman's idea of military training, just for the six months?

Mr. KAHN. That is all. I should not have him called again until his country should call him to come to its defense. I do not think it would be necessary to call him again, because I believe that in the six months' training he would receive he would be so prepared that only a few weeks' training would be required to get him into the field in case of an attack upon us. In the meantime our Regular Army, such as we may have, could hold the line until those few weeks of training could be given to the boys who had passed through the military training school.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I will.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman, however, does favor a provision that would put these men after they are trained into the reserve.

Mr. KAHN. I would prefer that.

Mr. GORDON. Like the German system. That is all there is of it.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman talks about the German system all the time. Now, I am not wedded to the German system. The gentleman knows—

Mr. GORDON. You have always advocated it. I do not know whether you favor it or not.

Mr. KAHN. I have advocated universal training for a period of six months, whereas the German system takes him for two full years. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER. Would the gentleman require every able-bodied young man over 18 years of age to take that training? Will the gentleman express himself on that?

Mr. KAHN. There would have to be some exceptions made, of course. The details of the system would have to be worked out, but I am trying to lay down the broad lines in this discussion, and hope sometime, if I am able to take it up, to discuss it even to the minutest detail.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman at this time is not prepared to give us an idea of what per cent of the 18-year-old men would be taken?

Mr. KAHN. No.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Committee on Military Affairs has any knowledge of the manner in which the English or French Army is being demobilized, in comparison to our Army over there?

Mr. KAHN. I have only this information: Gen. March, in one of his statements to the newspaper men, said that we were demobilizing about twice as fast as England. That is the only information I have on the subject.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. The same statement was made in one of the hearings at the War Department one morning when the gentleman was not present, as I recall.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] that the German military system has always required a two-year absolute service with the colors, and no man in this country has at any time advocated a system of that kind. The French system of compulsory training, as it was in force at the beginning of this war, required the French soldier to be three years with the colors, because Germany had so far out-

stripped France in population that the French people found it was necessary to hold their boys for three years in order to equalize their army with the German Army, where they were held for two years. But in this country the people who advocate military training do not intend to hold boys any length of time in our Regular Army. They intend to train them just for six months, and then turn them back into the body of the citizenship of the Republic.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. The gentleman from California, Mr. Chairman, is making a most interesting speech, as he always does, and it would be still more interesting if he were allowed to proceed. We would like to see the gentleman conclude his remarks without further interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter entirely with the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield just at that point?

Mr. KAHN. I yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman, if I understand his position, is in favor of universal military training not to exceed a period of six months.

Mr. KAHN. Absolutely.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Now, is it your view that after that is done the boy shall be returned to civil life without any obligation of military service resting upon him?

Mr. KAHN. My own preference would be that they should be put into the reserves; but not a necessary part of the program at all, because I feel that if we ever get into war again we could bring them all back into the Army by a selective-draft law. So that is not necessarily a part of the program. But the training, in my judgment, would be invaluable to the young men of this country.

I was speaking of the league of nations, I think, when I was interrupted, and I believe I was saying, as I recall, that the American people, in my judgment, will never agree to a plan that will keep our soldiers if we have to act as a mandatory—or "mandatory," I believe, is the correct word—for any country on earth.

The American people will not consent to allow their youths to go to such a country in order to maintain the peace there or in order to maintain order in such a country or in order to protect the rights of all the other powers signatory to such a league. I said awhile ago that the people of this country want their boys to come home as speedily as possible, and if the proposed league of nations shall contain any terms that are contrary to those two propositions I imagine it will have very hard sledding in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there are a few propositions in this bill that are matters of administration. The committee has seen fit to write into the proposed legislation a provision to remove all service chevrons. We have all seen a great many men walking our streets with silver chevrons and with gold chevrons. We hear a great deal of talk in this country about "democracy." All the soldiers of the Republic, whether they were fortunate enough to go to France or whether they performed their duty in this country, should be treated alike. [Applause.]

I am told that in some of the demobilizing camps the young men who come back from the other side will not salute an officer who has the silver chevrons. And yet those officers were compelled to stay in this country. There were thousands of officers who were clamoring for an opportunity to go to the other side. Their petitions, their requests, were turned down by the War Department. The department said, "You can perform the best work for this country right in this country," and it refused to send them across.

Mr. LAZARO. Based on the selective draft.

Mr. KAHN. Well, a soldier always has to go where duty calls him. That is the fact and has been the fact as long as there have been organized armies. A soldier is expected to perform the duty that he is ordered to perform.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California be permitted to continue for 10 minutes out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask that the first paragraph be read, and then let the gentleman be allowed to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state, in reference to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS], that by uniform convention here the time has been fixed. It can not be extended by unanimous consent in the committee. The Chair will state further that, if the committee chooses to do it, the present occupant of the chair has never seen any way it

can be stopped except by objection. What is the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. KAHN. If the committee will indulge me for 10 minutes, I will ask unanimous consent to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in contravention of the practice of the committee, but the Chair will put the request.

Mr. KAHN. I will withdraw that and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I suggest that the gentleman wait until the Clerk reads the first paragraph.

Mr. DYER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. DYER. To demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The reading of the bill is the regular order. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Army for the year ending June 30, 1920.

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

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

Mr. RUCKER. Does the gentleman want to proceed for 10 minutes?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. Ask for that.

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. It may be information that the Members of the House have not had, but it is a fact that in this war only 40 per cent of the Regular Army officers who graduated from West Point were allowed to go to the other side. Sixty per cent were kept in this country. The latter are the men who organized and conducted the training camps at the different cantonments. They are the men who carried on the training at the National Guard camps. They performed an invaluable service to their country. Without the training given by those officers, the training they were able to give, I doubt if we would have been able to raise the armies that were necessary to win this war, and we certainly could not have done it in the remarkably short time that it took.

Of course, those officers all have to wear silver chevrons at this time. The great mass of the people of this country do not realize the condition, and they probably feel, every time they see a man with silver chevrons, that he was a "slacker" who tried to find a safety station for himself in this country. That, in my judgment, should not be permitted. [Applause.]

I imagine that every soldier and every officer—and there were practically 4,000,000 of them, all told—was willing to do his full duty to his country; that he was in very fact a soldier, and was ready to go wherever duty called.

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

Mr. KAHN. In a moment.

Mr. LUNN. On this very subject.

Mr. KAHN. In a moment. Some were more fortunate than the rest. Some were detailed and transported to the other side. There is no question about their valor, their bravery, or the splendid manner in which they performed their duty. But I feel confident that if it were put up to those men themselves as to whether they want to be distinguished in that way from all their fellows, who would have been glad to go over to the other side but were compelled to continue here by the War Department, they would unhesitatingly say, "No, take all the chevrons off except the wound chevron."

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

Mr. KAHN. I yield first to the gentleman from New York, from my committee [Mr. LUNN].

Mr. LUNN. I wanted to ask my colleague on the committee whether he would favor a change of the bill that would provide for the removal of the silver chevrons but would still allow those in the foreign service to wear the gold chevrons?

Mr. KAHN. I think that would be discriminating, for it would show that the men who did not have them on were not on the other side, and it would lead, in my humble opinion, to the same misunderstanding.

Mr. LUNN. May I ask my colleague a further question?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. LUNN. Every one of us, when we meet a man, will naturally want to know whether he was on the other side. That is the first question we will ask him.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman is privileged to ask that question, and the soldier is privileged to reply.

Mr. LUNN. But under the present regulation we would have to ask those men from the other side, those who have been in France, to take off that gold chevron.

Mr. KAHN. The Congress of the United States, by making a uniform law that would apply to all soldiers of the Republic, would probably meet the approval of the soldiers themselves and the approval of the country.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state whether he believes this should be carried to the extent of even refusing special decorations or medals of honor to men who have distinguished themselves?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no, no. I believe that men who have signally distinguished themselves and who have been granted medals of honor by their country should be allowed to wear them, just as the men who fought in other wars now wear the congressional medal of honor and the other decorations which this country has heretofore been giving. I would not interfere with a single decoration.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Referring to the question which the gentleman from California has discussed so well—as to the disbandment of our Army and the size of the Army that we will maintain—I see in the Record of yesterday that under date of February 11, only three days ago, the number of enlisted men in the United States was 767,000 in the Army, in addition to the men in Europe. Now, the Chief of Staff, as I understand it, has given out the statement to the public press for information that this Army in this country is now down to its irreducible minimum. How are we going to reduce this Army, in line with what the gentleman has stated to us here, if it is the opinion of the War Department that at present we must maintain over 700,000 men in this country?

Mr. KAHN. As I understand the situation it is practically this: It takes a great deal longer to demobilize than it ever took before. It seems that when men are sent to the demobilization camps now they undergo a thorough physical examination to see whether a man has any disease that can be determined. I imagine that is done so that in the future men will not be importuned to come to the Government and to Congress for the passage of pension bills, with affidavits supporting the claim that they were taken with disease while they were in the service of this country. I am told that this medical examination of large units of soldiers takes three or four weeks time. Of course these men who are in the camps in this country have all, or nearly all, been ordered demobilized, and the demobilization is going forward just as quickly as the examinations can be made.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I should like to ask the gentleman, in his long experience, if he believes it requires 700,000 men to perform the demobilization for the small number of men, 100,000 a month, who are going out of our Army?

Mr. KAHN. That is a matter of military administration that I know nothing about.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Has the gentleman information that these men are being kept in idleness, being kept here apparently to maintain somebody in positions, rather than have the Army demobilized?

Mr. KAHN. I have heard such statements, but I want to say frankly to my colleague on the committee that I have been so very busy with different matters connected with my congressional duties that I personally have not been able to investigate this.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. For the information of the gentleman from Nebraska and the House, Gen. McIntyre this morning denies that newspaper statement absolutely. The demobilization is going forward.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] called at my office this morning, and while he was at my office I called up Gen. McIntyre's office, and they said that that was absolutely news to them, and that the demobilization is going on just as rapidly as they possibly can carry it on.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman from California permit me to give a little light to the gentleman from Nebraska? Will he yield a quarter of a second?

Mr. KAHN. Yes, half a second.

Mr. KING. I can give the gentleman from Nebraska some evidence as to what is being done with the soldiers in these camps. Here is a letter from a man at Camp MacArthur, Tex., which I just received this morning, which says:

We're still marking time and doing nothing to amount to anything. From present indications it will be late spring before I get away, even if I don't get sent to another camp. There is a lot of protest about keeping the men here. They took away their rifles about six weeks ago, and since that the men have been doing regular labor work. They have been wrecking a lot of the buildings, filling ditches and trenches, and at present are building a road for the county.

That is what they are doing with these men in these camps—farmers whose services are needed at home.

Mr. RUCKER. They are putting them on public works.

Mr. KAHN. I only yielded to the gentleman from Illinois for half a minute.

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to ask the indulgence of the House because of the rather brusque reply that the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] made to me, in which he designated the inquiry that I put to him as asinine. [Laughter.]

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman did not make an inquiry. He made a statement that I was advocating the German system, and what I said is what I consider that statement.

Mr. GORDON. I am going to prove that statement. That is the reason I have taken the floor. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, the distinguishing feature of the German system is that it puts men in reserve, subject absolutely to the control of the central authority, to be called out by that authority. Now, that and not the period of training, which is purely a matter of policy and opinion, is the feature that distinguishes a military system. The gentleman's political party in the last campaign in its national platform declared in favor of a military system under absolute Federal control. Of course, at that time everybody supposed that the militia was not under the absolute control of Federal authority, either President or Congress, or both, but a good many people have changed their minds upon that subject. But that has nothing to do with the question of whether or not the gentleman from California is now and always has been in favor of the vital principle of the German system of military training. I undertake to say this without meaning any disrespect to the gentleman from California, and I do not know why the gentleman should be ashamed of the German military system—

Mr. KAHN. If the gentleman will permit, the German system requires that a man shall be trained in the army for at least two years. The system advocated here is simply that a man shall be trained six months and then go back to the body of the citizenship.

Mr. GORDON. In the reserve, however.

Mr. KAHN. I said, in answering a question that was put to me by one of my colleagues, that personally I believed it would be best to put them into the reserve. But that that was a matter of detail that could be settled when the proposition is up for consideration.

Mr. GORDON. Exactly; that is correct. I do not want to be placed in the position of misrepresenting the attitude of the gentleman. That was also the attitude of the Republican Party in its last platform, except that it refused to indorse compulsory military service. I do not know why there should be so much mystery about this. The training of a man and putting him in the reserve, to be called out on the touch of a button, is the German system. If you want a military system that will respond quickly to one central head, you can't find a better one than the German system, and it has been proved to be so in this war.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. What does the gentleman say of the Swiss system?

Mr. GORDON. I have stated that it is the United States militia system supplemented by compulsory service under Federal authority.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Are they not required under the Swiss system to come out on the touch of a button?

Mr. GORDON. No, sir; let the gentleman go and read the Swiss system. Anybody interested in knowing what the Swiss system is will find in a Senate document, introduced by Ex-Senator Blair Lee, of Maryland, that information. They will find that the Swiss system was copied verbatim from our State militia system. The Swiss system only trains them for six weeks per year.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Swiss system is not compulsory?

Mr. GORDON. I say that it is.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is not that the very essence, the basic principle, of the Swiss system, and does not that differentiate it from our so-called militia system?

Mr. GORDON. It is not a law which allows a man to touch a button and call out a million population and throw them on their neighbors.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I beg to differ with the gentleman; it does allow it.

Mr. GORDON. It does not, but I have not time to debate that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It did do it during this war twice.

Mr. GORDON. Oh, the Swiss Army never departed over their own borders since the European war commenced.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; but they mobilized the army twice.

Mr. GORDON. Of course they mobilized, but they never went out of Switzerland. There is precisely the distinction.

Now, if gentlemen will let me make a few remarks. This is the point I desired to make, and it really is a vital question in this country. If the people of the United States want a complete military system, a thorough military system, one that will do the business, then, of course, they will adopt the German system. I do not want to be understood as in any way discrediting the system, because I do think that this war has demonstrated that it is the most efficient, as well as the most dangerous, military system that has ever been devised by the brain or purpose of man. At the outbreak of the European war the standing army of the German Imperial Government was only 700,000 men, but I noticed that they called forth and threw onto France about 2,000,000 men. That is what was done. That is what makes the system dangerous. You train the whole population to arms, so that some fellow in the General Staff goes and touches a button and calls them out and sends them out of the country to attack some nation. That is the thing that the American people sought to prevent when they adopted the Federal Constitution. They thought they had made that thing impossible.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Would not that be impossible under our Constitution from the fact that Congress has to authorize it before the button can be pushed?

Mr. GORDON. That is a matter of opinion. The framers of the Constitution thought that they had placed it beyond the power of Congress to do anything of that kind, but we found out when we got into war that Congress was merely a rubber stamp and that the Constitution does not afford much protection to the people. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have made my meaning plain in reference to the matter. I want to disclaim any intention of impugning the motives of the gentleman from California in the opinion which he has always entertained and advocated so long as I have been a Member of the House.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to withdraw the remark that I made a while ago.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman can do as he likes about that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In case of an invasion of the United States, or a threatened invasion, or a threatened attack on the United States, would not it be a good thing to have our system so prepared that we could touch a button and bring out 2,000,000 men instantaneously, already trained?

Mr. GORDON. I never have thought so and do not think so now. If the gentleman thinks that, he is entitled to his opinion. The trouble is that if you have 2,000,000 men trained and ready to be called out at the touch of a button the danger is that they will be used for some purpose outside of the United States. That is a thing that the framers of the Constitution sought to guard against.

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

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Of course, we were not prepared at all when the war was declared. Does the gentleman mean to convey the impression that the Members of Congress acted as rubber stamps when they declared war against Germany?

Mr. GORDON. Oh, no; we had not then reached the rubber-stamp point. That did not come for several months after we got into the war. It was several months, I will say to the gentleman in reply to his question, and during that time this Congress repeatedly in both branches voted down this press and speech-muzzling provision of the espionage law, and by roll call it was beaten by 44 majority in the House, and it was also voted down in the Senate, and now if a man criticizes it they threaten to put him in the penitentiary. Congress afterwards surrendered, did it not?

Mr. LAZARO. I do not agree with that.

Mr. GORDON. Of course it did, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. LAZARO. Congress did not propose to let men at home shoot the boys on the firing line in the back.

Mr. GORDON. Oh, yes; of course that is the excuse that was given. You can call it whatever you please, but it was a rank violation of our Constitution, and as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] said yesterday, it ought to be repealed; it is a disgrace to this country to have it remain on the statute books even for the period of this war.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman rightly? Is he in favor of the present Swiss system?

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman has not heard me say anything on that subject, except to refer to it in a general way.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I understood the gentleman was defending it, and I understood that he was in favor of it.

Mr. GORDON. I will say this to the gentleman, that if I had to make a choice as between the German system and the Swiss system I should take the Swiss system, because it is more nearly consistent with the theory of our Government, its institutions, and the Constitution. I do not know but that I would agree to vote for the Swiss system if we could adopt their constitutional provision which prohibits any standing army "under Federal control." This bellowing around here about universal training under absolute Federal control means, if it means anything, the German system and nothing else. I am opposed to that, and would accept the Swiss system as the alternative. I do not believe, and I think this war has demonstrated, that you do not have to train men two or three years in order to have them fight. The American troops in Europe did as good fighting as any troops that were there. We can fairly say that. They delivered the decisive blow that won this war.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. The truth about it is that you do not need any such time as has been talked about. According to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] only 40 per cent of the officers of the Regular Army were sent to France, and I understand that only 40 per cent of the men of the Regular Army were sent to France, which would not indicate that they were very hard up for men who were well trained. Just why they put in a lot of men who had not been trained more than a few months and left hundreds of thousands of men here in the Regular Army who had been in the service from almost the beginning of the war I have never seen explained. Perhaps it is not the time to ask for that explanation, but I certainly would like to have it.

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

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. I do not think the gentleman wants to make a mistake.

Mr. GORDON. I do not.

Mr. KAHN. The first few divisions that went over were all made up of Regular Army men. The Rainbow Division was made up of National Guard men. Then there was the New England Division, made up of National Guard men. Of course, the units of the Regular Army divisions were rounded out or filled up by men who were only recently inducted into the Army; but I think if the gentleman will look up the statistics he will find that the Regular Army organizations were the ones to go over to the other side first.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is partly right about that. As a matter of fact my understanding is that they used these draft divisions solely as replacement troops. The five leading divisions which did the greatest fighting in this war, which suffered the most casualties, were the three National

Guard divisions and the two Regular Army divisions, and those divisions, as fast as they suffered casualties, were replaced largely from the National Army divisions that were over there.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman can have in mind the Seventy-ninth Division, which was a draft division, and which was trained over here at Camp Meade. That was wholly made up of draft men from Pennsylvania and Maryland and suffered more than 2,000 casualties in the course of the war.

Mr. GORDON. My understanding is that the large number of casualties among the Pennsylvania troops was among the National Guard troops. But I will ask my colleague on the committee [Mr. CRAGO] about that.

Mr. CRAGO. The First Division of the Regular Army suffered the greatest losses, and the Twenty-eighth Division, National Guard, was second.

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

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that after the first three divisions of the Regular Army had been sent to France, or about that time, the Regular Army was enormously expanded in skeleton form and filled up by recruits and later by drafted men, so that within a very short time at least 70 per cent of the personnel in the Regular Army was absolutely raw and untrained, and had had much less training than the National Guard troops, and for that reason the National Guard troops were sent over first.

Mr. GORDON. I will say to the gentleman, not to prolong the controversy, that my recollection is wholly different from his. My recollection is they began by voluntary enlistments at the breaking out of the war and continued until they stopped in December, 1917, because they were out of supplies. They closed the enlistments in the Regular Army in December, 1917, and they had at that time something like four or five hundred thousand men, and only a small part of those, less than one-half, were sent across.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has referred to the proposed league of nations and has undertaken to demonstrate that it will not work because it was tried back in the seventeenth century, or proposed at that time. Just on that subject I will say to the gentleman, as he himself hinted, those leagues which were proposed in those days were designed solely and entirely for the purpose of perpetuating the monarchies then existing. Of course, there were no republics in the world at that time, and the thrones of some of those monarchs were getting a little bit shaky, and these propositions were solely and entirely for the purpose of maintaining them upon their thrones.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I will.

Mr. KAHN. I think the gentleman misunderstood what I said about it. I said the project had been tried many hundreds of years; that I hoped they would be able to work out something that would prevent war, but if this country was to be obligated to a proposition to send our boys into foreign lands to maintain the peace, if the league proposed that we should surrender our sovereignty, then the American people would have none of it. That is as far as I went.

Mr. GORDON. I agree with the gentleman, but I understood him to observe and got the impression from his remarks that he had not very much confidence in it. Now, I do say if this Congress of Nations in Paris would adopt the suggestion of the English delegates and adopt a treaty prohibiting compulsory military service on the part of all nations who are parties to it, that it would be a very long step in the direction of maintaining permanent peace.

Mr. KAHN. How about navies?

Mr. GORDON. Well, I think they ought to limit those, too, as far as that is concerned, but navies are not as dangerous as armies. The trouble about it is that this war was caused entirely by the fact that the nations in Europe, on the Continent of Europe, for years maintained their systems represented by the German system of compulsory military service. If they had not had that system of compulsion that they have maintained even since the organization of the German Empire under the central authority this war would never have occurred, and I do not believe there is an intelligent individual in this House or elsewhere who does not believe that is absolutely true. When you train your whole population to arms and put them under control of one man who can touch a button and call them out and throw them against any nation, I say to you you have a dangerous situation if it is put under the supreme authority of

the man who is at the head of that army, who is the king, the monarch, or the kaiser, or anyone else with that power. Now, he is always advised by his general staff, of course, that remains in the background and is not in any way responsible, and whenever they get ready to attack somebody they can always find an excuse and pretext to do it, and one of the strongest incentives to do that is to train your entire population to arms and make them subject to the orders of your central authority.

Under the German and other European systems, it is true, it does not put men in the Army until they are 20 years old; my colleague proposes to put them in at 18. Of course that would permit the drafting into the military service of minors and to impose upon them the whole military burden, and, of course, I do not think that any self-respecting nation ought to do that in war or in peace. Of course we have a million boys in this country of 18 and a million at 19 and a million at 20 years of age.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. I do.

Mr. KAHN. Does the gentleman mean to infer that we are not a self-respecting Nation?

Mr. FIELDS. Places all the responsibility upon the boys.

Mr. GORDON. Congress passed a law, finally, permitting the military authorities to draft by classes or ages into service all ages between 18 and 45 and, of course, that does confer upon the War Department the authority to impose the whole military obligation upon minors. Rome, when she was on her last legs, resorted to drafting aliens into her military service, but she never got so low, until she disappeared from the face of the earth, never got to the point where it was seriously proposed to impose the whole military service of the Nation upon minors. I hope this Nation will never do a thing of that kind. The truth is military service is exceedingly strenuous and my own notion is it ought not to be imposed upon anybody until they are 20 years of age. I believe there is the danger of a breakdown—

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

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman has now had 20 minutes and another gentleman 10 minutes since we commenced to read the bill. There are a lot of items in the bill that gentlemen want to consider. This has no relation to the bill. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] whether he proposes to give the House full opportunity to discuss the items of the bill after we get through with the buncombe talk about these general things?

Mr. DENT. I will state to the gentleman that I hope we can get down to the discussion of the bill. I do not understand that there are any questions of compulsory military training in this bill at all. But I have found that when you first start to read a bill it is best to let the general talk go on for a while.

Mr. MANN. I do not care how much talk there is if it is not shut off later. I have seen committees allow a great deal of talk about general matters in order to prevent talking on a bill.

Mr. DENT. There is no such intention as that so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, has the request been put?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. I will say to the members of the committee that when I was interrupted it was my intention to discuss one or two matters which I had not reached when my last extension of time expired, and I will endeavor to bring my remarks to a close at the earliest possible moment.

We were recently regaled by some very interesting newspaper comment inaugurated by an extended speech made in another body of the Congress of the United States upon the subject of the articles of war under which punitive justice in our Army has been administered, and I commend to the consideration of the House all of the information upon that subject which is contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I believe the New York World's write-up has been inserted in the RECORD under extension of remarks at the instance of Senator LODGE, and the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate made an extended speech on that subject. And the purport and effect of the contention, which, I am prepared to admit, was that instead of trying our men in the Army according to even military law the Articles of War are primarily designed, apparently, to carry out the arbitrary will of

the military commanders, instead of trying our soldiers according to regular rules. That is unquestionably true, and I will say for the information of the committee that in 1916, when it was proposed to revise these Articles of War and they were pending in the House and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, I was a member of the subcommittee which was investigating and endeavoring to pull some of the fangs that are now being complained of out of those Articles of War. And you may recall that Gen. Crowder became impatient over the fact—impatient because our committee did not agree with his notions about what the Articles of War ought to contain—and he induced the President of the United States to use his influence to take that bill away from our committee. It was fastened onto the Army appropriation bill over in the United States Senate and passed through Congress as a rider. That is actually what occurred.

I simply want to remind the Members of the House of that incident and refer to the barbarities that have been perpetrated under those Articles of War, as again illustrating that it is unwise to legislate upon general subjects by riders to appropriation bills. Some 273,000 soldiers have been tried under these Articles of War and some 16,000 of them are now confined in Federal penitentiaries as the result of trials by general courts-martial.

Mr. SIEGEL. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that 370,000 cases have been tried and 22,000 men are now confined, and the Secretary of War is getting up a list of those names, the offenses, and the sentences.

Mr. GORDON. Yes. I am very much gratified indeed to know that the American Bar Association is interesting itself in this matter. It thus far appears to have the sympathy and cooperation of the Secretary of War. I hope this investigation will be carried through to a finish and that the Articles of War will be revised and amended in accordance with modern humane principles. [Applause.]

Much has been said upon the subject of conscientious objectors, Mr. Chairman, and I was just wondering whether it would not be worth while to insert in the RECORD something in regard to that. I will ask leave to extend my remarks for the purpose of inserting this and other documents in the RECORD, the general order under which conscientious objectors have been recognized under the laws of the United States—General Order No. 28.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the document indicated.

Mr. MANN. Do the other documents relate to the same subject?

Mr. GORDON. There is just one relating to conscientious objectors.

Mr. MANN. That and other articles. I do not know what they are.

Mr. GORDON. It relates to this subject—the subject of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman mean the others are orders from the War Department? Of course, there is no objection to the—

Mr. GORDON. Not orders from the War Department.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman is going to insert a lot of propaganda such as we receive in our mail, I shall certainly object. I would like to know what it is the gentleman intends to insert. I have no objection to the insertion of such as he has specified. Therefore I would like the gentleman to be specific in his request.

Mr. GORDON. I will reassure the gentleman by saying that I intend to insert nothing in addition to this order No. 28 that is not written by myself.

Mr. TILSON. Is that an order of the War Department?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. What is the nature of the matter the gentleman is going to insert? Does the order justify those conscientious objectors?

Mr. GORDON. I will insert the order in the RECORD to enable Members of Congress to determine whether or not it justifies what has been done. I do not intend to comment on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the document referred to:

[GENERAL ORDER NO. 28.]

[G. O. 28.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 23, 1918.

The following Executive order is published to the Army for the information and guidance of all concerned:

EXECUTIVE ORDER.

1. By virtue of authority contained in section 4 of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase

temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," whereby 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 organizations; but no person so exempted shall be exempted from service in any capacity that the President shall declare to be noncombatant." I hereby declare that the following military service is noncombatant service:

(a) Service in the Medical Corps wherever performed. This includes service in the sanitary detachments attached to combatant units at the front; service in the divisional 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 service. Also, in rear of zone of operations, service as follows: Railroad building, operation, 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 explanations to secure acceptances 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 to combatant service by any 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.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 20 March, 1918.

[283.2, A. G. O.]

By order of the Secretary of War:

FRYTON C. MARCH.

Major General, Acting Chief of Staff.

Official:

H. P. McCAIN,

The Adjutant General.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I propose to speak the truth, just as I see it. I will tell you something. This committee has brought out a bill here which I will discuss in a moment. I can not agree to this thing. I am for an Army of 175,000 men.

I want to tell you, gentlemen, that I do not take any stock in all this severe and unjust criticism of the War Department and of the Army officials. Gentlemen on this floor have stated that these officers of the Army here, these bureaus, would not treat them with proper respect. I am sorry that any man has been treated disrespectfully. For my part, they have always shown the utmost courtesy to me, and I believe that they intend to do that to all Members of Congress.

Again, I do not take any stock in this wholesale criticism of the Army across the sea. Gen. Pershing, according to what the Secretary of War told our committee, had carte blanche in Europe, even to the ordering of shoes; and when you gentlemen criticize in vicious fashion all that is going on there and all that has gone on there, by so doing you have laid the blame on Gen. Pershing. I believe he has conducted this Army in Europe in the proper manner. [Applause.]

Further, gentlemen, I have looked over the signs of the zodiac and I have observed that the season is now propitious for altering this bill. I think the number in the proposed Army should be cut down from 500,000 to 175,000 men, with a proper number of officers to officer that Army. [Applause.]

We have raised an Army of nearly 4,000,000 men. We sent over 2,000,000 across the sea. These men that were called from the rank and file of the great body of the people went across the sea after having received only two or three months' training, and they fought as soldiers never fought before, and this, too, among people whose language they did not understand. Yet, after our soldiers have won this great war, after we have emptied the Treasury, after we have placed \$30,000,000,000 of debt upon the American taxpayers, it is now proposed to float what they call a victory bond issue about April 9 of \$7,000,000,000, and one for \$5,000,000,000 will have to come a few months later, and one for \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 will be bound to come in 1920. And yet this Congress sits around, after having won this great war, talking about an Army of half a million men! You might just as well have a billion as half a million. It makes no difference in the final analysis.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides, as I understand it, a feature to the effect that you can even go out and conscript these men, because it comes under the provisions of the act of May 18, 1917. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] may indorse that kind of business; but all this talk about compulsory training and compulsory service in this country in time of peace is rot, and the majority of the people will drive any party out of Congress that enacts such a thing as that in this country. [Applause.] We have won this war, and are called on now to raise the greatest Army that the United States has ever had in peace times.

Another alteration that should be made in this bill is to repeal what was done under the act to coordinate and harmonize the departments and other establishments of the Government. I will tell you what they did. They built up a General Staff, and the President delegated, as he ought to have done as the Commander in Chief and as President of this Republic, the authority to a body of expert military men; but they built up a General Staff that is a duplicate and replica of this hated and contemptible German system, and that staff has divested the Secretary of War of any real constituted authority which he formerly possessed. They absolutely took the virility out of the office of The Adjutant General and took the marbles away from The Adjutant General, until he is now in reality nothing but a chief clerk down there. [Laughter.]

Other bureaus have been treated in the same way. This bill proposes to take away part of that authority, but it fails to do it in whole. The General Staff is riding yet, because we have got the word "organizations" in here. My information is that you ought to cut the guts out of it and hang them up in the sun to dry. [Laughter.] We can not afford to let the General Staff have all that authority.

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

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield. I want to say further that this bill has not only placed upon the American taxpayer, as the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] wanted the House to believe, a burden of over \$1,000,000,000, because he claimed that that would pay all of our Army in France and it would maintain this Army in our country here at a strength of 500,000, but it has placed on the American taxpayer a burden nearly twice

as big, because every man who has any sense knows that this Army costs \$1,000 per man, and we would be called upon to pay a deficiency of nearly \$1,000,000,000 more.

There is no use to fool ourselves. The American Congress has spent all of this money and is going ahead now when the taxpayers of this country are groaning and limping under the load that has been placed on them. I want to say that Congress is not to blame for all of it. The administration of this Republic is to blame for a great deal of it, some men from every department. Here is the Secretary of the Interior coming down and proposing to go out over this country and buy up a lot of old cut-over pine land, worth about six bits an acre, and pay the owners of that land valuable prices, and have the American Congress be fool enough to go out and dig up the stumps, and put up fine houses and waterworks and electric lights in them out of the American taxpayers' money. They are full of such schemes as that to take the money away from the taxpayers of this country. Are we, as true, honest representatives of the masses of the people of this country, going to stand and submit to it? Some men propose to donate to our soldiers a year's salary. Every kind of waste! We passed a law, and I voted for it, to fix up the wheat farmers, to pay \$2.26 a bushel for their wheat. You are called upon now to put up \$1,250,000,000 to make that good. You are called on to pay \$750,000,000 more, after the railroad control has spent the \$500,000,000 that you gave them. You are asked to pay out \$750,000,000 more to go out and raise the salaries of everybody in this country to demoralize labor. You are called upon for every kind of a scheme to go out and grab money, with the Treasury already empty. And now you have only one place where we can call a halt. They are not going to halt any of these other things that I am talking about. You can call a halt on the Military Establishment in this country. I want my country protected. This bill has a provision in it which does that. If we will take the vitals out of that 500,000-men proposition, and cut it down to 175,000 enlisted volunteer men, with the proper officers, you have in this bill a provision for the National Guard, with about \$32,000,000 worth of equipment, that we already have, and the balance in cash, making \$50,000,000 to build up a strong National Guard in every State of this Nation. My friends, there is the hope of this Republic. With the National Guard, the States will have a proper force to quell riots and disturbances in any section of the State. Then there will be these 175,000 volunteers in the United States Army. By the way, according to my conception of this volunteer enlistment plan we can not get any more than that, but under those two provisions you will have a sufficient Army to guard properly the coast and the insular possessions and to be sent to quell riots and strikes in this Republic. What more should we want? Is the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] afraid that some one is going to come over and take us overnight? Why should we need 500,000 men after we have just won the great war, and the President over yonder around the peace table proposing a league that will prevent war? Why should 500,000 men, with 29,000 or 30,000 officers with shoulder straps be living off the people?

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I can not yield. What is the object of this? Do you believe that the American Government is in danger? Do you believe that 500,000 soldiers and 30,000 officers could save us? With the experience that we have had, do not you know that an army could be raised in a very short while if we should be suddenly attacked from any quarter? Do not you know that it has been demonstrated that all this talk is nonsense, that a great many of the officers said you had to have a great standing army in order to be prepared to fight a war successfully? All of that idea has passed away like the mists before the sun. Yet we have it urgently insisted that this Government should fasten upon itself now this great ball and chain to drag along and hold us down. In the name of heaven, let us get those soldiers that are now in the Army back home in civil pursuits. [Applause.] Let us have these men back on the farms and in the workshops. Across the seas there are still two millions of men. We may need some there, but the greater part of that great number of two millions of men should be transported back across the Atlantic Ocean and put out into the fields. Old Bossy and old Muley are calling for them. The bobwhites out in the cornfield are calling for the boys back on the farm, and here we are proposing to keep two millions of men standing almost in idleness, drawing salaries, and wasting money, and to have 500,000 more in this country. What are the people going to think about it? I will tell you what they are going to think. They are going to talk in 1920. They are going to talk at the ballot box. They are going to talk where it counts. The ballot is a mighty voice, and some of you in distress may tremble when you hear it in 1920.

With all of the talk and all the attempt to stir up trouble in this country and all the attacks that have been made against our Government, we may need some men to protect our country against bolshevism.

Some of them the other day hollered up in New York "to hell with the United States." We need some force to handle such bunches as that; but, my friends, do we need 500,000? Is there a man on this floor who believes that you can go out and get by volunteers 510,000 men for a standing Army? Of course, we can get the officers. There will be no trouble about that. That is why I think this army is wanted, to give a big crowd of officers a job for the taxpayers to maintain. Is Congress, representing 100,000,000 people from all stratas of society, going to proceed on the ground that this great Military Establishment after the war, after peace is virtually in sight, after the league of nations has been agreed to according to this morning's paper, and is virtually a success—is Congress going to say that we need 500,000 men? Are they going to call on the American taxpayers to sustain this heavy burden, to sustain this enormous force, while our country is in peace? We need the rehabilitation of industry and agriculture in this country. You need to bring these men back from the Army to do that. You can not raise corn, wheat, cotton, sheep, cows, and hogs without bringing these men back from the Army. You can not do it by the Agricultural Department sending out bulletins. You have got to do it by brawn and muscle, and it is going to be no 44 hours a week either. The farmers of this country do not believe that this Government should fasten upon the taxpayers of the Nation a great standing Army, and the large taxpayers have reached the point where they do not believe it. There is not a taxpayer within the Government to-day that is not feeling the pinch, and who is not calling a halt on the wild extravagance and waste of money. I want to say that I have voted against every raise of salary that has been proposed in this Congress. I have voted against expenditures which I did not think essential. I voted for the naval appropriation bill because I thought it was needed to protect the country under all the circumstances and because the President of the United States urged it as essential to his success at the peace congress. But no man has come forward to bring any evidence here that we need a great standing Army in a time of peace. No man has brought forth anything to prove that you can raise that army by voluntary enlistment. The ideals for which our Republic stands and the sentiments of the plain people will not tolerate this big army in times of peace. [Applause.]

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LARSEN. We have read one paragraph of the bill and I would like to know how long it is possible for Members to go on discussing matters that have nothing to do with that paragraph in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Just as long as the members of the committee give unanimous consent that they may proceed.

Mr. LARSEN. I want to say that I shall have to object to any further discussion outside of the matters contained in the bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word in reply to the gentleman from Georgia. General debate on this bill was closed by the statement by the chairman that Members desiring further discussion might get time under the five-minute rule. I do not want to take any time myself, but I know of several gentlemen who do desire time and want to speak.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. Before the gentleman proceeds I would like to say that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] has given notice that he will object unless debate is confined to the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the gentleman from Georgia insists that debate be on the paragraph, I will take my seat as soon as the point of order is sustained. After I have consumed five minutes I am going to ask for more time, and if objection is made I will take my seat, but until we reach that bridge I will proceed in order, or, perhaps, out of order.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the floor simply to say a word in behalf of the Regular Army. All of us are interested, of course, in the National Army; all of us are interested in the National Guard, especially in those units which come from our States and our communities. But nobody feels particularly called upon to say anything for the Regular Army, and proceeding, perhaps, on the same theory that Kipling proceeded when he was bragging on Fuzzy Wuzzy, because, as he said, "he 'asn't any papers of his own." I want to call attention to some facts touching the Regular Army as a fighting machine.

There were 30 combat divisions which engaged in fighting in France and sustained battle losses. Seven were from the Regular Army, 11 from the National Guard, and 12 from the National Army. The total killed in battle was 27,762 in the 30 combat divisions. The 7 Regular Army divisions out of the 30 lost 8,281 killed, or 30 per cent of the total. The total losses—that is to say, the killed, died of wounds, missing, and captured, not counting the other casualties—the total battle casualties of the 30 divisions was 56,592. The 7 Regular Army divisions out of the 30 lost 17,768, or 31 per cent of the total battle casualties.

Now, if we take the average battle losses which I have just enumerated—the killed, died of wounds, missing, and captured—the combat divisions engaged in the battles lost, on the average, 1,886 to the division. That average with the Regular Army divisions was 2,538.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Was that owing to the inferior leadership?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I do not think so. I am willing the gentleman from Arkansas should take that opinion.

Mr. CARAWAY. I expressed no opinion. I asked the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I presumed the gentleman entertained the opinion or he would not have asked the question to find out if I disagreed with him.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think it is fair, though.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman thinks that is a fair inference. Then the Rainbow Division and the Wisconsin Division—the Thirty-second—and the Twenty-eighth Divisions, which have won immortal glory in this war, are properly subject to the criticism that they were badly led. I do not believe that. There were 23 divisions which sustained battle losses, as I have defined that term, exceeding 1,000 to the division. The average losses in such divisions was 2,354. The average loss in such Regular Army divisions was 3,464. The highest loss—killed in battle—of any regiment in the Army was in the Ninth Infantry, 547. The next was the Twenty-eighth Infantry, 517. The next, the Eighteenth Infantry, 512, and the next, the Twenty-third Infantry, 504, all Regulars.

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

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, so that when it comes to the bloody business of the battle field the Regular Army has measured up not only to the expectations of its friends, but to the best traditions of the American Army. [Applause.] The total losses of the First Division—Regulars—highest of any in the Army, were 5,248. The Forty-second—the Rainbow Division—the division in which all of us take especial and thoroughly justifiable pride, because it was composed of National Guard units from 27 States, and every section of our country was represented, lost 2,950. The Thirty-second Division, made up, as I recall, from Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan and possibly Iowa, the division in which I think everyone in the country who has real American blood in his veins takes great pride, lost 3,213; the Twenty-sixth Division, 2,868.

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

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. The gentleman from Mississippi seemed to rather resent a moment ago that I asked about the leadership.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I did not resent it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is it his inference, then, from citing the figures, that the Regular Army was superior to the National Guard and the National Army in courage, skill, and willingness to go into battle?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It is not.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then what is the gentleman proving by his figures, other than possibly the opportunity to engage in battle?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, it is very likely that I am wasting the time of the House, but I will state to my friend that I am thoroughly enjoying the pastime. [Laughter.] I put it in here because all of us naturally and properly sing the praises of the National Guard and the National Army divisions and point to their sacrifices on the battle field. I took the floor simply to show that in this bleeding business the Regular Army was doing its full share and shedding its full proportion of very precious American blood; that is all. As to the reasons for it, they are perfectly apparent. They were sent over there first. In October, 1917, for instance, the first division went into the trenches. The National Guard units, which were considered the best trained, were sent over first and were put into battle first,

and therefore they suffered the greatest losses. At Cantigny, where the marines won their first fame, the newspapers had little to say of the other units. Gen. Pershing, however, in his report of that battle, says this:

On April 26 the First Division had gone into the line in the Montdidier salient on the Picardy battle front. Tactics had been suddenly revolutionized to those of open warfare, and our men, confident of the results of their training, were eager for the test. On the morning of May 28 this division attacked the commanding German position in its front, taking with splendid dash the town of Cantigny and all other objectives, which were organized and held steadfastly against vicious counterattacks and galling artillery fire. Although local, this brilliant action had an electrical effect, as it demonstrated our fighting qualities under extreme battle conditions, and also that the enemy's troops were not altogether invincible.

Who can accurately measure the full significance of this last sentence? For four long and unhappy years the German hosts had been victorious. In the previous March drive they had utterly crushed the English Fifth Army and came perilously near winning the war. All of us remember Haig's Macedonian cry. Who, then, I repeat, can estimate the tremendous value of this long prayed for demonstration that "the enemy's troops were not altogether invincible"?

When this campaign had ended the following general order was issued by the commanding general, which tells its own story:

General Orders, No. 112.

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
France, July 9, 1918.

The commander in chief desires to record in the General Orders of the American Expeditionary Forces his appreciation of the splendid courage, service, and sacrifice of the officers and men of the First and Second Divisions of these forces during the recent operations in which these divisions participated and in which the enemy was checked by the resolute defense and counteroffense of the allied armies.

These divisions submitted fully for the first time to all the drastic tests of modern warfare, bore themselves always with fine valor; their cooperation with their brothers in arms of the unified command was prompt and efficient and brought from their allied comrades many expressions of sincere appreciation. The conduct of these brave men and that of their fallen comrades who made the supreme sacrifice has established a standard of service and prestige which every division of the American Expeditionary Forces will strive to emulate and preserve. This order will be read to all organizations at the first assembly formation after its receipt.

By command of Gen. Pershing:

JAMES W. MCANDREW,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

ROBERT C. DAVIS,
Adjutant General.

On the 15th of July the other great offensive opened; the offensive which all Germany hoped and believed would win the war. Alas for their hopes. It was indeed to be the last offensive, but its failure was to spell their downfall. Here, too, the Regulars did their full share of the fighting. Reading again from Gen. Pershing's report:

The Third Division was holding the bank of the Marne from the bend east of the mouth of the Surlin to the west of Mezy, opposite Chateau-Thierry, where a large force of German infantry sought to force a passage under support of powerful artillery concentrations and under cover of smoke screens. A single regiment of the Third wrote one of the most brilliant pages in our military annals on this occasion. It prevented the crossing at certain points on its front, while on either flank the Germans, who had gained a footing, pressed forward. Our men, firing in three directions, met the German attacks with counterattacks at critical points and succeeded in throwing two German divisions into complete confusion, capturing 600 prisoners.

I believe every State in this Union shared in the sorrow and the glory of what has come to be known generally as the victory of Chateau-Thierry.

I believe I am within the record when I say that the great drive of July 15 was stopped by the soldiers of this Republic and the tide of battle turned by them which was the forerunner of Germany's collapse.

The following general order is a fitting acknowledgment of the praise due to all our soldiers alike. It will be observed that the divisions named are four Regular and four National Guard:

General Orders, No. 143.

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
France, August 28, 1918.

(For official circulation only.)

It fills me with pride to record in general orders a tribute to the service and achievements of the First and Third Corps, comprising the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Twenty-sixth, Twenty-eighth, Thirty-second, and Forty-second Divisions of the American Expeditionary Forces.

You came to the battle field at the crucial hour of the allied cause. For almost four years the most formidable army the world had as yet seen had pressed its invasion of France and stood threatening at its capital. At no time had that army been more powerful or menacing than when, on July 15, it struck again to destroy in one great battle the brave men opposed to it and to enforce its brutal will upon the world and civilization.

Three days later, in conjunction with our allies, you counterattacked. The allied armies gained a brilliant victory that marks the turning point of the war. You did more than give our brave allies the support to which as a nation our faith was pledged; you proved that our altruism, or pacific spirit, our sense of justice have not blunted our virility or our courage. You have shown that American initiative and energy are as fit for the test of war as for the pursuits of peace. You have justly won the unstinted praise of our allies and the eternal gratitude of our countrymen.

We have paid for our success in the lives of many of our brave comrades. We shall cherish their memory always and claim for our history and literature their bravery, achievement, and sacrifice.

This order will be read to all organizations at the first assembly formation after its receipt.

JOHN J. PERSHING,
General, Commander in Chief.

ROBERT C. DAVIS,
Adjutant General.

There is glory enough for all surely in the record that was made. From the 18th of July to November 11 our boys in all branches of the service showed the mettle of their pasture. After this splendid division, the first to enter the trenches in October, 1917, had finished its great work with Cantigny, Chateau-Thierry, Belleau Wood, and Argonne upon its banners, the following general order shows how well the sequel held together:

General Orders, No. 201.

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
France, November 10, 1918.

(For official circulation only.)

1. The commander in chief desires to make of record in the General Orders of the American Expeditionary Forces his extreme satisfaction with the conduct of the officers and soldiers of the First Division in its advance west of the Meuse between October 4 and 11, 1918. During this period the division gained a distance of 7 kilometers over a country which presented not only remarkable facilities for enemy defense, but also great difficulties of terrain for the operation of our troops.

2. The division met with resistance from elements of eight hostile divisions, most of which were first-class troops, and some of which were completely rested. The enemy chose to defend its position to the death, and the fighting was always of the most desperate kind. Throughout the operations the officers and men of the division displayed the highest type of courage, fortitude, and self-sacrificing devotion to duty. In addition to many enemy killed, the division captured 1,407 of the enemy, 13 77-mm. field guns, 10 trench mortars, and numerous machine guns and stores.

3. The success of the division in driving a deep advance into the enemy's territory enabled an assault to be made on the left by the neighboring division against the northeastern portion of the Forest of Argonne and enabled the First Division to advance to the right and outflank the enemy's position in front of the division on that flank.

4. The commander in chief has noted in this division a special pride of service and a high state of morale, never broken by hardship nor battle.

5. This order will be read to all organizations at the first assembly formation after its receipt. [14790-A-306.]

By command of Gen. Pershing:

JAMES W. MCANDREW,
Chief of Staff.

Official:

ROBERT C. DAVIS,
Adjutant General.

Mr. Chairman, all of us have indulged in criticism of the Regular Army. I have listened to many gentlemen do it, and some gentlemen have listened to me do it. I have no doubt that I shall continue to listen to criticisms of the Regular Army, and if the House will be patient with me in times to come, I have no doubt that they will hear me indulge in similar criticisms. The conduct of the Regular Army, Mr. Chairman, in this war has been such, however, that, in my opinion, every American can take pride in.

The Regular Army men who went over to the other side, as I have shown, did their duty fully on the battle field. A great majority—62 per cent—of the officers remained over here; and for what purpose? In order to train the other boys from civil life who were necessary to go. Did they perform that service well? I think the answer to that question came at Belleau Woods, at Chateau-Thierry, and along that long and bloody trail which lead thence to Sedan. They trained the boys fresh from the walks of civil life and demonstrated that whatever our lack in guns and cannon, we were in the main essential element of preparedness—the spirit of the people and the quality of our boys—the best-prepared Nation in the world. To my mind they also demonstrated that there is no necessity hereafter to maintain as a permanent Military Establishment any considerable number of troops above that which was authorized before the war. They showed that they could train the boys in civil life to be the match of any soldiers beneath the sun.

Mr. Chairman, I felt that in justice to the Regular Army some one ought to present these facts to the House and possibly to the country, because whatever else may be said of them, they have demonstrated that they are first-class fighting men.

I append the following, taken from the Official Bulletin, so that Members may see the exact losses in all the divisions which had the luck, and it was only luck, to get into action:

Total casualties by divisions.

[Field signal battalions and trains not included.]

Division.	Killed in action.	Died of wounds.	Missing in action.	Prisoners.	Total.
1.....	2,303	1,050	1,789	106	5,248
21.....	1,383	696	813	73	2,965
3.....	1,901	589	873	254	3,617
4.....	1,500	618	817	51	2,983
5.....	970	505	969	60	2,504
6.....	49	67	3	3	122
7.....	175	98	50	3	323
26.....	1,388	660	462	354	2,864
27.....	1,302	404	330	158	2,194
28.....	1,544	553	1,174	619	3,890
29.....	597	220	267	33	1,117
30.....	1,084	415	251	22	1,772
32.....	1,694	708	708	43	3,213
33.....	632	261	249	29	1,171
35.....	596	217	803	112	1,733
36.....	358	116	393	2	869
37.....	658	289	303	1,250
42.....	1,702	723	440	85	2,950
77.....	1,275	552	529	336	2,692
78.....	915	339	508	63	1,825
79.....	880	352	1,142	15	2,389
80.....	636	337	286	96	1,355
81.....	203	86	79	2	370
82.....	508	324	271	189	1,592
83.....	20	33	7	6	66
88.....	838	427	256	4	1,525
89.....	936	327	287	35	1,585
90.....	934	275	470	23	1,702
91.....	109	50	47	5	211
92.....	372	105	8	4	489
Total.....	27,762	11,396	14,649	2,785	56,592

¹ Two regiments of marines not included.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we are sitting to-day under our constitutional power to make appropriations for the maintenance of our Army, and I must confess that I approached the deliberations upon this measure with an open mind. I am one of those who have consistently supported the administration and the Government in the prosecution of the war and all measures that I deemed essential or vital for the successful and victorious termination of that cause. But hostilities have ceased; the war is to all intents and purposes ended, and we now, gentlemen, sit here as the representatives of the American people to meet the propositions of rehabilitation and reconstruction. Since the armistice was signed and the war ceased each one of us, I am sure, in his own heart and intellect, has begun to take stock of what his course and procedure should be in the future with reference to these bills which should come before this House. As has been pointed out here time and time again, and you gentlemen all know, the war has necessitated the piling upon the Federal Treasury a stupendous and almost unimaginable burden that has to be paid out of the labor, toil, and sacrifices of the American people.

I am not making complaint about the appropriations which were made to carry out and win this war. I voted for them, and I have no apologies to make; but we are now, gentlemen, approaching—and are, as a matter of fact—upon a status of peace, and here comes the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and presents an appropriation providing for the expenditure of \$1,916,000,000 for the purpose of maintaining the Army during the next fiscal year. It contains a provision, gentlemen, authorizing, in all events and under all circumstances, a standing army of over 25,000 officers and 500,000 men. Now, we are responsible to the people. I am not standing here to-day in the capacity of a diplomat; I am not standing here in this forum in the exercise of any judicial power; I am here as a representative of 200,000 hard-working, honest, toiling Alabama people, just like you are the representative of such in your district. What do you think their feeling and their judgment are upon this new proposal and absolute departure from the traditional policy of our people for a large standing army in time of peace?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that there are now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means and in expectation it will be shortly reported to the House a bill which proposes to increase our bonds from \$20,000,000,000 to \$25,000,000,000, with an additional issue of \$10,000,000,000 of notes?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am aware of that, and every Member of this House is aware of it; but, gentlemen, the pay day has got

to come in the future. [Applause.] Yet here we are on both sides of this aisle voting daily huge sums of money for all sorts of purposes, and I particularly desire to take this opportunity to admonish my Democratic brethren that the responsibility is primarily upon us to cut out these unnecessary expenditures, because we are the party in power and the country properly is going to charge us with any undue and wanton extravagance in these expenditures of the people's money. Yes; that situation has to be confronted, and that is the reason why I for one—and I do not claim any particular virtue upon this situation—propose to call a halt. I have to be guided, gentlemen, by this monitor here in my own individual bosom, by what little intellect God has given me as to my individual course and procedure; that is the reason, after the war ended, as I have said, as far as I am concerned I am going to see to it by my vote that our appropriations are limited to our governmental necessities. [Applause.] I voted against the appropriation giving \$100,000,000 away to feed the Germans and Austrians, Russians and Turks and Bolsheviki over yonder, and my vote on that question did not meet with the approval of the majority of this House, but it met the approval of my judgment and conscience and will meet the approval of my constituents. I voted against the naval appropriation because it authorized the spending of \$750,000,000 of the people's money right at a time when we are hoping and believing that the peace treaty at Paris will provide for the disarmament of nations.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I hope that my colleague from Alabama will not refuse to vote the money to pay the necessary number of troops before demobilization.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, yes; that is the attitude my colleague undertakes to put us in. They want me hog-tied, as it were, for fear of criticism if I vote against a big standing Army. You can say, "Yes; he voted against an appropriation to pay boys still in the service—"

Mr. DENT. I think that is a fact.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What I want to do is to cut out the Army of half a million men in time of peace and have in the bill the necessary sums to pay and provide for the boys still left in the present Army. But that does not prevent us on the floor of this House from making an honest effort to cut down the expenditures provided in the bill, if it can be done. Now, what is the necessity of a standing Army? The proposed Army, as my friend from California [Mr. KAHN] called it, I believe, yesterday, a "stop-gap" Army of 500,000 men. I asked the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE], a man of fine common sense and high patriotism, to give some reason for the necessity for this proposition, and what was his answer? I am sure it was the best that he could make. It was that they tell us—that is, the General Staff—that, in view of our colonial possessions, our insular possessions, and our long seacoast to defend, that, in their judgment, that is the minimum amount we should rely upon. Why? With what new menace are we confronted in reference to the safety of our insular possessions? Why, one regiment is a sufficient constabulary for the Philippine Islands. What war cloud is brewing over the Panama Canal Zone or Porto Rico or any other of our possessions that did not exist prior to our entrance into this war? Gentlemen, this is but the entering wedge for a permanent policy of a large standing Army that the people of the United States have opposed [applause] and to which conviction and sentiment I am unalterably opposed in time of peace. Why, it is admitted by members of the Committee on Military Affairs that the Chief of Staff, when he had a hearing on this proposition, advocated the adoption of this policy providing for a minimum Army of half a million men as a permanent peace policy, and when that proposition met with criticism in the committee finally Mr. KAHN suggested, or undertook to provide, a rider that would only provide for an emergency Army for the fiscal year of 1919-20. What is the necessity for keeping 500,000 boys in the Army if we can get them home this year? The boys in the Army from my district went to the war to lick Germany. They have done their part in finishing that job, and now they want to go home to their own people and get back into the useful and peaceful trades and callings.

We are told that our Army is being brought back home as fast as ships can be procured to bring them.

I trust that that is so. I pray to God that those in authority may exercise the same zeal, energy, and industry in getting them back as they did in getting them over there to the firing line when we sent them over there. [Applause.] I believe in good faith that they are making every effort to do so. I have scores of letters every day from my district from mothers, fathers, wives, and children asking when their soldier will get

back. The farms all over my district are vacant because the boys are over there in the Army. I think we ought to put some legislation on this bill, gentlemen, authorizing and directing the Secretary of War immediately to discharge from the service certain classes of men. [Applause.] I propose at the opportune time to offer an amendment authorizing and directing him, as soon as possible under the machinery provided, to discharge from the service those who have dependents at home, all of those for whom the Government of the United States pay the family allowance at home, and those engaged in agriculture. I do not know what support that proposition will get. But, gentlemen, we are proposing here an Army of, as I say, 500,000 men, without any necessity for its existence having been satisfactorily stated by the members of the committee.

I am sure that the explanation that has been offered by the committee on this proposition does not meet with your honest convictions upon the ground of governmental necessity. If we are going to spend money extravagantly, let us spend it for some useful and serviceable purpose. Why should we have half a million men in camps throughout the country in absolute idleness, doing nothing except to conform to regimen and military discipline, producing nothing, but consuming all the time, under constant daily burdens of the taxpayers and the people of the United States? I say, if we are going to spend the money, let us spend it for some instructive, useful, and humanitarian purpose.

The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] said that 270 soldiers out of every thousand enlisted were afflicted with some congenital or contracted disease. We could spend \$10,000,000 upon that proposition and accomplish great results along that line. There are to-day in the United States of America 8,500,000 people who can not read or write or understand the English tongue, making a great problem of national illiteracy, which I think this Congress could well afford, by Federal aid and co-operation with the States, to meet and master. We could spend it much more profitably in aiding the States to build good highways for the people or in providing Federal aid, stimulus, and leadership in the great problem of retraining for some useful calling the victims of industrial accidents.

Gentlemen, we ought to remember the people back home. We are too prone to overlook, I fear, sometimes the plain people of our district. And they are nearly all plain people, because there are but few millionaires; there are very few of the blue-stocking element in America as compared with the general population. That man back there is the fellow who has to go down in his pocket and foot these bills. He can not escape. He is penalized if he does not pay. And already the Treasury Department is getting out its return for every citizen of the United States who commands a salary or makes wages of more than \$1,000 a year, and asking him to go down in his pocket and pay his tithe of these great tax burdens. We ought not to forget them and the business men of the country. While we are discussing sovereignty let us sometimes think of the private citizenship back yonder.

I want to illustrate that spirit and that purpose by a suggestion once made by that silver-tongued son of Georgia, the late Henry W. Grady, a comparison that I have used before:

Not very long ago I stood out here in front of this Capitol and looked up at this magnificent structure, the Capitol of our Republic, magnificent in its architecture and design, the flag of our Republic floating above the Goddess of Liberty on its top, and I thought surely that if justice and wisdom and mercy and humanity abided here that the world should be indebted to this temple that had taught the world its best lessons of human liberty.

A few days after that I went back to my district and visited an old farmer friend. As I walked up the gravel walk to his home I could see the beegums out there in the peach orchard. I could see the pigeons fluttering down through the air. I could hear the drone of the bees and the poultry's gentle clucking. My old friend met me at the door and bade me into the sitting room. You have seen its type among your people. There was the clean counterpane on the bed; on the mantel the clock that had ticked the watches of the living and for the dead. There on the center table was the old family Bible, thumbed by fingers long since stilled and blurred by eyes now dimmed forever. He led me out on the porch and we looked down on his fertile fields. He was an American farmer, sowing in his own season and selling in his chosen market, the master of his land and the master of himself. He had a service star in the window for a son who had been taken from that farm and who was fighting for that flag. As I looked upon that picture the memory of this magnificent Capitol Building here in Washington faded from mind. I felt and knew then, as you do to-day, that here in the hearts and homes of the people is the ark of the covenant and the hope of this Republic. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, let us not forget the homes of America, the toil and the sacrifice that lies before them when we, I am afraid, are about unduly to hamper and burden them with unnecessary taxation. [Applause.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly stated in the debates on this bill that its provisions look to the maintenance of an Army of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men for the next fiscal year. When this feature of the bill was under discussion yesterday morning, having read it very hastily, I ventured to accept the same interpretation of its language, and so stated to the membership of the House. But since that time, after reading the act carefully, I am clearly of the opinion that it does not limit the program to the maintenance of an Army of approximately 500,000.

I ask you to read closely the provisions of the act at this point and see if the statement I now make is not amply substantiated by the language used. It provides:

That in addition to the Regular Army 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 provisions of "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 8, 1917, as amended, a force sufficient to maintain an aggregate commissioned and enlisted strength of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men.

This language not only authorizes but instructs and requires that "a force sufficient to maintain an aggregate commissioned and enlisted strength of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men" shall be raised and maintained "in addition" to the force provided for in the act approved June 3, 1916.

Upon first reading the act I construed the word "aggregate" to apply both to the Regular Army organized under the act approved June 3, 1916, and the additional force required to be raised under the provisions of the act approved May 8, 1917, but a more technical construction seems to limit the application of the word "aggregate" to the additional force only. So if we adopt this measure as reported by the committee we not only require the establishment, in time of peace, of an Army of 175,000 men under the act of 1916, but we require that there shall be organized and maintained an additional force of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men.

If this interpretation is correct, this act would require the maintenance in time of peace of an Army of nearly three-quarters of a million men. Now, for my part, I am unalterably opposed to any such scheme. Whether limited to 500,000 men or not, I am opposed to authorizing in any event more than 175,000 men as provided in the act of 1916.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand you to say this force of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men is in addition to the Regular Army?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is the language of the act.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. A strange thing about that is that the men who drew the bill meant it to read just the opposite, and all thought it did.

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, if the gentleman will consult the various members of the Committee on Military Affairs regarding this matter, he will find at least one member of that committee, a very able lawyer, who construes it as I do.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I have been consulting them for the last two months on it daily, and we all seem to have the opinion that the Regular Army and temporary forces when put together would equal 500,000 approximately.

Mr. STEAGALL. That was the conclusion I reached yesterday upon a careless reading of the bill, but a strict examination of the language shows it does not mean that.

Now, I do not wish to criticize the War Department, but gentlemen on the committee have stated that the plans of the department look to the establishment and maintenance of an army of approximately 500,000 men in addition to the regular force.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. No; I regret that my time is so limited; I prefer not to yield.

Mr. SANFORD. I want to help the gentleman to understand it.

Mr. STEAGALL. Well, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SANFORD. If the House should make a rule to the effect that in addition to the speech the gentleman is making there should be sufficient further speeches to make an aggregate of three, can the gentleman tell me how many speeches under that ruling there would be in all? Then he can express an opinion on the meaning of the paragraph.

Mr. STEAGALL. I thought yesterday that the word "aggregate" saved the point, but upon further reading of the bill I reached a different conclusion. The act provides that "in addition" to the Regular Army organized under the act of June 3, 1916, there shall be raised and organized under the act approved May 8, 1917, a force sufficient to maintain an aggregate commissioned and enlisted strength of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men. It is this force to be raised under the act approved May 8, 1917, that is to amount to an aggregate commissioned and enlisted strength of 28,579 officers and 509,909 enlisted men.

But, gentlemen, there is no use to spend further time discussing this feature of the act, because I think members of the Committee on Military Affairs are sincere in their position.

I have the highest regard for the ability and fairness of the gentlemen on this committee, especially my good friend and colleague, the able chairman of that committee, Mr. DENT. I am sure they want to be fair with the House. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE], a member of the committee, stated yesterday that he welcomed and courted discussion, and would welcome an amendment to this portion of the bill if necessary to accomplish what the committee intended. In my judgment, if it is desired to make this bill accomplish what the Committee on Military Affairs intended, it will be necessary to pass an amendment to make certain its provision. To say the least of it, if this is not done it will leave it open for construction by the War Department. I am not sure that the first word of the provision for this additional force of approximately 500,000 men does not have a peculiar significance. You will notice that this provision begins with a requirement that there shall be organized and maintained a force of 28,579 officers. Remember, gentlemen, that whoever wrote the bill puts the officers first, and if the bill is passed in its present language I venture to predict that when they go to construe it some interpretation will be found that will find places for all these officers for the next year. After that possibly the scheme advocated by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] may be contemplated, a plan by which these officers can be used for purposes of instruction in a course of universal military training that efforts will be made to establish in this country.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. STEAGALL. My time is so limited that I prefer not to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAZARO. Just for a question?

Mr. STEAGALL. Well, I yield for a question.

Mr. LAZARO. Was that provision written by an officer or a private?

Mr. STEAGALL. I am not in possession of any more information than the gentleman is. Of course, he knows, as we all know in a general way, how this legislation originates—the way the various departments have of preparing legislation for our approval.

I am sorry this bill deals only with the creation and maintenance of the Nation's military force. I wish the committee would report some measure looking to the demobilization of the millions of men already in our armies. I think every man who has dependents and every man who was engaged in farming and desires to return to such work ought to be selected for discharge. I have introduced a bill, now before the Military Affairs Committee, which provides that all men who had dependents or who at the time they entered the military service were engaged in farming shall be discharged. I wish the committee would report that bill or some similar measure.

I think we ought to adhere to the principle of selection underlying the draft law, and demobilize our armies just as they were raised, with a view to obviating economic loss and industrial disturbance as far as possible. The task of finding employment for the vast number of men now in the Army is, indeed, a serious one. We are maintaining an employment bureau at an enormous expense to assist in this work. The Secretary of the Interior is seeking legislation authorizing the expenditure of \$100,000,000 to purchase or improve lands for the use of soldiers to be discharged. Certainly in such a situation men who desire to engage in farming ought to be discharged with all possible haste. Not a day passes that every Member of this House representing agricultural districts is not flooded with appeals to assist in securing discharges for men who are begging to go home and begin the cultivation of crops, and it will be too late unless they get out in the next few weeks, because the planting season will soon be past. For reasons of public policy these men, and men who have dependents, ought to be given a chance to return to their former occupation in order to prevent the accentuation of economic difficulties that must follow the complete demobilization of our Army.

Gentlemen, I attach no importance to the provisions of this act which make this vast army only temporary. The gentleman from Illinois quoted a statement from the Secretary of War in which the Secretary said that all legislation was temporary, and that is true. This is the entering wedge, the beginning of a policy to establish a big standing Army in this country, and if the plan is countenanced by this House at this time there is no telling when we may hope to see it abolished. There has never been a time when such a plan was so unwise and inexcusable. This bill authorizes an expenditure of more than \$1,000,000,000 for the support of the Army for the fiscal year beginning June 30, almost a year after the termination of the war. A year's expenditure for the support of the Army for any fiscal year before the war began was never over \$100,000,000 or thereabout. How can we justify such a change at this time, at the end of the great war, when the only enemy constituting a serious menace to this Nation in a hundred years has been humiliated and crushed and when we are trying to establish universal peace?

The expense of the Navy before the war never ran in any fiscal year above \$150,000,000, but we have just passed in this House a measure providing three-quarters of a billion dollars for the support of the Navy for the fiscal year beginning June 30 next—almost a year after the conclusion of the war—and the bill contains an authorization for additional ships that will add nearly a half billion annually whenever the completed program is set to going.

The vast increase proposed to be expended for the maintenance of the Army and Navy following the war, as compared with the expenditures made prior to that time, would in just a few years be sufficient to pay our entire national indebtedness.

I know it has been contended that the provisions of the naval bill for the additional program will never be put into effect, but I believe if the Congress passes that bill it, too, will be an entering wedge which will culminate in the policy of building the greatest Navy in the world. When it is admitted that our present naval strength is equal to that of the combined strength of any three nations on earth except Great Britain, with whom we have just been associated in the great war against the military autocracy of Germany, unless we are in danger of war with Great Britain, what excuse can any sane man offer for such a program? Of course, no man would dare say that there can be such danger after our recent effort to assist Great Britain in destroying the system of militarism which so recently attempted to destroy the freedom of the world.

We face already a public debt of nearly \$25,000,000,000. We have just passed a revenue bill designed to raise approximately \$6,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year; and yet, if I can remember correctly, the chairman of the committee in charge of that bill stated that the indications point to an expense of nearly \$8,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year. How are we going to get the money?

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to deliver any lecture on economy. I have usually voted with the majority of the House in making provision for the expenditure of money, and I am not censuring nor criticizing now. I know how it all comes about. Every measure that is brought in here for the unnecessary or unwise appropriation of money is always supported by the claim that it has some peculiar merit distinctively its own, just as was the case with the bill brought in by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and which was passed a day or two ago.

Each and every one of these schemes to take money out of the Treasury is always represented as having some merit peculiarly its own. But I voted against the naval bill, and I am going to vote against this bill if the provision is retained authorizing the maintenance of a standing Army of 500,000 or 700,000 men in time of peace. So far as I am concerned, from now on I am going to treat all alike and cast my vote against all useless expenditure of the people's money when they are burdened, as they are, almost beyond endurance. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the truth is we have been doing many unusual things in this Congress since we entered the war. And every time we have been confronted by the people of the country with the suggestion that we were departing from well-established customs and ideals we have answered them by saying, "Yes, but we are in war, and we want to go about winning it; but as soon as it is over we are going to tear down the military machine being built up and undo many of the things now deemed essential and indispensable to the winning of the war." Now, gentlemen, we have right here the opportunity to make good our promise by returning to the established policies and well-known wishes of the American people in the matter of our regular Military Establishment. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON rose.

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

Mr. TILSON. I was going to ask for the floor in my own right.

Mr. STEAGALL. I have voted with the majority almost invariably during my service in this House. I voted for the declaration of war. I voted against the McLemore resolution. I have voted at all times, as I thought, for the assertion and for the defense of American rights, for the right of the people of this Nation to traverse the high seas, and for the right of the producing masses of the Nation to maintain commerce with the world and ship their products to every quarter of the earth. And when those rights were at stake and the welfare of humanity was involved I voted for every dollar of appropriation suggested from responsible sources, in order to maintain our Army and sustain the dignity and honor of the Nation.

But we are now practically at peace with the world. We should return to the policy of simplicity and economy, to the old ideals, and get back into the paths established by our fathers, and run this Government as it used to be run without so much centralization of power in Washington and without the burdens involved in the maintenance of so many bureaus to control business and regulate the activities of the people. Let us release the initiative and productive forces of the Nation, and let the country move forward along normal lines, to the end that we may develop our resources, discharge our obligations, and leave our children unhampered and unshackled by a staggering public debt and the expense and danger involved in a large standing Army. Let the Government take its hand off the citizen and out of his pocket. Let the Government umpire the game and give every man in this Republic an equal chance to fight out the battle for industrial success. [Applause.] These are the things we have promised the people during the war, and, so far as I am concerned, I intend to make good the promise. [Applause.]

But, gentlemen, it is not alone upon the idea of dollars and cents that I am opposed to the maintenance of a vast military organization in this country in time of peace. It is a matter that transcends any question of dollars and cents. It tends to the overthrow of American ideals of government. [Applause.] Ah, gentlemen, to-day the thoughtful men of this country are not concerned so much about the dangers that lurk in foreign lands or any menace of other powers. We face domestic questions the solution of which affect the peace and perpetuity of this Republic. Solomon said: "He that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city." The greatest task confronting American statesmanship is to work out the many problems of rehabilitation and readjustment following the great war in which we have been engaged; to correct evils inherent in our national life; to eliminate the dangers and weaknesses of our own Government; to preserve it as a blessing to our children and a light to the world.

While cherishing the sincerest friendship for the masses of humanity everywhere now bleeding from the wounds of war, let us look first to the restoration of normal economic conditions among our own people. Let us release to the fullest the productive forces of the Nation, extend our trade throughout other lands, and discharge the enormous burdens recently imposed upon our people. Let us not arouse their fears nor dampen their loyalty by the maintenance of useless and expensive armies. Above all things, let us not forget that when the record of this war shall be written by the impartial historian its greatest and most unmistakable lesson will be that the German Government, after whom some of us on this floor wish to pattern, went to her doom through her effort to dominate the world by military force—that in attempting to live by the sword she perished by the sword. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the House well knows that I am no apologist for the War Department. I try to stand by the officials of that department when they are right and to criticize them when I think they are deserving of criticism. I think that in some things they have been worthy of criticism, and I have attempted to administer it on this floor. One thing I have criticized is the delay in discharging the men from the Army; but there is no harm in facing the facts as they exist. There is nothing to be gained by misrepresenting the situation in which we find ourselves placed. Gentlemen agitate themselves very much over the provision of the bill which calls for an aggregate of 500,000 men, properly called a stop-gap Army. There should be no trouble about that. If that language does not mean what the Committee on Military Affairs intended it should mean, it is an easy matter to insert a single word that will make it mean that, and there is not a member of that committee who will resist it. There is no use in agitating ourselves over that proposition. The truth of the matter is that it is the intention of the committee to provide pay, subsistence, supplies, transportation, and other necessities for an Army averaging 500,000 men during the next fiscal year, and that is the smallest number which the

responsible officers of the executive department of this Government claim they can get along with.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for a question.

Mr. CARAWAY. The gentleman uses the word "average" as applied to the 500,000 men. The language of the bill has nothing to do with an average.

Mr. TILSON. The item for the pay of the Army tells the story. The pay of the Army is sufficient for 500,000 men and the requisite number of officers during the entire year. Therefore the Army may amount to over a million men on the first day of July, 1919, but on the 30th of the following June may not amount to 200,000 men; and that is what we mean by the average, and that is what we have provided for here.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. STAFFORD. If no substantive legislation is provided, will not the present Army continue in existence until the emergency is ended, and all that will be necessary will be a sufficient appropriation to provide for that Army until demobilization is completed?

Mr. TILSON. Yes, that will be so; but as a member of the committee I, for one, believe that it would be a great hardship upon these men who were either drafted or enlisted for the war to be kept for an indefinite time until peace shall be finally concluded. We believe it to be the better plan to enlist a volunteer force of men who are willing to serve in that Army during the next year.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. No; I decline to yield, if the gentleman will excuse me. I do not wish to take any more time.

I should like to call upon some of these gentlemen who have had the floor and who have discussed this matter on the other side to state what items they would cut out of this bill. We have a large Army over in France, and we all wish to see every man brought back home.

What is the largest item of this \$1,100,000,000? Nearly half of it is for transportation, \$449,000,000. Would gentlemen cut that out? Our men over there must be brought home.

The supplies must be carried to them while they are over there. We must have the transportation.

Our soldiers must be fed. One hundred and twenty million dollars is for their subsistence. Would gentlemen cut that out? Would they let the men starve?

Then there is the pay. We are told that 500,000 men are the smallest number that can perform our part of what ought to be done in cleaning up the aftermath of this great war. This is the best opinion that we can get from the military advisers of the Government. Therefore we are providing for the pay of 500,000 men, and the pay item amounts to \$303,000,000. Would gentlemen cut that out? We must provide the pay if we have the men.

Gentlemen are indulging in destructive criticism, but I would suggest that they tarry a moment and say what they are going to put in place of what they destroy. After having incurred these heavy burdens, after having voted for these expenses, it is all very well to say that we want to return to the old-time normal. All right; but we are not yet at the old-time normal, and we are not in sight of it. It is going to take a great deal of money to return to it; but the point is that having voted for these great appropriations, having incurred these great expenses, gentlemen must take their share of the responsibility in helping to get us out of the difficulties in which we have been placed by the aid of their votes. [Applause.]

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. Goodwin of Arkansas, 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. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman from Georgia here?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, for one I am not disturbed about the language of this bill on page 58. I think the argument that my friend from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has just made will clear a doubt in the minds of some of us as to whether or not the legislation is to be permanent. At any rate, I am not one of those who have believed that we can raise 500,000 men by voluntary enlistment. I might say that I am disturbed somewhat about the 28,579 officers that the bill provides for. If we are going to have 500,000 men, that will mean 20 divisions and 5 army corps, and, of course, it will require the 28,579 officers; but I do not believe that one single officer should be appointed or commissioned for this Army until the Army grows to the strength requiring that particular officer.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. That very provision is in the bill.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Then it is a better bill than I thought for. [Laughter.]

Mr. KAHN. The officer can not be appointed until the men are in the unit he is to command.

Mr. GALLIVAN. The committee is in hearty accord with the gentleman from Massachusetts. [Laughter.] But I did not rise to discuss this bill in this particular feature. I listened to a discussion on the floor yesterday in which the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY] had something to say about what is colloquially known as the "canning factory" of the American Expeditionary Forces, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] asked the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] what he knew about the "canning factory," and he said in his belief it never existed.

When I referred to the conditions at the reclassification camps at Blois twice in the past month, I think I gave the House substantial evidence that there was a "canning factory" at Blois, and if my good friend from Nebraska will read the Washington papers he must be familiar with the intelligent contributions of George Rothwell Brown, who went to France, who spent months in France, and who has given through the columns of the Washington Post a magnificent description of what he saw and what he knew about conditions in France. I commend to my friend from Nebraska that he read the Brown story of the "canning factory" at Blois.

Now, I am going to read a letter just received from France. Sunday's mail brought me 40 letters from France this time, every letter from a stranger, and they come from colonel down to second lieutenant. I am not going to read them all. I am going to read two. I am not going to say that what is conveyed to me in the first letter is the truth. I have only the evidence in this letter; but if it is the truth it is horrifying. Listen to this: It is signed by a major, and, of course, I shall not give the man's name, but he appends the number and location of his outfit, and he refers to having read some of my remarks on the floor of this House in the Paris edition of the New York Herald. He says:

FRANCE, January 20, 1919.

Gen. Hill, of Illinois, one of the most able and conscientious officers that the National Guard ever produced, was hailed before that tribunal, whose door should have upon it "All who enter here leave behind," and told he could accept a colonel's commission in the S. O. S. or a major's commission in the line, and he stated that he came over here to fight, and was going to fight if he had to fight as a private. He went to the line as a major, and every officer and man who knew him testified to his soldierly conduct and ability. I have visited his grave near Epionville, in an orchard, in that shell-torn Argonne Forest, and as I stood at that shrine I felt that if God ever cursed a human being he surely would trouble the consciences of that board, who never smelled powder, but who have broken the hearts of many patriotic American officers.

Col. Joseph Cavander, who left Wyoming with as good a regiment of husky westerners as was ever organized, and who was transferred from the Infantry to the Artillery, with no choice, and who took up the new work with vim and enthusiasm, and put together a regiment whose record has not been excelled, and who were on the fighting line for five long months, was detached from the regiment and sent to the same board, where he was informed that he could take a captain's commission or go home. Broken hearted he walked over to the hotel and fired a .45-caliber pistol bullet into his brain, and then the casualty reports showed him "killed in action," and I have in mind at least 50 generals, colonels, and lieutenant colonels of the National Guard who have met disgrace at this tribunal of injustice, and I will be glad to furnish the names and addresses if they are needed.

We stood this long without a murmur while the war was going on, for the reason that nothing mattered much if the boche won, and we were willing to suffer even these things, in order to maintain harmony in our own forces, but now we feel that justice must be done.

Sincerely, yours,

May I say here that before I read that letter I consulted with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and he said that he knew Col. Cavander well, and that the earlier reports from the Expeditionary Forces did say that he was killed in action. Yesterday, only yesterday, the record was corrected to show that he died from a self-inflicted wound.

I may say that my correspondent is unknown to me except as he signs himself, and that he is not from New England but, I understand, from a Southern State.

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

Mr. GALLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I have a letter from a member of the Expeditionary Forces in France, dated January 15, 1919, in the course of which he says:

Senator GALLIVAN—

And he simply anticipates [applause]—

of Massachusetts certainly put it up to them in the Congress about keeping you all in the dark.

I will not ask the gentleman to give up his time, nor shall I ask to take the time of the committee to read this in full, but I wish the gentleman would ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, so as to include this letter, which is most interesting.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will ask that permission for me now.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing this letter, or any other letters, in full to which he may refer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that his colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] may be granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the letter referred to and such other letters as he may choose to include. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall include that letter to which the gentleman from Massachusetts refers at this point. It comes from a soldier son to his father, and is as follows:

VISERNY, FRANCE, January 15, 1919.

DEAR PA: I am sending this letter through the base censor, so that I may write more freely. I certainly feel that you people at home have a right to know the truth about what we are being forced to go through. What one reads in the papers is just the best of what is happening to troops in a big city. So much is written that, so far as we know, has no basis of fact that it would lead a person in the States to think that we were on a touring trip with the latest of every modern convenience at our command. This is good camouflage, but will be rudely destroyed when the troops get home.

The men located as we are, in a little village back up in the hills, are up against it. Probably 300 or 400 people inhabit the village. They are farmers by vocation. The only amusement they can offer the soldier is an abundant supply of red wine and rot-gut cognac. For those who can not stand the strain these two drinks have proven treacherous pitfalls. Many of the fellows, out of pure despondency, have taken to drink as a means of escape. When one has money he may occasionally get a supper cooked by some family. How can we do it with October, November, and December pay due us?

During the day we are drilled in elementary tactics, such as hand salute, squads right and left, facings, standing gun drill, etc. Most of the men have been in the service for upward of 12 months and do not need this. They even went so far as to try to give us tent pitching. Imagine that after we had traveled night after night across country with no tent poles and pins and had pitched our tents in the dark. Then we had struck camp in the dark, rolled packs, and all without the use of any light. To give us instruction in such things is pure nonsense. But what is worse, every day now men are detailed to crack stone for shed floors and to do "white wing" work in the town. One day a successful practicing lawyer from New York was on a detail cleaning up the streets while some of the Frenchmen stood and laughed at him.

Our billets are fairly comfortable, inasmuch as the weather here is mild. Being barns, however, it is practically impossible to keep the floors immaculate, as the authorities seem to demand. It was announced that if one "butt" was found on the floor at any time that thereafter no smoking would be allowed in the billet. It is becoming well-nigh intolerable living under such unreasonableness. If we hadn't seen a paper we would never have known the armistice was signed. Not a single thing are we told. We are just treated like so many serfs and ordered to do things without reason. What we would like to know is: Why are we kept over here?

Why are the authorities not picturing things as they are? Were we brought over here to fight Germany or clean these backwoods towns of France? How long does the law allow the National Army to be kept in France? Why do the people at home not find out some of the real facts?

We realize that all the troops can not be returned at the same time, for most of us have a reasonable amount of intelligence and are open to reason. But we do demand that our treatment be that that any self-respecting American should be accorded.

I wish that this might be brought to the attention of somebody who could use the material in presenting our side to the public. Of course you realize that an out-and-out publication with my signature might involve me in some difficulty, such as the regulations to suppress the truth from being known.

But we want to come home if our duty is done. If it is not, then we want to know about it and we will listen to reason.

Every single word of this is fact, and I do wish in some way something might be done. Every day is simply wasted and is costing the Government a large sum of money. It doesn't seem a very wise way to inspire patriotism toward the purchase of liberty bonds.

We are getting good food and plenty of it.

To-day classes in many subjects have been started, and this will, in some measure, help to lessen the tension; but we want to get back to civilian life, not to have beneficent charity forced upon us.

Outside of the depression caused by these conditions, I am well.

Please bear in mind that it would be unwise to publish the letter with my signature, but do try and use it in some way in behalf of us fellows so that we may get back.

Added a few days later:

I have purposely waited before sending this to see if possibly I had been in a supercritical mood when I wrote it. To-day I find myself in much the same condition mentally that I have been since coming into the town; but I have more facts at my command, with which I will not tire you. Our pay has not come, and yesterday, when one of the most-touted leaves was announced, scarcely anyone had any money at all. There is absolutely no excuse for this, for we have been out of the lines two months.

Senator or Representative GALLIVAN, of Massachusetts, certainly put it up to them in the Congress about keeping you all in the dark. Possibly a copy of this, minus the name, from a Massachusetts voter might help hasten the time when your two boys will be released from their idle occupation and be able to reenter a profitable civilian occupation.

Am trying to get a leave of absence to visit ———. Perhaps I will get it and perhaps I won't. I certainly want it.

Now that I have gotten some of this off my chest I will promise to write a cheerful letter next time.

Do try and do something for us.

With love,

I do not want to take up much more of the time of the House, but I have two short extracts from letters which I have which I desire to read.

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

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I have two extracts here, one touching on what my colleague from Massachusetts has said, and this comes from a major of Engineers, who signs his name, who is at Tours. He says:

I also want to say to you that they are making our army here a regular mob; not soldiers. It is getting so that men have little respect for the officers, and if you knew all you would understand better why. It is getting so that officers are no better than enlisted men, as far as discipline goes, and the men know it. The papers seem afraid to publish the facts, if they have them.

In conclusion, I ask your attention to this short expression of opinion from a lieutenant colonel, who writes me from France:

No one in the American Expeditionary Forces over here would have had the attitude of Congress other than it has been during the active conduct of this war, but certainly every grant of an extraordinary power carries with it a strict accountability for the use of that power, and the National Guard and the Reserve Officers over here are glad to see that Congress at last is beginning to ask an accounting from the men who have been given extraordinary power.

Mr. Chairman, I simply rose to assure my esteemed friend from Nebraska that when we say something about conditions at Blois that it is not something that we have just dreamed of, but that it is an actuality, and that men have been wounded in pride and feelings and reputation at Blois almost as badly as on the fighting line at Chateau-Thierry. [Applause.]

Congress will get more of the truth when our valiant boys get home. Suffice it for the present to say that I have given information to the House as it comes to me from the men who ought to know. I believe their statements. [Applause.]

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It took the American people a long time to understand that we were at war. It seemed to take a long time for Congress to understand that we were at war. A man who rises now to make criticism of the War Department often brings down upon himself the condemnation of some Members of the House. It was not right to arouse the people of our Nation by calling attention to any mistakes that might have been made while the war was in progress; but it is now 90 days since the armistice was signed. Of course, legally speaking the war is not ended. But just criticism or criticism that is made for the purpose of righting wrong ought to be made, and a Member of this House who knows the conditions and refuses to call attention to them does not perform the duty that he owes to his people or to the people of the United States. The rôle of a critic is not a pleasant one, and a man who criticizes without offering some remedy does himself an injustice as well as the Members of the House.

I want to say a word in behalf of some of my people, because they can not speak for themselves, and it is in reference to the delivery of the mails to the soldiers in France, and I know that some Members here will say that they are getting very tired of hearing of that subject, and of hearing the matter referred to in this House. We are getting tired of that matter, but the thing that I am tired of is the fact that the mails are not delivered, and I am mightily tired of that. [Applause.]

In making this statement I appreciate the conditions under which the mails have to be handled. No sensible man who thinks but knows that it is a gigantic task, one that must take patience and time, and if I thought that my remarks here to-day would make my people more restless and dissatisfied and add

to their distress I would desist from speaking. The War Department has stated that the mails were being delivered, and I think that the restlessness that is abroad among the people comes from the fact that the people know from returned letters properly addressed that their mail was not delivered to the soldiers. The War Department should take the people into its confidence and tell just what the facts are, giving the difficulty, because I know the American people have common sense, and that whenever any reasonable excuse is given them they will be patient, as they have been patient throughout this entire war. They are beginning to be impatient, however, because for 90 days the conditions, while improved, have not yet been corrected. Every man on this floor has received mail which has been properly addressed and which has been returned. That condition ought to be corrected, because I say to you that when you forget the breaking hearts of the fathers and mothers of these boys who won this war you forget the very foundation of patriotic sacrifice for our Government. Do not say these things do no good, for I have observed that criticism in this House calling the attention of the department to wrongs that are going on has attracted the attention of the War Department and efforts made to correct same.

I wish to refer to the proposition of working our American soldiers at \$30 a month alongside of men who get \$6 and \$8 a day. Out there at Indianapolis, Ind., a private concern rented an old factory to the Government in which to store automobile trucks. When the men and officers arrived with the trucks to store them they found civilians clearing out the rubbish, and what happened? The civilian employees, whose business it was to clean out the rubbish for the private owner, were discharged and the American soldiers put in there to clean out the rubbish of that factory. That is not right; it is not fair. It is not fair to the boys, and I want to say here that there are other similar cases throughout the United States. This is not a criticism of the general policy of the Government, but it is simply calling attention to these facts in order that such things may not continue.

It is true we must not forget the wonderful achievements of our boys across the sea and the wonderful achievements of the War Department in this emergency, but because of that fact we should not shut our eyes or close our ears to those things that we ought to remedy. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the House, there is another subject that I wish to discuss, and that is the demobilization of our Army. When the news came that the armistice had been signed the wives, fathers, and mothers of the men in France and in the Army in the United States immediately became interested in the return of the soldiers to their homes. To those not familiar with military methods it seemed just that the boys in France who had been engaged in the hard fighting should be the first to be returned home to America, and that those soldiers who were called under the first orders of the draft, according to their numerical numbers and who never had an opportunity to be classified under the selective-draft law, would be discharged early, especially those of them who were married and had dependent families and who, if they had had the advantage of classification, would not have been taken. I realize that it is a huge task to orderly demobilize an army, but I am convinced in my own mind that the officers having charge of the demobilization of the men should be compelled to give heed and act upon individual cases where the conditions demand the immediate return of the soldier.

Some say we are too impatient in this matter of demobilization; but, sirs, one can hardly be patient when he sees the daily exhibition of a purpose on the part of some officers not to give any attention to, but thrown in the waste basket, as it were, the applications of meritorious cases, and using the threat of court-martial to prevent the soldiers from requesting any assistance in the way of getting a discharge. Every officer that makes an order threatening court-martial proceedings against any soldier who desires to communicate with the Members of Congress or with his family ought to be cashiered and discharged from the service. Such procedure is un-American and should not be tolerated by this Congress. Every man who has a family that can possibly be spared should be immediately discharged. Every man who has employment on the farm, in the workshop, in the stores, and industries of the country waiting for him and can be spared should be promptly discharged. Some armed men, it is true, will have to be maintained for a while in Europe, but I imagine that it will not be necessary to maintain an extensive force there for many months. For military reasons many of the boys who did the fighting are with the occupation army in Germany guarding the Rhine, while there are many other soldiers who did not have the opportunity to reach the battle front are being first returned home. There

is evidently some sufficient military reason for this, but the people do not understand why this is done, and it causes unfavorable comment and criticism, and the point I am insisting upon is that the War Department in so far as it can to take the public into its confidence and explain the reasons for actions on its part that run contrary to the public idea of common sense, equity, and justice. Every mail brings complaint from the families of wounded boys in regard to the failure of the War Department to furnish them with any information as to the condition at the present time of the soldier. It is not sufficient to answer that there is no casualty or that the soldier was wounded in September or October with no further information as to his condition, and I insist that the War Department obtain the hospital reports and furnish this information or explain why the same can not be furnished promptly.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, America helped win this war with the brave, heroic men who left their homes in this delightful and pleasant country and went overseas to fight and die on foreign soil; patriotic men and women at home toiled, saved, and sacrificed to sustain them in their hours of trial. Men in all walks of life who remained behind poured their money into the Treasury of the Government through the purchase of liberty bonds and war-savings stamps. They curtailed their business and conformed to all the orders in the regulations of the Government. The women of the cities, villages, and countryside vied with each other in the Red Cross work and other similar missions. Their contribution to the carrying on of the war can not be measured. Now, sirs, when our people have done all these things and are at this moment supporting fervently the Government of this country, I say that they have a right to have their heartaches receive due consideration at the hands of officers whose salaries they pay. In conclusion let me say, my prayer is that out of the peace conference may come a lasting peace and some system that will make impossible any great world war in the future.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the speech of my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], in which he objected to the temporary Army provided for in this bill of over 300,000 men, and unless the Committee on Military Affairs can show the need of such temporary Army I trust the House will not authorize it. By way of suggestion, may I call attention to the fact that the Committee on Naval Affairs, in providing a temporary naval force for the fiscal year 1920, required that they be shown what absolutely necessary service demanded this temporary force, and unless an essential service had been shown no temporary force would have been allowed. The bill as drawn and passed stipulated not only what service the temporary force should render but expressly provided that such temporary force should automatically be discharged when the need for their services ceased. In other words, a temporary naval force of 82,000 men for the purpose of manning cargo and transport ships for the oversea Army was expressly provided, and the bill further provides that when such transport and cargo service ceases, either in whole or in part, automatically the temporary force must be released. The same is true of the temporary increase provided for the Marine Corps. We gave them a temporary force equal to the number of men serving with the Army in France, and provided that when those men return from France automatically this temporary force shall be discharged. And it occurs to me that in providing a temporary force for the Army the duties of that temporary Army should be clearly shown and written into the bill. This House is entirely willing to provide adequate military force for the essential needs of the country, but unless the necessity can be clearly shown and unless provision is further made for the diminution of this temporary force as the needs disappear this House should not authorize the temporary force herein asked for.

Now, in connection with the duties the Navy is performing in bringing back our soldiers and in carrying supplies to them, the question was asked by Mr. GARNER, of Texas, how many naval vessels are employed for these purposes were being manned and operated by our Navy? A letter just received from Admiral Blue, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, gives this information. The Navy at considerable expense, and with some question from an economic standpoint as to the wisdom of its course, after the armistice was signed, proceeded to prepare 16 battleships and 10 cruisers to bring back our troops, and these naval vessels are now engaged in that service. They have a monthly carrying capacity of about 27,000, and the number to date returned on these battleships and cruisers, including those to be landed in a few days, exceeds 35,000 men. In addition to these they are manning with naval crews 72 transport ships for the Army and 267 cargo ships. Personnel units are now organized for 22 addi-

tional American transports, soon to be fitted out by the Army, and 20 additional large German transports, all of which it is hoped will be added to the service within a few weeks. Careful surveys are being made of other vessels, and if found suited for transport service the Navy is prepared to supply the personnel to operate the same. For this important work we have provided a naval temporary force. The vessels now in service and soon to be added, operated by the Navy for the return of our soldiers, have a carrying capacity per month of more than 250,000 men, and it is thought that additional cargo ships can be converted into transports so as to increase the monthly carrying capacity to 300,000. You will recall that with the limited number of transport ships flying the American flag during the war, our Navy carried to France more than 46 per cent of our Army of 2,000,000 men and furnished 82 per cent of the destroyer and cruiser escort for the ships carrying the entire force. Not a ship convoyed by the American Navy was lost, a most remarkable record, and one never equaled by any navy in the world.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will.

Mr. MASON. I am very much obliged and very glad to hear the report. I want to ask whether the gentleman knows of any rule in the War Department that prohibits or prevents the bringing of the boys home on first-class passenger ships? I ask the question because my colleague from Massachusetts, who came over on a first-class passenger ship, stated that there was room for a thousand more soldiers on that ship, which room was not occupied, and I wondered whether there was any departmental rule that they had to be brought back on battleships or some other sort of ships?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I regret to say I know nothing of the rules of the War Department. I am only giving information obtained from the Navy Department as to what is being accomplished with the ships manned by the Navy.

Mr. MASON. I am very thankful to hear it.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I recall the gentleman making a similar statement on yesterday, and I asked for information as to the ships manned by the Navy in bringing back troops—whether their full carrying capacity was being employed—and the answer was that in January, owing to the large number of wounded brought back, that the full carrying capacity of the ships was not utilized, for the reason that more room was required for the wounded.

It will doubtless interest the gentleman to know that it is now estimated that the seriously wounded will all be returned at an early day, and I am sure that then the carrying capacity of every ship can be used to the fullest.

Mr. MASON. I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have not criticized any department of this Government on the floor of this House, and I shall not do so now. First, I shall make a few observations in reference to the speech the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] made a few minutes ago, which tended, it seemed to me, to prove the National Guard and the National Army are inferior to the Regular Army. All comparisons are odious, and I regret to see them made on the floor. I fear the statement of my good friend from Mississippi when it shall be read in the RECORD will not convey the real intention of the gentleman. I fear that those whose sons served in the National Guard units or the National Army might feel that their services were disparaged here upon the floor of this House, and be hurt thereby. I am going to acquit the gentleman from Mississippi from any intention of doing it, but nevertheless that is the way it now reads.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Does the gentleman question the accuracy of the statements I put in the RECORD?

Mr. CARAWAY. I never saw them. I do not question them. I do not have any opinion about them one way or another. It is so common to attribute to men who have special training superior qualities. There is a kind of fetish in the minds of some people that military science is a peculiar science, and that men who have not had the professional training of the schools can not acquire this knowledge. The history of this country shows that is a mistake. We have to go no further back than the War between the States to learn this. Many officers who came to the front toward the conclusion of that war were men who had not the military training of the schools. In the beginning of that struggle most officers of high rank were professional soldiers. To the end some of those most renowned for military prowess were men who had come to the Army fresh from civil life. Forrest, Gordon, and many others who followed the Stars

and Bars are but examples. I mention this to say that comparisons of one branch of the service with another is wholly unfair. I am sorry that it has been indulged in on this floor. There is honor enough for all.

With reference to the bill itself, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has just come over and menaced us with his uplifted finger if we dare to touch one single provision in this bill. If we did so, the country, and he particularly, would hold us responsible for it; that the bill was a perfect product. It had come from the Committee on Military Affairs and therefore was sacred.

I have as much respect for the Military Committee as for any other 21 men on this floor, but no more. There is nothing in their history so far that shows they are supermen. The gentleman defied us to lay our hands on it. If we should we would pull down the temple or the ark of safety. [Laughter.] That sort of an argument does not impress us.

Mr. GORDON. Especially after the war is over.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, if you would believe what you heard here to-day from some gentlemen we are but getting ready for a real war. We have had a little difference of opinion, in which millions of men have gone down to their death, but a real war is now looming over the horizon, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] are the first to see its coming. All others are lacking vision if they do not see this spectre as they see it.

What I want to say about this bill is this: These 500,000 men here sought to be provided for you say you intend to raise by voluntary enlistment, and I take it for granted that the committee in good faith intends that. I do not want to criticize them. I think the language is susceptible of two constructions, but the committee has expressed itself as willing to make it susceptible of but one—voluntary enlistment. If this army is to take the place of the army that we put in the field under the selective-draft act, and that army be brought home, I am willing to vote for this measure if we need that many men to make certain the fruits of our victory and the safety of our institutions. But if it is to be an army raised merely to commit us to a peace army of that size, I shall hesitate. If it is to be supplemental to the army we now have in the field I do not know why the threat of the gentleman from Connecticut ought to deter honest men from voting their honest differences of opinion.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CARAWAY. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman has expressed better than I could express just exactly the purpose of this bill.

Mr. CARAWAY. What is it?

Mr. TILSON. We intend to raise 500,000 men to take the place as rapidly as possible of the men who are already in the service.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the gentleman a question? Is it the intention to send this newly raised army to Europe?

Mr. TILSON. To take the place of certain men over there.

Mr. CARAWAY. Are they going to Europe?

Mr. TILSON. If it is necessary.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is that the intention? Was that what the department told the committee?

Mr. TILSON. The department does not give directions to the committee.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is the first time I ever heard it; but let it go at that.

Mr. TILSON. That is as I understood it.

Mr. CARAWAY. What does the gentleman from Connecticut understand? Is it to take the place of the Army now in Europe?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. This Army is to go to Europe?

Mr. TILSON. As much of it as may be necessary. It is my hope that we will not need that many there. It is my belief that we will need comparatively few; but all that are necessary will go over there.

Mr. CARAWAY. And bring the others home?

Mr. TILSON. All that wish to come.

Mr. CARAWAY. The gentleman from California, who knows practically everything, shakes his head. [Laughter.] I yield to the gentleman from California to set us all right. [Laughter.]

Mr. KAHN. The soldiers in Europe will have to come home when their units are ordered home. The soldier has no volition in the matter.

Mr. CARAWAY. I knew that. He could not resist.

Mr. KAHN. But what is intended is this: It is intended to bring home all the boys who are in Europe as speedily as possible. But it is recognized that we will have to have some soldiers over there, at least until the end of the next fiscal year. Now, instead of keeping the drafted men in Europe, it is very desirable to give all our men an opportunity to return with their

respective organizations. We ought not to keep them over there longer than is necessary. It is proposed by this legislation to send over the men raised under this law by volunteering, or to maintain over there by volunteering as large a force as may be necessary, up to the number of 500,000 men.

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

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes additional, to go to the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Now, I want to reply fully. As to the disposition of this Army and as to whether it is to be sent over there or not, that rests entirely with the Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States. He will have the right to dispose of the men as the needs of the country require.

Mr. CARAWAY. Now, will everybody who understood that stand up? [Laughter.]

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. I would like to ask the gentleman from California this question: Is it his opinion that we will need some of these men over in Europe until July, 1920?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Whose opinion is that?

Mr. KAHN. The officers of the War Department of this Government, who have been running this war.

Mr. KEARNS. What are they going to do over there until July, 1920?

Mr. KAHN. Well, that is a question that the Committee on Military Affairs has nothing to do with. That is a question of policy to be decided by the President of the United States and the military department.

Mr. KEARNS. Well, it is a question with Congress whether it wants to provide the funds or not.

Mr. KAHN. That, of course, rests with Congress.

Mr. CARAWAY. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have any rights on the floor I shall exercise them. [Laughter.] The two leading authorities in the world on militarism, the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from California, do not agree. [Laughter.] Now, what a layman shall do in that event I am at a loss to know. [Laughter.] But I will say this, that the statement of the gentleman from California—and I say it with all due deference to the gentleman—conveyed no information at all. It simply said that if it is decided to send them to Europe they will send them to Europe, and if it is decided to send them somewhere else they will be sent there.

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

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. WISE. In my judgment this is the process: It is the opinion of the War Department that they will need that many men. The Director of Finance submits all these estimates. He wrote to the different departments and asked the question: "Based upon this—that we would have 500,000 men in the United States and insular possessions—what are the requirements of your department?" The head of that department would reply: "Based on your assumption as to 500,000 men in the insular possessions and the United States, we need so much money."

Mr. CARAWAY. And they are not to go to Europe at all?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairmau, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. DENT. There seems to be some confusion as to the basis upon which we have proceeded to write this bill.

So far as I am concerned, and according to my information, as I tried to make it clear yesterday, it was this: There has been no recommendation whatever on the part of the War Department as to any army of occupation in Europe, but it was the opinion of the War Department that we were to have an average sized Army during the period of demobilization of 500,000 men, and we were asked to appropriate accordingly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me ask the gentleman from Alabama a question: Is it the gentleman's understanding that we are to raise this Army to take the place of the Army in Europe, or is it to be a supplementary Army to that which we now have?

Mr. DENT. The idea, as I think the language clearly shows, is simply this: To organize by voluntary enlistment an Army under the national-defense act of June 3, 1916, and to provide a temporary force by voluntary enlistment for one year such as may be necessary to take care of an average Army of 500,000 men.

Mr. CARAWAY. For what purpose are we to have an Army of 500,000 men?

Mr. DENT. The purpose was to put the men in during the period of demobilization. It would take that long to demobilize.

Mr. CARAWAY. The others are to be demobilized?

Mr. DENT. You can not get rid of an army in a short time.

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

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether it would be possible, if the authorities of the War Department should so decide, to still retain all the men in Europe that we have there and in addition to that have an Army of 500,000 men over here? Would we still have that Army over here?

Mr. DENT. I do not think so. I propose to offer an amendment, when we get to that section of the bill, providing that all the provisions of the act of May 18, 1917, for raising an Army by draft or conscription are hereby repealed, and that it is the sense of Congress that the Army organized under that act shall be demobilized as soon as possible.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is one amendment that I shall vote for. I shall, of course, have due regard for our necessities. We want to keep whatever force may be necessary to carry out and make sure the ideals for which we entered this war, but let us, as soon as consistent with that, return these boys to their homes.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I do not like the idea that the War Department may keep everybody over there in Europe.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yesterday I saw in the paper a statement purporting to come from the War Department saying that practically no further discharges would be made from the forces now in the United States; that the men now in the cantonments would be kept in service and those discharged who are in Europe.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman knows that that has been denied this morning by a high official of the War Department, and the statement has been made that there was no foundation for that. It has been so stated on this floor to-day.

Mr. CARAWAY. Does the gentleman know who first made that statement, which made it necessary for somebody to deny it?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know who first made it, but Gen. McIntyre has denied it.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am glad to know that, although I want the soldiers brought home from Europe.

I have indulged in no criticism of the War Department. I am not criticizing gentlemen who have stood here on the floor and criticized the War Department, but that course has never appealed to me. I have always felt if I had any criticisms to offer I should offer them to the man whose conduct I am criticizing. I have never taken advantage of a forum where I could be heard and the other party could not, and I shall not do it now. I want to say, however, that I sincerely hope that this Army that we sent abroad and this Army that we gathered to go abroad, if their services should be required, may be discharged as quickly as it is possible. I have not much patience with the theory that it takes longer to get a man out of the military service than it does to enlist and train him. Yet we are confronted with the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] that it will be July, 1920, before we can get the armies home from Europe.

In conclusion I shall say but this: I have never taken this floor to criticize or to eulogize men, but everybody agrees with me that it is the hope of the world that the men who are now gathered at Versailles to write a treaty of peace will make wars impossible in the future. [Applause.] I have no patience with the man who says, "We have had wars in the past; we will therefore always have wars." That is the doctrine of hopelessness, that the world can never be better than it is.

There are some of you gentlemen here who can remember when it was considered that certain offenses against the person or honor of individuals were of so grave a character that the individual could not keep his self-respect if he let a judicial tribunal right his wrongs. He had to kill his opponent, and he was denounced as a coward if he did not do it. A Vice President of these United States left the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol and went to New York and killed his opponent in a duel because, as he said, his adversary had assailed his honor. Members have left this floor and gone over to a little village yonder in Maryland, whose very name would be forgotten if it were not for the fact that men went there and killed each other to vindicate their

honor. My particular section of the country was wedded to that practice up to the time of the Civil War, and until we wrote into the constitution of pretty nearly every Southern State a positive provision that no man who accepted a challenge or sent a challenge should be eligible to hold any office of honor or trust. That seems to have been the only means that could deter them. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERWOOD. If the gentleman will go out to Bladensburg, to the old dueling ground, he will learn that 27 duels were fought there, 6 of them with fatal results.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; men thought they had to avenge their private wrongs. Now we have laid that doctrine aside, and we go to court with our differences or we do not say anything at all about them. I am satisfied nobody regrets that those old days are gone and that that custom no longer prevails.

The eyes of the Christian world—aye, of the whole civilized world—are centered upon one man. He carries in his keeping the destiny of civilization; and if God prospers his mission, all these armaments for which we are here providing in these the closing days of this great war will be permitted to rust in the arsenals. That man is Woodrow Wilson. [Applause.]

If he writes into the treaties of peace that are to conclude this gigantic war the promise that men may breathe once more without terror, that they may possess their own souls, and that never again shall nations of the earth be cursed with war, I do not care what may be said against him, that he has been inconsistent, that he has changed his opinion—God knows every man who has good sense changes his opinions—the whole world is going to say that he has been the greatest benefactor to mankind since Jesus Christ died 2,000 years ago. [Applause.] In the light of that sentiment I hope that gentlemen will find some way to reconcile this present gigantic military scheme with the desire of the world, with the hope of the world, that we shall not need it. I am willing to give this country all the force that is necessary to defend it, but I do not want to burden civilization with armaments at the very moment when we are praying that armies shall be called into the field no more. [Applause.]

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

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TILSON. Is not the gentleman willing to trust that man to use such force as he thinks he may need out of these 500,000 men during the next fiscal year?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; perfectly willing.

Mr. TILSON. He has control of them as Commander in Chief of the Army.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; but so far as I know he has not requested an army.

Mr. TILSON. His representatives have.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not particularly like this way of having all my information come secondhand. The strange thing about it, the thing that gives me pause, is that those who want a program that seems inconsistent with the very ideals that the President is trying to establish, for the first time I discover gentlemen on that side of the House wanting to align themselves with the President.

Mr. TILSON. The information about the Navy was firsthand information, was it not?

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, I voted for that program. We have, however, no intimation from the President, or from those who have a right to speak for him, that he wants this program. If he does, and it is necessary to carry out his purposes in going to Europe, I shall support it. Unless that is true you but excite suspicion by failing to disclose your reasons. If you have knowledge, divulge it. I have an open mind. I do pray, however, that no mother shall ever again be required to mourn her dead if their death can justly be prevented. My hopes and faith are with our President beyond the seas. God prosper his mission.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] referred to me in his remarks in connection with the efficiency boards in Europe. The statement I made on the floor, as Members will recollect, was that I did not believe there was a "canning factory," the imputation being that there was some sort of a board whose purpose it was to deal unfairly with the demotion of men in the United States Army. I think it is fair to the country and to Congress to know that under the law that Congress passed there is provided an Army Efficiency Board to pass on the efficiency of men to command men who are sent into battle.

No doubt a board has been acting there in France. It was a necessity, as everyone knows. We took 200,000 men into the Army as officers at the beginning of the war. It was impossible that all of these men would be found suited for the places they

were appointed to, and in the good judgment of Congress and the War Department boards were commissioned to sit and decide upon the fitness of these men for these places. They have been ordered for trial before this board by their commanding officers, and they had to come before them and stand trial. I do not doubt that some mistakes have been made in the decisions of these boards. I know that I, as executive officer for a short time, had the appointment of men who were commissioned in the National Guard. I know that I appointed men in time of peace, because they had been chosen by their different commands, that I would not have wanted to see lead their men in battle in such a great war as we have just gone through. These boards have passed upon the men who have been in command, and that is what they were established for.

But what I object to is the imputation that there has been unfairness, or some sort of chicanery, in their actions. But of that there has been no proof brought before Congress. If I had been an officer in the Army and had been tried before one of these boards and they decided that I was not fit to lead men into battle, and I think in view of my military experience that would be a correct decision, I believe I could sit down and write as good a letter that injustice had been done me as has been read here. And so the thing that I protest against is the constant attempts being made by reading the complaints of men who have been passed upon by a competent military authority that they have been unfairly used and not justly treated without submitting any disinterested proof of unjust action.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. The gentleman does not mean to leave the imputation that I have read a single letter from any man who has been ill-treated? My letters were from men still in the service, who have written about men who had been ill-treated, some of whom can not now speak for themselves, because they are buried in France.

May I say this to the gentleman, that since I made my first speech on this floor with reference to the conditions at Blois, I believe that the commander in chief of the Expeditionary Forces did not know of all the conditions, and that since that speech a brigadier general and three colonels to whom I referred on the 14th of January in this Hall have been restored to their command last week by order of Gen. Pershing?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Which shows that we have the right man at the head of the United States Army. I want to say in reply to the gentleman, if I am permitted, that it was not the man who suffered the judgment that wrote the letter. Well, if I had a friend that I thought had been unfairly used, I could write as good a letter in regard to him as has been read here. So after all the thing comes down to this, that this board has had a disagreeable but a necessary duty to perform, and I think the performance of our Army shows that we had men ready to perform their duty in France.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all debate on the paragraph has been exhausted. If the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] will not exercise his right, I will exercise it. We have been now three hours making no progress on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DENT. I hope the committee will let us read awhile.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. I hope the gentleman will let some Members be heard a little while longer.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection, but let us read the bill a little while; let us make a little progress.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENCIES OF THE ARMY.

For all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for and embracing all branches of the military service, including the Office of the Chief of Staff; for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, including the employment of translators and exclusive of all other personal services in the War Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, District of Columbia, or in the Army at large, but impossible to be anticipated or classified; to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of War, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, including the payment of a per diem allowance not to exceed \$4, in lieu of subsistence, to employees of the War Department traveling on official business outside of the District of Columbia and away from their designated posts, \$100,000.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, to make plain what I think was the view of the committee touching this bill. Under the Stone amendment of an appropriation bill, every man now in the Army will be discharged on the declaration of peace. Within four months they have to be returned to this country; but on the declaration of peace, as I understand it, every man that is now in the Army is discharged.

Mr. DENT. Except those who—

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I am coming to that—with the single exception of a few men who enlisted prior to the war whose terms of enlistment have not yet expired. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that there remain now but very few men of that character, so if we do not pass some legislation providing for an Army in this appropriation bill, immediately upon the declaration of peace we will find ourselves without an Army.

Therefore it is entirely impossible to view the fears of the gentleman from Arkansas that we intend to keep anybody in Europe contrary to their wishes, because their terms of enlistment expire with the declaration of peace. Another thing: The national-defense act, upon the declaration of peace, immediately comes back into full operation, except so far as the pending bill provides otherwise. The Overman Act, by its own limitation, ceases to operate with the emergency. It is true there is some reference to the emergency act of May 18, 1917, but that provision has reference more to the appointment of temporary officers than it has to the provision for enlisted men, because all enlistments must be voluntary. Those who want to go into the Regular Army, which will be limited by the national-defense act to 175,000 men, will enlist for three years, and those who are to be enlisted under the emergency act of May 18, 1917, will be enlisted under the one-year provision. It would be a very dangerous matter if before peace has been declared, before peace has actually been established, we were to leave this country without an adequate Army to deal with any possible contingency that might arise.

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

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Is there anything now to prevent voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army up to 175,000 men?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes. Under the provisions of the act of May 18, 1917, all enlistments from that time on became for the war only, so that no one can enlist at the present time for anything except for the emergency. The very purpose of this act is to give the right to receive under voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army for three years such as desire to enlist therein to the numbers defined in the national-defense act and to provide a temporary additional Army by the one-year enlistments.

Mr. HARDY. Has the gentleman thought of this solution—to reinstate the act of 1916?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The law reinstates itself. It never has been repealed, but we have to provide for voluntary enlistments both in the regular and temporary Army, and that is what we are trying to do in this bill. Under the old law it was three years, and under this provision we are simply providing for a temporary force for one year after the Regular Army has been enlisted. Therefore we change the national-defense act so as to allow this temporary and this additional force by an enlistment for one year only.

Mr. HARDY. It seems to me that it would clear the atmosphere a good deal if the committee would authorize reinstatement of the law of 1916.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Why reinstate that which is in full force and vigor? It has only been suspended by laws which expire upon the declaration of peace.

Mr. HARDY. And then a further provision authorizing the call for volunteers for the occupation of Europe as long as it is needed.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. We do not care for any occupation of Europe.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is a bill on the calendar providing for that very thing that should have been called up long ago.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. This does it. This is the very purpose of this provision, instead of having an independent act, which would take some time to get through the Congress. We have placed it here as a rider on this bill for that purpose, providing for the reinstatement of voluntary enlistment for a three-year term for the Regular Army and one year for a temporary Army.

Mr. SHERWOOD. The gentleman states that if this law is not passed we would have no Army. Would we not have the Regular Army?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. No; except for a very skeleton force, because of the expiration of the enlistment of the soldiers.

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

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, do I understand under the War Department regulations, or the law itself, that notwithstanding a man may have been in the Regular Army before the National Army was raised, if he had been transferred to the National Army, when he gets his discharge from that Army he is out of the Army entirely?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And must reenlist in the Army in order to get back into it.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. The gentleman will understand that all enlistments prior to 1917 expired within three years, and a number of them had very nearly run out when the war was declared. There are very few of these soldiers now in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. And many of them have been transferred to the National Army.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. And the testimony before the committee was that there would not be a handful of an Army if we did not have this provision here for reenlistment. Another thing about this bill is that it only appropriates for 500,000 men. Gentlemen have asked on the floor whether this is to be in addition to the men over in Europe or if its to be supplementary to them. We appropriate for only 500,000 men altogether. We could not provide for an army over in Europe and an army here, supplementary to each other, because the entire appropriation is only for 500,000 men. The men now in the Army in Europe are virtually all released by the very terms of their enlistment upon the declaration of peace.

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

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman stated awhile ago, in response to an inquiry, that under the act of May 18, 1917, voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army were stopped.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. What is the gentleman's opinion of this provision of the act—

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I do not know whether it is in that act or in an independent act.

Mr. WINGO. I think this is the one—section 7 of the act of May 18, 1917—and upon this language I desire to get the gentleman's opinion:

All enlistments, including those in the Regular Army Reserves, which are in force on the date of the approval of this act and which would terminate during the emergency, shall continue in force during the emergency unless sooner discharged, but nothing herein contained shall be construed to shorten the period of any existing enlistments.

Does that mean that they can hold the men who, say, enlisted a few days before this act was passed?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes; I think they can.

Mr. WINGO. For the full period?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Before April 1, but the testimony before the committee was that there were very few men now who could be held under the original enlistment, which was before April 1, 1916. I am not prepared to say the provision to which the gentleman refers is the act I have in mind, but the existing law is that all enlistments after April, 1916, are only for the war.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman gives it as his opinion that in order to enlist men in the regular standing Army there has to be affirmative action by Congress?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Because in this act we stopped voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I do not know whether it is in that act.

Mr. WINGO. Some act?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from Virginia has made a very clear statement of this bill. I would like to make this suggestion: There is nothing in the law that stops enlistment, but there is something in the act that fixes the period.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That is it.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield a little further?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Beginning section 7, the act to which the gentleman refers reads as follows:

That the qualifications and conditions for voluntary enlistment as herein provided shall be the same as those prescribed by existing law for enlistments in the Regular Army, except that recruits shall be between the ages of 18 and 40 years, both inclusive, at the time of their enlistment, and such enlistment shall be for the period of the emergency, unless sooner discharged.

Is that the law to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. That is the provision to which I referred.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I will.

Mr. KAHN. My colleague will recall in this very proposed provision we also take care of that further condition permitting enlistment under the Regular Army act that a man who served four years in the reserves is wiped out by this proposed legislation.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes. I want to say another thing, gentlemen, and that is that under the operation of this law we go right back to the national defense act and the General Staff has only such powers as are conferred by this act and consistent with the national defense act, so there is no ground for complaint. This bill confers—

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

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I ask for two minutes more.

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

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. My own position was that we ought to get back to this national defense act for the standing Army in peace just as soon as practicable [applause], but I for myself am utterly opposed to stripping the War Department of the necessary permission that it thinks necessary to maintain during the period of uncertainty and of unrest. Now, the question comes up here, what are we going to do? For my part I advocated that we simply appropriate for 500,000 men, and then let the defense act operate, but after the hearing and statements before the committee I thought the wise thing to do was to do what the War Department asked us to do; that was to provide for a temporary force for a temporary period and a temporary enlistment for the period of one year. We must bear in mind that the National Guard, which the national defense act provided as a supplementary force, has been wiped out. [Applause.] We provide this temporary Army by a temporary appropriation, by a limited enlistment period, under language which defines its temporary character, and this will give us an opportunity to recruit the Regular Army to the strength authorized by the national defense act, and will give the States the opportunity to reorganize their National Guard, for which liberal appropriations have been made.

Congressmen will assume a very grave responsibility who deny to the War Department and the President the Army deemed necessary to bridge over this time. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, on January 28 I presented to the House an order issued in the name of the commanding general at Camp McArthur which in substance forbade officers and enlisted men to attend the same social affair. Again, on the 7th of this month I referred to the matter and read a letter from the Secretary of War, in which he stated that the order had been revoked. During the last discussion of the matter the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] interrupted me and said this:

I want to commend the gentleman for getting this order of Gen. Buck out of the way, and I want to ask him if he would not go further and get the other regulation out of the way that makes a distinction between the private soldier and the officer in allowing the officer to give social attention to our nurses in uniform and forbidding the private soldiers to do likewise.

That statement of the gentleman from Texas excited laughter in the House, laughter of incredulity, and indeed I myself was inclined to smile at it because I did not dream that it had been well made or was founded upon actual facts. But I have to-day received a letter which is a verification of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas.

I received this morning an anonymous letter—of course all public men receive them occasionally, usually they are abusive—but we know they are from cowards and we pay no attention to them. But this letter was written on the stationery of the Y. M. C. A. at Camp Gordon and was signed "A Committee of Soldiers," and though no names were signed to it I know they were not cowards, for I understand why they could not sign their names. I am going to read it to the House:

CAMP GORDON, GA., February 9, 1919.

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your speech of January 28, rapping at the system of caste in the Army, is certainly to the point and at the right time.

At present down here in Camp Gordon there is an order to the same effect, issued by the colonel commanding the base hospital, stating that nurses (female) are not to speak to enlisted men.

If only some more Members of Congress would only keep up the good work that you are doing to eliminate the caste system from the Army. It is no wonder there is Bolshevism in this world—it was just that same caste that caused a revolution in Russia. The only way to keep the soldiers from becoming socialists is to do away with that caste.

Your good work in Congress is certainly appreciated by the soldiers; a few more men with your good judgment would certainly help the soldiers.

Respectfully, yours,

A COMMITTEE OF SOLDIERS.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand how soldiers would not care to write even to a Member of Congress a letter to the slightest degree reflecting upon the officer class, particularly their own commanding officer, because we all know well what would happen to those soldiers had they signed their names and the matter become known to the commanding officer. It is a shame to the spirit of our Army and violative of true American ideals that brave men serving their country as soldiers should be forced to resort to anonymous letters in order to present their grievances. But we all know what the situation is. These soldiers did not dare to sign their names.

This letter verifies the statement made by the gentleman from Texas the other day, and I believe such an order has been posted at Camp Gordon. I am hoping that if it is not true the Army authorities will take occasion to deny that, as they did the statement of the order at Camp McArthur. This is a very trifling matter in itself; it amounts to little, as I said the other day, but it bespeaks the spirit of the Army. Now, we know that the private soldier is just as much a gentleman as the officer—a gentleman in the true sense of the word—as brave, kind, self-sacrificing, and true, for those are the qualities of the real gentleman. We all know that these nurses could well afford to associate with enlisted men, and we all know that the reason for this order is the contamination which it was feared that these women would suffer from such association—was “social” contamination, so that thereafter they would not be good enough for the officers to mix with socially. The purpose of the order was to build up a wall around them and say to the enlisted men, “This is our private preserve, you shall not trespass thereon.”

It is a part of patriotism not to indulge in time of war in general criticism of our Army, but even in time of war just and proper criticism, which will raise its standards and will give to it a higher morale, certainly would be justified. But let us remember that the war is over and this is in time of peace. There is nothing sacred about the Army. It is merely one of the institutions of our country. Of course, I know the militarists would like, even in times of peace, to have us bow our faces in the dust as the Army goes by, and to salute a man wearing straps on his shoulders with reverence and awe. That is the spirit. But that is no part for the patriot. It is rather a part for another individual whom I do not like to name in this House.

But now is a time of peace, and it seems to me we ought to correct these evils that we recognize as being in our Army. A strange thing about it is that those who seem to desire that the Army shall be regarded as sacrosanct, and that a man should reverently take off his hat when he goes into its presence, have little respect for some of our other institutions. That class has no respect for Congress. They have not even respected Congress while the war was on. They have not feared they would break down the morale of Congress, but more than ever have they taken advantage of the opportunity to point out the faults and the mistakes of Congress and its Members. Congress certainly is higher and should be more exempt from criticism than the Army. We are here as the representatives of the American people, chosen by their suffrage, and have some small dignity because of our representative capacity. But the Army has no such position. It is merely a collection of individuals brought together for a certain purpose, and in time of peace its duties are not nearly so important as the duties of many other people.

I would rather have respect for the great army of American workmen, going each day with the rising of the sun, with little tin buckets in their hands, to do a day's honest work, and to bring home some wages to feed their wives and children—I would rather look upon the labor of America as a great and worthy institution before which every patriotic citizen would take off his hat and bow in respect. I would rather regard any class of people, following any kind of peaceful occupation, producing something, doing something that is worth while, going to and fro in the world, engaged in commerce, in the practice of a profession, in doing something that is useful to mankind, or which adds to the beauty or welfare of the world—I would rather regard any of those occupations with respect than the soldier's occupation in time of peace.

Let us lay aside any thought that we may have that the Army is above criticism. It is not. Whether soldiers are generals or privates, they are men like you and me. Many of the officers are engaged in the business merely as a profession, which is a loafing job in time of peace, as it might be considered, not doing anything useful, except perhaps giving a little of their time to fitting themselves for a duty that may never come and can come only when our Nation is in danger.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All debate on the amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment on page 2, line 11, by striking out all of the words after the word “War.”

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 11, strike out, after the word “War,” the words “and for such purposes as he may deem proper.”

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes in which to discuss the amendment, notwithstanding the order of the committee.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to these words and to the fact that similar words appear in a number of other paragraphs, each paragraph providing a very large amount of money for certain specific purposes, but placing it all at the disposal of the Secretary of War to be used just as he may please.

I submit that is not the proper way to legislate. No paragraph should contain those words. If the committee preparing the bill—and if the committee does its duty, it prepares the bill and does not permit somebody else to prepare it and place the bill in its hands and insist it shall be passed as presented—the committee that prepares the bill will designate specifically the purposes for which the money is to be used and will not find it necessary to use those words which I consider very improper, words that authorize the Secretary to spend the money just as he pleases.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is now talking about the contingent fund?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am talking about this item and calling the attention of the committee to the fact that similar words are used in a number of other paragraphs in this bill.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman contend that that is unusual language which is used in that place?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I insist that it is improper language to be used in any place, and I insist that the committee should perform its duty and specify the purposes for which the money is to be used. It ought not to give the Secretary of War or any Cabinet officer or head of a bureau carte blanche to use large sums of money. During my service in Congress I have noticed that this practice of leaving the expenditure of money to the discretion of public officers has grown up and is growing alarmingly. There is a tendency on the part of committees and on the part of the House to shirk their duty. They are not willing to take the time and give proper attention to the preparation of the bills. They write “So and so shall be done in the discretion of the Secretary of War,” and “So and so shall be done and the money shall be expended in the discretion” of some officer named. That is a shirking of duty. It is not a proper way to legislate. And we are growing more and more into the habit of accepting bills as they come from some one in a bureau or a department, instead of being willing to give the time necessary and put forth the effort necessary to draw properly the bills ourselves.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman's amendment were adopted there would be no traveling allowance whatever in the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If that relates to traveling allowance, why did not the committee put it in as such, and not permit the Secretary of War to have \$100,000 for buying automobiles or motor boats or airships or something of that kind? The paragraph as it stands permits the use of money for any purpose in the discretion or according to the sweet will of the Secretary. In the next paragraph I notice, on the next page, there are the same words. There is \$200,000 appropriated for “such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper.” Those words run all through this bill, aggregating millions of dollars. All through this bill are provisions to the effect that the money shall be expended just as the Secretary of War may deem proper.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In a moment. If the money is intended to be expended for traveling expenses, the

committee should write it in the bill, so that we will know what the money is to be expended for, and take away the discretion of the Secretary of War. If it were always wisely used, that might not be necessary; but from my experience with departments and bureaus I know that frequently the laws are distorted and sometimes the money is misspent.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman has had much longer service in Congress than I have had, but I ask the gentleman if that provision has not been in the law ever since he has been in Congress?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It may have been in the Army bill, but not in bills that I have had to do with; but wherever found it is improper.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of the Army War College, being for the purchase of the necessary stationery; typewriters, and exchange of same; office, toilet, and desk furniture; textbooks; books of reference; scientific and professional papers and periodicals; printing and binding; maps; police utensils; employment of temporary, technical, or special services; and for all other absolutely necessary expenses, including \$25 per month additional to regular compensation to chief clerk of division for superintendence of the War College Building, \$9,000.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, during the colloquy this morning between the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and myself it was developed that the War Department estimates that it will not be able to demobilize the conscripted army now in France and in this country until about July 1, 1920. This bill provides for a volunteer army of 500,000 men during the fiscal year from June 30, 1919, to July 1, 1920. Therefore, if this bill passes without amendment we will have two armies, the present army and the new army.

Now, I believe that we should make some provision for demobilizing the conscripted army before the end of the fiscal year 1920, or that we should not provide for a volunteer army of 500,000 men. Clearly the conscripted army should be demobilized.

Therefore, as I announced this morning, I shall offer at the proper time an amendment, which I desire to call to the attention of the committee; and, having spoken to the chairman about it a little while ago, I will furnish him with a copy of the amendment after I have read it for the information of the House. The amendment is as follows: On page 58, line 23, after the word "prescribe," add the following:

Provided, That all men who enlisted in the Army for the period of the war and all men inducted into the Army under the so-called selective-service act and all officers commissioned for the period of the war shall be discharged not later than July 1, 1919: *Provided further*, That any such soldier shall be immediately discharged upon the filing of an application with his immediate commanding officer, whether he be at present in service overseas or within the United States; that said soldier shall be discharged upon the filing of said application and shall continue to receive the same pay and allowances thereafter to the date of and be furnished transportation from the point where he is released from the Army to the point of his enlistment or induction: *Provided further*, That all such men discharged under the foregoing provision shall be granted the opportunity to enlist in the Volunteer Army under the provisions of this section until the voluntary enlistments provided for herein shall be filled.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. In what place does the gentleman intend to offer that?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I thought on page 58, line 23, after the word "prescribe," would be the proper place.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman seriously contend that 60 days after the passage of this act we should demobilize and discharge from the service our entire Army, so that we would be without any Army whatsoever, regardless of our obligations, 60 days after the passage of this act?

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman was not listening to me carefully, else he would have known that I never intended or suggested such a thing.

Mr. TILSON. I so understood the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. What I said was that if you are going to provide for a volunteer army of 500,000 men, you should provide for the demobilization of the conscripted army. You should not hold, nor authorize or permit the War Department to hold, the conscripted army to the end of the fiscal year 1920 or for the time covering the period of enlistment of the volunteer army. Why leave it to the Secretary of War to enlist 500,000 volunteers and still keep an army of 2,000,000 conscripted men? The amendment only reaches those who enlisted for the period of the war and the conscripted men. The gentleman from Cali-

fornia [Mr. KAHN] says that we only need the 500,000 men provided for in this bill.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman means that they shall be discharged after we get the 500,000 men?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I mean that the War Department should go ahead at once and provide its volunteer Army which it says it needs, and then demobilize and release from the Army the men who were taken from their vocations of peace and were put into the Army for the period of the war. The war is in effect over now. It may take the peace conference six months or eight months yet to complete its labors, and it may take the Senate six months more to decide upon the treaty of peace and have it signed. These boys should be released and discharged as soon as possible.

Mr. DENT. I understand the gentleman is not offering that amendment now?

Mr. McCULLOCH. No; I am discussing it. Now, under the conscription law these men can be held, as I understand it, for four months after the signing of the treaty of peace. That may mean that the conscripted boys will have to remain in the Army for a year and a half or two years. This committee brings in a bill providing for a volunteer Army of 500,000 men for the next fiscal year, or from June 30, 1919, to July 1, 1920. Then the gentleman from California, on this side, comes forward and says we are not going to be able to demobilize the conscripted Army until the end of the next fiscal year, or July 1, 1920. I say it is absurd to think of raising the volunteer Army and still keep the conscript Army; but the best advice we have from the War Department is that they are going to keep them, if they see fit, until July, 1920. Now, my experience with this department has been that the officers are reluctant to let go of the men. A lot of the officers have better jobs now than they ever had before in their lives, and after the Army is demobilized they will have to go back to private life and a lot of them are going to be working for the privates.

So they are interested in keeping this Army business up as long as they can. I have a constituent at one of the camps who was making \$15,000 a year as a physician, and who is now engaged in the important work of signing the name of a major to papers already approved, work that any boy would be able to do. Yet that man is deprived of his discharge, or the approval of his commanding officer which would enable him to be discharged, because they say that he is necessary to the service. We all know that such cases are numerous. They do not want to let them go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of that time the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded.

Mr. WINGO. I want to offer an amendment to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that at the expiration of five minutes debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto shall terminate. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, I have a bona fide amendment that I should like to offer.

Mr. DENT. Make it seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman modifies his request to seven minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I would not want to be a party to any attempt to hamper the War Department in its efforts to demobilize these troops. I understand that the question of transportation enters into it, and all that sort of thing; but I believe that in order to be consistent Congress ought to go on record as being in favor of the demobilization of the conscript Army, and that a provision should be written into this law which will result in demobilization. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] says he is going to suggest an amendment; but the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama as he made it to me still leaves it up to the War Department to decide when it will act, and I think they have reasons of their own for keeping these boys in the Army just as long as they can. A lot of them, at least, have their own reasons. I believe Congress ought to be consistent, and that we should not provide for a volunteer Army of 500,000 men unless we intend to go about raising them, and the War Department ought to go about raising them. They

should provide the volunteer Army, and then they should be required to demobilize the conscript Army and let the boys come home and go back into the various positions and pursuits of peace from which they were taken. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Does the gentleman understand that it was the theory of this legislation, as I understand it, that practically every man who enlists under this will come out of the present Army? He will have to be demobilized or transferred into the new Army.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Why, certainly, if they raise the Army; but they do not have to raise it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They will be demobilizing the one Army while they are raising the other.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Let them go ahead and demobilize. The way to resume is to resume, and the way to demobilize is to demobilize. This bill does not provide for demobilization. We are providing for raising 500,000 volunteers, but we are not providing for releasing these boys in the conscript army, and there is no law that will make the War Department do it until four months after the signing of the treaty of peace.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. This bill provides for it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. It does not provide for anything of the kind.

The provisions in this bill, which are to be found in the legislative section, on pages 57, 58, and 59, relative to the organization and strength of the Army, provide for a force of approximately 500,000 men for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1919, and ending June 30, 1920. The declaration is made in the provisions that such organization shall be "temporary." It is further provided 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 enlistment for the period of one year." Under existing laws the conscripted army, which, according to my recollection, it has been estimated during this debate numbers approximately 2,000,000 men, a large proportion of whom are now in Europe, can be held for service by the War Department until the proclamation of the treaty of peace has been promulgated. They can be held during all the negotiations at the peace table, during the discussions of the Senate preparatory to ratification, during all the complicated procedure prior to the issuance of the proclamation, which anybody knows will consume many months.

Some have estimated that it will take more than a year to carry out all of these complicated negotiations and formalities. During all of that time under existing law the War Department can hold these boys for service. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], the ranking Member on the Committee on Military Affairs on this side of the Chamber, made the statement this morning that the War Department did not expect to have the conscripted Army demobilized much before July 1, 1920. So that from the most authoritative source upon this floor next to the chairman of the committee, we are informed that this process of demobilization of the conscripted Army is going to take a year and four months or the entire fiscal year for which the volunteer force of approximately 500,000 men is provided in this bill. The gentleman from California in response to my question during the debate this morning, said that this force of 500,000 men was all that was necessary to make up the army of occupation. Now, this bill provides for the force they say they need, but there is no provision in it whatever requiring the demobilization of the conscripted Army, so that unless some amendment is adopted, the War Department is going to have a force of 2,500,000 men that they can do with exactly as they please and will not be forced to demobilize any part of it, if they do not see fit to do so until the treaty of peace has been proclaimed. We are asked to rely upon the statement of members of the committee who do not even say that they are speaking by authority of the War Department, but who have been content with the declaration that they have been told that the conscripted Army will be demobilized "as speedily as possible," and in the next breath the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] indicates what he means by "as speedily as possible" by saying that it will probably take until July, 1920. Now, if these soldiers are not needed and it has clearly appeared from this debate that they are not needed and that the force provided in this bill will be sufficient, then this conscripted Army should be immediately demobilized or as soon as it is possible to do so, and men who have patriotically responded to the call to the colors and who have done their part when their services were needed should not be required to depend upon the whim of some Army officers as to whether or not they will be relieved from service. These boys should be permitted to go home, if they are not needed, and it is the duty of this House which passed the legislation that took them from their

homes, their avocations and their schools and placed them in the Army to serve during the war, to see to it that they are released and not leave these boys subject to the petty whims of Army officers, in order to get the justice that is rightfully due them.

The first section of my amendment provides:

Provided, That all men who enlisted in the Army for the period of the war and all men inducted into the Army under the so-called selective-service act, and all officers commissioned for the period of the war, shall be discharged not later than July 1, 1919.

There should be written into this bill a definite provision in regard to the demobilization of the conscripted Army.

Whatever the provision is, it should be definite and certain, and the War Department should be forced to live up to it.

The next section in the amendment only differs from the present orders of the War Department in that it takes away from the commanding officer the opportunity which the present regulations afford for him to play Army politics in the discharge of men. The regulations now provide that men shall be discharged upon application "if in the discretion of the commanding officer" such action should be taken. These conscripted soldiers should be discharged upon their application and permitted to come home if they desire to do so, and the officer should be required to fill their places by volunteers. The second paragraph of the amendment is as follows:

Provided further, That any such soldier shall be immediately discharged upon the filing of an application with his immediate commanding officer, whether he be at present in service overseas or within the United States, that said soldier shall be discharged upon the filing of said application and shall continue to receive the same pay and allowance thereafter to the date of, and be furnished transportation from the point where he is released from the Army, to the point of his enlistment or induction.

I feel that the foregoing provision is only just and fair to the soldier. If he wants to get out of the Army, since the war is over, he should be released upon the filing of his application and not be subject to the politics of the Army and the whims of commanding officers.

The last provision in the amendment is as follows:

Provided further, That all such men discharged in accordance with the foregoing provisions shall be granted the opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army, if he so desires, under the provisions of this section until the voluntary enlistments provided for herein shall have been filled.

If a boy who has been in the conscripted army wants to remain in the Army as a volunteer, he should have the opportunity to do so, and in my opinion he should have a preference.

Every Member of Congress is besieged with requests from soldiers, and the parents and friends of soldiers, to get them out of the Army. If this amendment is adopted, it ought to solve the problem, and the Congress at least will have done its part toward assisting our boys in getting out of the Army and back to the avocations of peace. Of course, the Army officers do not want to be shorn of any power; they want to be able to exercise their discretion, but unless the War Department can show reasons for holding these boys they should be demobilized and discharged, and it is up to this Congress before it authorizes another army to know something about what is going to be done with the present Army, and in the face of the statements made by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] to-day upon this floor the conscripted army is not necessary, and the force of 500,000 men provided for in this bill will meet all the requirements.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in lines 19 and 20, page 2, to strike out the words "typewriters and exchange of same; office, toilet, and desk furniture."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wingo: Page 2, line 19, strike out the words "typewriters, and exchange of same; office, toilet, and desk furniture."

Mr. WINGO. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what provision, if any, is attempted to be worked out by which this furniture, including surplus typewriters which they now have in the War Department, can be utilized for these different branches as they may be needed?

Mr. DENT. I do not know about that.

Mr. WINGO. My information is from a Member of the House that we have a surplus of typewriters and desks, and I would like to ask if the War Department has authorized the sale of typewriters and desks?

Mr. DENT. That is my information.

Mr. WINGO. My information is that they are selling typewriters at \$10 apiece; good typewriters. Instead of the War Department going ahead and disposing of them, why not work out some plan by which the typewriters can be distributed among those departments that need them, instead of authorizing them to buy new ones?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I am willing to accept a proviso that in the event that there is a surplus of typewriters in one branch they can be transferred to another. This is the language that has been carried in the bill for some time.

Mr. WINGO. If my amendment is adopted, I shall, of course, offer the same amendment at the proper places throughout the bill, because the bill is full of other provisions of a like character. The excuse for this is that it has always been carried. The fact is that they have been spending money like drunken sailors for office furniture—they have thousands and thousands, and I speak advisedly when I say thousands, of desks that they do not need. I am told by one Member of the House that he told his secretary to go and buy six typewriters at \$10 apiece. That is an absolute waste of money. We ought to stop it and ought to turn this expensive furniture and office equipment over to other departments that need it, instead of sacrificing it and giving it away. If my amendment is adopted, I intend to offer it all through the bill, and then let it be transferred from one department to another where it is needed.

Mr. STAFFORD. They have already done that.

Mr. WINGO. Then why carry this here?

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman had yielded to me, I would have told him.

Mr. WINGO. Then I regret not yielding to the gentleman. The gentleman is in favor of my amendment, is he not?

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it would be a hardship on the service to strike these words out.

Mr. WINGO. All right, if you have provided for it; but where is the provision carried?

Mr. STAFFORD. The President has issued an order, at the suggestions of the Committee on Appropriations, providing for transferring all unnecessary supplies that will not be needed by the departments to the control of the General Supplies Committee of the Treasury, and that that order also has a prohibition that no such supplies shall be purchased except under authority of the General Supplies Committee.

Mr. WINGO. Where are these typewriters and supplies being sold?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is news to me, that any supplies are being sold, because under the presidential order promulgated in December last, when it was first called to his attention, this order was issued.

Mr. WINGO. Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were 19 ayes and 22 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent expenses of the Military Intelligence Division, General Staff Corps, including the purchase of law books, professional books of reference; subscription to newspapers and periodicals; drafting and messenger service; and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad; the cost of special instruction at home and abroad, and in maintenance of students and attachés; and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$200,000.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, some days ago the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] called the attention of the House to an order, purporting to have been issued by authority of Maj. Gen. Buck, at Camp MacArthur, Tex., in reference to the attendance of officers and enlisted men at social functions. While I felt at the time that there must be some mistake about the matter on account of my belief that the order was absolutely at variance with the character and conduct of Gen. Buck, I did not feel warranted to speak about the matter until the facts could be ascertained. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] was good enough at a later date to place in the RECORD a statement of the Chief of Staff to the effect that the obnoxious order which purported to have been issued on the 6th of January was countermanded by Gen. Buck on January 8, just as soon as his attention was called to its existence.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] on January 29, 1919, addressed to Gen. Buck the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1919.

Maj. Gen. BUCK, United States Army,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GEN. BUCK: I inclose herewith clipping from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

I am a member, as you probably know, of the Military Committee of the House and am anxious to know whether or not you caused the order to be published as therein stated; and if you did, by what authority, and what was the occasion therefor?

I am informed by several officers in the Army that this is in violation of the rules and regulations, and that if such an order was published, you are liable to punishment by a court-martial.

Before taking the matter up in the committee, I am writing this letter in the hope that you will be able to explain the circumstance.

Yours, sincerely,

CHAS. POPE CALDWELL, M. C.

The gentleman from New York received the following reply:

HEADQUARTERS CAMP MACARTHUR, TEX.,
February 10, 1919.

From: B. B. Buck, major general, United States Army, commanding.
To: Hon. CHARLES POPE CALDWELL, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. (through The Adjutant General of the Army).

Subject: General Orders, No. 1, Headquarters Camp MacArthur, Tex.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 29, 1919. It appears to have been delayed in the mails. I hasten to answer.

2. The order in question was not authorized by me. I knew nothing of its preparation or contemplated issue until I saw it in the public print. Without waiting a moment, I hastened to my office at camp headquarters and summoned my executive officer, his assistant, the camp adjutant, and the provost marshal to come to my office.

These officers being assembled, I showed them the order and demanded who wrote it and by whose authority it was published, at the same time stating the fact that the subject had never been brought to my attention. Also, I repeated what they all knew full well, that it was only in matters of routine administration in which the policy of the camp was well known and which I had already approved that the staff was authorized to issue orders without first getting my approval. I called emphatic attention to the fact that this order did not have my approval; that it in no way reflected my sentiment or my wish; that no greater error could possibly be committed by the staff than had been committed in this case; that this order, by its inexcusable provisions, had at one stroke made me out as insincere in what I had said to my command in my Christmas address or as an overbearing snob, both of which I disclaimed. I then repeated, "Who is responsible for this order?"

Two of my staff, the executive officer and the provost marshal, at once desired to take the blame for its preparation. Whereupon I said, "However many may have been engaged in its preparation, there was only one who could be responsible for its issue—the executive officer. It is the executive officer who is responsible to me for its issue. It is wrong in substance, contrary to my wish, practice, and sentiments, and must be immediately revoked."

I thereupon turned to the camp adjutant and directed that the order be immediately revoked, and that messengers be dispatched to recover every possible copy of the order which had been distributed. This was done by the issuance of General Orders, No. 2, Camp MacArthur, January 8, 1919, copy herewith.

3. I regret exceedingly the issue of this ill-advised, unauthorized, unnecessary, harmful, un-American document. But its issue was not foreseen by me, had never entered by mind, and came as a complete surprise to me. It dealt me a severe blow, which I was powerless to parry, and at once placed me in the unenviable position of being forced to discredit my staff or acknowledge myself to be a snob.

4. During the few hours it was in effect, so far as I can learn, there was no action taken under its provisions, and consequently, so far as this camp is concerned, the order has operated to the disadvantage of only one of its members—myself.

5. Had the order expressed by views or my wish, or had I had an opportunity of passing upon it before its issue, I should have stood upon it. Under the circumstances I feel it my duty to repudiate it.

B. B. BUCK.

Accompanying the letter was the following order:

HEADQUARTERS, CAMP MACARTHUR,
Waco, Tex., January 8, 1919.

General Orders, No. 2.

1. Paragraph 1, General Orders, No. 1, current series, these headquarters, which prohibits officers and enlisted men attending the same social affairs, is hereby revoked.

All organization and separate unit commanders, this camp, will have all copies of paragraph 1, General Orders, No. 1, c. s. these headquarters, which have been furnished them returned to camp headquarters immediately.

By command of Maj. Gen. Buck.

W. H. WOOLWORTH,
Major, Infantry, United States Army,
Acting Executive Officer.

Official:
[SEAL]

E. E. LAMBERT,
Major, A. G. D., Adjutant.

Ex. Off. 1; Den'l Inf. 2; F. T. & H. Co. 2; Personnel 9; Camp Vet'n 2; Personnel Co. 2; M. T. C. Hdqrs. 2; M. T. C. 348, 2; Cmp. Q. M. 7; Dev. Bn. 20; 1st Bn. 43d Inf. 7; Ordn. 2; Eng. 2; Labor Bn. 8; Ord Arm't 2; Remt. 2; Med. Supp. 2; Post Off. 1; Cmp Surgeon 1; Moral Off. 1; Lt. Thayer 1; Supp Off. 1; Cmp Insp. 1; Judge Adv. 1; Capt. Harvey 1; Ord. Room 1; T. R. C. 115; Prov. Guard 3; Prov. Marshal 1; Bakers & Cks. 2; Bak'y Co. 986, 2; Util. Co. 2; Signal Supp. 1; Chap. Earle 1; Y. M. C. A. Hq. 1; Med. Det. B. Hosp. 2; Clin. & Urology 2; Q. M. Det. B. Hosp. 2; Serv. Pk. U. 324, 2; Comdg. Gen. B. Hosp. 5; Lt. Fullerton 1; Intell. Off. 1; Cmp Sani. Insp. 3; Comdg. Gen. 1; Maj. Lambert 1.

It will be noted that the gentleman from Alabama complained of the objectionable and offensive order on January 28, 1919, and that Gen. Buck had revoked the order on January 8, before knowledge of the order had reached either the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] or the War Department. This fact should be sufficient evidence that Gen. Buck neither authorized nor had knowledge of the contents of the order until after its issuance, and that he at once vacated, and recalled it.

For fear that some erroneous impression may be entertained by Members as to the personal character and sincerity of Gen. Buck, I desire to say that it was my privilege to serve under him as a cadet many years ago, and I believe I know something of the kind of stuff of which he is made. I learned to know him

well and intimately, and I can assure the House that he is an excellent man and a fine soldier. He is a native of the State of Mississippi and was appointed to West Point from the State of Texas and has been in the Army a great many years. He is a man of the highest integrity and character.

In 1898 he was a major in the Second Texas Infantry Volunteers. I was an enlisted man in that regiment and I have personal knowledge that he then displayed consideration and respect for enlisted men.

Gen. Buck went to France with the first contingent of Regular troops. He was in the First Division, whose gallant conduct and behavior have been so well discussed to-day by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

At this point I desire to insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times under date of February 9, 1919, which refers to the operations of the First Division, as follows:

[From New York Times, Sunday, February 9, 1919.]

COURAGE, DASH, AND VICTORY IN FIRST DIVISION'S RECORD—STORY OF AMERICAN REGULARS WHO LED THE WAY TO FRANCE AND WHOSE CASUALTIES OF ALL KINDS REACHED 23,974, INCLUDING 715 OFFICERS.

(By Maj. Gen. A. W. Greely, United States Army, Retired.)

There is no division of the American Expeditionary Forces that has failed to display in the face of the enemy the qualities of courage, discipline, and efficiency which are acknowledged attributes of the American Army. It is natural and commendable that war correspondents and local newspapers should loudly and proudly acclaim the achievements of the military organizations identified with and formed in their own communities. It would be an injustice to the rank and file of our citizen soldiery if their own sections failed to display pride, especially in the combat divisions.

Thus New England honors the Twenty-sixth Division, New York the Twenty-seventh and Seventy-seventh, Pennsylvania the Twenty-eighth, Michigan and Wisconsin the Thirty-second, Kansas and Missouri the Thirty-fifth, Ohio the Thirty-seventh, and the Pacific States the Ninety-first, to mention only those of greatest losses.

It should be borne in mind, however, that certain organizations are entitled to general recognition for their soldierly merits, as they present to the world by the men of their ranks a thoroughly homogeneous army, gathered from all sections and all races of our composite Nation. These troops are of the so-called Regular Army, whose ranks are now filled almost to a man by volunteers for service only in the great war. It is not generally known that the war casualties of these organizations—battle and disease—have depleted their ranks from 25 to 100 per cent of their original personnel. These vast gaps have been filled by drafts from the replacement divisions of selected men, thus making the Regulars truly national organizations.

That the public may appreciate the fiber and metal of these representative troops, formed by such a national consolidation, it appears desirable and of timely interest that the achievements of a typical regular division should be briefly, if somewhat inadequately, described.

For this purpose the First Division is selected, not that its bravery is superior, its discipline better, or its morale higher than mark the others, but because it was the first division to reach France, first to serve in trench warfare, first to fire a hostile shell, first to lose a man, first to capture a prisoner, first to repel a German raid, first to man an independent sector, and first to recapture a town (Cantigny) and hold it against all counterattacks.

THE OFFICERS IN COMMAND.

Sailing from Hoboken on June 24, 1917, the First Division reached St. Nazaire, at the mouth of the Loire, on the 24th of that month. The division, 27,000 strong, was trained by Gen. W. L. Sibert, of Alabama, but went into actual war service under Gen. Robert Lee Bullard, also of Alabama, with Col. Campbell King, of Georgia, as chief of staff. The First Brigade, Sixteenth and Eighteenth Regular Infantry, was commanded by Gen. John L. Hines, of West Virginia, and the Second Brigade by Gen. Beaumont B. Buck, of Texas. The Artillery Brigade, the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Regiments of Field Artillery, was finally put under Col. W. A. Holbrook, of Wisconsin. In addition, there were the First Regiment of Engineers, the First, Second, and Third Machine Gun Battalions, a headquarters troop of Cavalry, Signal Corps, field battalions, and medical units.

Unskilled in methods of modern war and unprovided with field artillery, the division was scattered to suitable camps, where they were intensively instructed by experienced officers from the French Army. That such training involved physical hardships, uncomplainingly endured, is evident from Maj. Palmer's statement that some of the men, in want of new shoes, drilled with their feet wrapped in sack. The Field Artillery had to unlearn their own drill and acquire expert skill with the remarkable but novel French gun, the famous soixante quinze, 75-mm. A French officer commented on the high intelligence and extraordinary aptitude of his artillery pupils.

Three months later, with coming winter and almost continuous rains, the division was inducted in trench warfare, serving under French command, a short distance southeast of Nancy. The usual horrors of trench life were experienced, though their vitality and methods prevented any material increase in the sick. Here the first hostile shell was fired by Battery C, Sixth Field Artillery, on October 23, 1917. The Germans on November 3, by a barrage, cut off the advanced outpost and captured 11 prisoners. The command, rallying, repelled the enemy. Trench service, rendered by battalion detail for 10 days each, was marked by 56 casualties—3 killed, 43 wounded, and 11 captured. One German prisoner was taken. The casualties herein given include killed, wounded, gassed, missing, and prisoners, but not by disease, accidents, etc.

The trench apprenticeship was followed by independent service January 15 to April 3, 1918, about 12 miles northwest of Toul, in a sector near St. Mihiel. Here the First Division relieved the famous Moroccan Division, cooperating with the Sixty-ninth French. The Toul service entailed constant losses with small chance of reprisal. The front was dominated by the St. Mihiel hills, of which Mount Sec was the key, strongly held by German batteries within easy range. Maj. Palmer tersely describes the situation: "It was like sitting at the foot of the stairs and having the fellow at the top throw rocks at you from behind a curtain." Occasional incursions into no man's

land were made, whereby 11 prisoners were captured with machine guns and flame throwers. In this quiet sector the First Division had 352 casualties—56 killed, 150 wounded, 127 gassed, and 19 missing.

HASTILY SHIFTED TO PICARDY.

The vast and dangerous offensive launched by the German command on March 21, 1918, called the division into extremely active service. On March 28 Gen. Pershing offered the American force in its entirety to Gen. Foch, and a week later the First made its great journey half across France to Picardy. It was a test of administrative ability, met successfully by Pershing's quartermasters, to move with its essential accompanying paraphernalia 27,000 men, 1,700 animals, and 1,000 wagons. Turning over its sector to the Twenty-sixth New England Division the First made this transfer of more than 300 miles and was in Picardy, near Beauvais, on April 18.

How it was done no one knows, for the railroads were swamped with ammunition, reinforcements, supplies, etc., for 3,000,000 men, while the roads—in awful condition—were jammed with ambulances, motors, fugitives, and troops. It was nearly confusion confounded between withdrawals before the enemy, the evacuation of the occupied provinces, and transfers of troops to meet exigencies. But the First got there, both fit and equipped to fight.

Kept for a time in reserve, the First occupied the Cantigny front—April 25–July 7—three miles west of Montdidier, then strongly held by the enemy. The operations of the division in this sector are popularly supposed to have been confined, as far as fighting went, to the capture of Cantigny, which was a mere episode involving only one-fifth of the casualties here suffered. The First was put in line opposite the very apex of the most advanced German salient, with orders to hold it at all costs. If the front gave way Amiens, a few miles to the northwest, would fall and its railway system be destroyed. The fatal effect would be the diversion to southern France of all the supplies needful for the British Army, which was then receiving from the channel ports everything needful for all forces north of the Somme.

Constant fighting, though on a small scale, continued almost daily until early June. The front had to be kept against preponderating and victorious enemies, who, holding both banks of the Avre, were within easy cannon shot of Amiens. The First not only gave no ground in the repeated attacks of the enemy, but it made them pay toll, capturing from its columns 60 prisoners and 3 machine guns. It paid dear, however, as its casualties—omitting those in the capture of Cantigny—numbered 140 officers and 4,183 men; killed, 199; wounded, 1,621; gassed, 1,999; missing, 49. The few missing show that the men fought to the last.

HOW CANTIGNY WAS TAKEN.

The division commander viewed with dissatisfaction the occupation by the enemy of the village of Cantigny. Admirably organized and strongly fortified by the Germans, its high ground dominated both the American front and also sections in the rear. Whenever another advance was made, and it was daily expected, Cantigny was an excellent jumping-off place for a great assault. If it could be captured and held its value for a counter offensive was strikingly evident. Preparations for its capture were systematically made.

At daybreak on May 28 the division artillery opened a terrific bombardment which drove the enemy to their shelters. At 6.30 a. m. the troops went over the top as the artillery fire pulled back to an initial barrage a hundred yards in advance of the moving line. Col. Ely, with the Twenty-eighth Infantry, and Lieut. Col. Theodore Roosevelt, jr., with a battalion of the Twenty-sixth Infantry, moved forward with clock-work regularity, 55 yards a minute. Each man had food for two days, ample water, much ammunition, and intrenching tools. The town was taken within an hour, when began immediately the consolidation so essential, as counterattacks were certain. The Engineer detachments wired under fierce fire the trenches occupied, while the men of the Signal Corps spread their cobweb lines to insure telephonic communication with the rear.

To take Cantigny was easy compared with holding it. Six counterattacks were made by the exasperated Germans, without success. Fierce artillery fire soon reduced Cantigny to a mass of formless ruins, but the Americans held fast, repelling the enemy, who ceased their efforts after losing over 1,300 men killed and wounded, besides 225 prisoners. The casualties of the first numbered 1,067—killed, 199; wounded, 652; gassed, 200; missing, 16. Heroically fighting after being wounded, Lieut. Col. Maxey, Lieut. Drum, and Corpl. Finnegan were killed.

IMPORTANCE OF CANTIGNY CAPTURE.

A small affair, seemingly, Cantigny's capture was a matter of great and international importance. There could not have been a more timely victory, for on that very morning the last German success was attained. Going over the top of the Chemin des Dames, their shock troops drove the allied forces down the Marne to Chateau-Thierry, and thus placed Paris in imminent danger of capture. At this critical and disheartening period it fell to the lot of the First Division of the American Expeditionary Forces to prove to the anxious allied nations that a counter-offensive was possible, and that victory was yet to be gained for the free men of the world.

For a few days a part of the First Division turned from scenes of war to parade in Paris on July 4.

Three days later urgent orders put the First Division on the march. For four days and nights it went on without any regular rest, now on trucks, now hiking. Of the men's physical condition near the end one of its officers writes: "The dismounted men would fall asleep in the gutter at every halt. The mounted men dozed in their saddles, and the animals could scarcely drag one foot after another. When a chance for food came most men hit the hay, though too tired to sleep." The afternoon found them 10 miles in rear of the battle line, which they were ordered to occupy so as to go over the top at daybreak.

Foch had perfected his plans for a counteroffensive. The march to their assigned positions had to be secretly made over unknown roads, through fields and forest, without a gleam of light, lest the enemy note the movement. To add to the troubles a thunderstorm soaked their clothing and made the shell-ruined roads veritable quagmires. In utter darkness thousands of men, hundreds of horses and of motor trucks jammed the road in almost inextricable masses. It was feared that some units could not reach the line in time to go over the top, fixed at 4.35 a. m. One unit barely reached the front at 4.30 and went over almost exhausted.

IN FOCH'S GREAT OFFENSIVE.

It was known that the fighting would be desperate, as it involved attacks on fortified heights held by an enemy flushed with victory and confident of continued success. Hundreds of camouflaged nests of machine guns, heavy batteries in positions of natural strength, caused the

enemy to believe their terrain impregnable. It rested on the courage and persistence of the American soldier to prove this a fallacy.

The division entered the counteroffensive under its new commander, Gen. Charles P. Summerrall, of Florida, distinguished as one of the captors of Peking in 1900. I was sandwiched between the One hundred and fifty-third French on the left and the veteran Moroccan division on its right, with the Foreign Legion.

At 4.35 a. m. the First went over the top in extended order of five paces interval. The artillery, hitherto silent, started a rolling barrage which, systematically lifted a hundred yards a minute, drove the enemy to their shelters. Advancing as planned, and leaving small parties from time to time to clean up the snipers and machine guns, the main body attained its first objective and halted 20 minutes, as allotted. Night found them at the third objective, about 3 miles' advance, having smashed through the wire barricades and fortifications constructed the previous six weeks. Scarcely a thousand casualties, and more than that number of prisoners with many guns, were the record of the day. The Sixth German, Eleventh and Forty-second Bavarian Divisions were that night reinforced by the Thirty-fourth and Twenty-eighth Divisions, prepping warm work for the morrow.

On July 20 still another German division, the Forty-sixth, confronted the First. As it had outrun the One hundred and fifty-third French in advance, the First Division was asked to take the village of Berzy-le-Sec, which had been assigned as a French objective. This village was a fortified place, which dominated the Soissons-Outchy-le-Chateau Railway, and its capture meant the loss to the Germans of the entire salient. It involved desperate work, and that day failed. The fighting was intense, often at close quarters, when grenades, bayonets, knives, and even clubbed rifles were used. To and fro swayed the struggling masses, with slight and dearly gained advances by our men. The American casualties had now run up to 3,000, about the number of prisoners captured by them. With nightfall Berzy was still uncaptured, and the Moroccan division was relieved, which was also the orders of the First. Summerrall, however, told the corps commander that he had promised his men that they should go on, and was unwilling to leave victory half gained.

VICTORY ON SOISSONS HIGHWAY.

The losses of the Second Brigade had been enormous among its officers, as nearly all had been killed or wounded. However, on the morning of the 21st, Gen. Buck paraded his exhausted and decimated command, and, walking down its front under heavy fire, led them in assault. They swept into Berzy-le-Sec, capturing its men, batteries, and machine guns, and winning the most important objective. Meantime the First Brigade had overrun the Soissons-Chateau-Thierry highway, leaving no hope to the demoralized enemy. Victory then and for the future was assured.

The perfidy and the contemptible methods of the Germans appear from a report by an officer of the division. The moans of a wounded German attracted the attention of an officer in the advance, and in response to his pitiful appeals first-aid treatment was given. The officer went on to join his command, and a few hundred yards further a companion officer called out that he had been shot from the rear. It developed that the German, refreshed by first-aid treatment, had crawled up to the shell hole, and, resting his machine gun on the edge, opened fire on our troops. Just punishment of the treacherous soldier was rendered needless. A German shell exploded and killed him.

One prisoner was brought in with his high leather boots full of grenades and his right arm adorned with a Red Cross badge.

The captures included 125 officers, 3,375 men, 75 guns (77 millimeter and 150 millimeter), 50 mortars, 300 machine guns, 2,500 rifles, with much ammunition and supplies. The price paid was the heaviest to date of any division, 7,840 in all—killed, 1,252; wounded, 4,771; gassed, 274; and missing, 1,543. One officer to every 16 men was killed—an extraordinary proportion.

Many officers and men were cited by division orders, and to others distinguished-service crosses were issued by order of President Wilson.

This victory of the First against six German divisions was naturally followed by recognition. Buck and Hines became major general and Holbrook a brigadier. The chief of staff, Campbell King, was made brigadier and succeeded by Col. John N. Greely, general staff, who, cited "for distinguished ability while performing duties of grave responsibility," served in that position until the armistice was signed.

Quiet service for assimilation of about 8,000 replacements was had in the Salzera sector during August, the casualties numbering only 21. The St. Mihiel operation, September 12-15, was not entirely the picnic that has been sometimes assumed. Familiar with this terrain from their earliest service, the First Division had an important share in the capture of the salient. Against resistance they advanced 8 miles in 19 hours, and their reconnoitering party 12 miles. Their casualties were 11 officers and 761 men. They captured 5 officers, 1,190 men, 30 77-millimeter and 150-millimeter guns, and much war material.

Moved up by easy stages, the First Division took station at Cheppy, awaiting its fiercest fighting between the Argonne Forest and the Meuse River. A serious emergency arose, and its orders came. Entering this sector, it fought continually from October 1 to October 12 under conditions of undescrivable difficulties, over a terrain capable of easy defense and against the best German divisions, who knew that defeat there meant the absolute loss of the war. The situation is best set forth by Gen. Pershing in General Order 201, the only order devoted during the war to a single command. It begins:

"The Commander in Chief desires to make of record . . . his extreme satisfaction with the conduct of the officers and soldiers of the First Division in its advance west of the Meuse between October 4 and 11, 1918."

The First Division paid a fearful price for its Argonne victory, the casualties numbering 8,554, of whom 117 were officers. Killed, 851; wounded severely, 2,664; wounded slightly, 1,710; gassed, 1,614; missing (mostly dead, it is thought), 1,715. One of every three!

Ordinarily this would have been the end of a division for months, but the First answered promptly for an emergency in the operations against Nouzon and Sedan (November 3-8), where it sustained losses of 1,087, and captured 54 men, guns, etc.

Summarized, its war casualties, killed, wounded, gassed, and missing, aggregated 23,974, of whom 715 were officers. Its losses by disease are unknown, but the total replacements slightly exceed 30,000.

The armistice signed, the First Division left Abincourt, near Verdun, six days later, and by a march of more than 200 miles occupied the Coblenz bridgehead on December 24. It was the first American force to cross the Rhine.

The brigade of the First Division commanded by Gen. Buck participated in the battle of Cantigny on May 28, 1918, and cap-

tured that village. Here for the first time our allies and the enemy had opportunity to estimate the fighting qualities of American troops when fighting as a large American unit and under American leadership and direction. Had the conduct of the brigade been less gallant or heroic or its leadership less efficient or daring, despair would have assailed our allies and hope would have brightened in the hearts of our enemies. The brigade under Gen. Buck's command took a conspicuous part in the thrust toward Soissons, which began on July 18, 1918. At the battle of Berzy-le-Sec, July 21, 1918, after losing 75 per cent of his officers and 50 per cent of his men, Gen. Buck and his brigade continued to advance until the town and all objectives were captured.

For gallantry in action on that occasion he was decorated by the French, cited in orders, and awarded the distinguished-service cross by the commanding general, American Expeditionary Forces, and promoted by the President to the grade of major general. [Applause.] Since his return to this country, he has received a second decoration from the French Government. He has been awarded the Croix de Guerre with two palms, which, as I understand it, is a superlative mark of distinction for gallantry in action.

In this connection I desire to insert the following clippings from the Waco Times-Herald of Waco, Tex.:

[From the Waco Times-Herald, Feb. 12.]

MAJ. GEN. BUCK HAS CROSS OF LEGION OF HONOR COMMANDER.

Gen. B. B. Buck, United States Army, at present commanding Camp MacArthur, has received through the War Department at Washington official notice of his appointment as commander of the Legion of Honor by the French Government. Last August Gen. Buck was made chevalier of the Legion of Honor, and he is now advanced in that order to the rank of commander.

When seen by a reporter to-day, Gen. Buck said he was very happy to have received this additional honor, and displayed with evident pride the beautiful decoration sent him by the French Government. He also received at the same time an additional Croix de Guerre from the French Government. Gen. Buck has been decorated with the distinguished-service cross by Gen. Pershing for his work on the battle front in France.

HOW BUCK LED MEN IS TOLD IN STARS AND STRIPES.

In that famous journal of the men overseas, the ever-popular "Stars and Stripes," are found many graphical tales of adventure and life on the battle front. In the edition of Friday, January 3, there appears the following article of local interest, in that it pertains to the actions of the present commandant of Camp MacArthur, Maj. Gen. Beaumont B. Buck:

"Against the most desperate opposition, the Americans were relentlessly approaching Berzy-le-Sec, the capture of which would mean to the Germans that the Soissons-Outchy-le-Chateau Railway and the Soissons-Chateau-Thierry highway could no longer be used for transportation into the Marne salient from the railroad of Soissons. It would mean, in short, the salient was lost.

"Knowing this only too well, the enemy during the night thrust into the line covering the village and its all important heights still another division, the Forty-sixth Reserve. On their part the staff of the Twentieth French Corps, finding that the One hundred and fifty-third Division was still some distance from it, directed the First United States to take Berzy-le-Sec at 2 o'clock next day, for which purpose the Second Brigade was reinforced by a battalion from the divisional reserve.

FORWARD TO FIERCE STRUGGLE.

"At the appointed time, following a furious barrage of two hours by the divisional artillery, the troops went forward. There followed a struggle as ferocious and protracted as any in the annals of the American Army. Time after time throughout the afternoon and night the lines surged back and forth in attack and counterattack; machine-gun nests were taken and the opposing infantry grappled one another with bayonets and trench knives, grenades, and clubbed rifles.

"At length, early on the morning of the 21st, when the officers had nearly all fallen, killed or wounded, and when his men, exhausted, but still determined, had dropped back for a brief respite, Gen. Beaumont B. Buck, the brigade commander, walking along his front beneath the hail of the enemy's fire, personally directed the formation of the line for a last supreme effort, and then himself led the first wave as it rose up and rolled toward and into and over the smoking ruins of the village, engulfing there a battery of field guns, dozens of machine guns, and hundreds of prisoners.

"The victory was won."

On January 16, 1919, the War Department received officially from the commanding general, American Expeditionary Forces, the insignia for commander of the Legion of Honor, and an additional Croix de Guerre for transmittal to Gen. Buck.

At this point may I call attention to the following extract from General Orders, No. 109, War Department, November 19, 1918, as follows:

General Orders, No. 109.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 19, 1918.

By direction of the President, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 9, 1918 (Bul. No. 43, W. D., 1918), the distinguished-service cross was awarded by the commanding general, American Expeditionary Forces, for extraordinary heroism in action in France, to the following named officers and enlisted men of the American Expeditionary Forces:

Beaumont B. Buck, brigadier general, 2d Infantry Brigade, 1st Division. Before and during the attack on Berzy-le-Sec, France, July 21, 1918, he displayed conspicuous gallantry and heroic leadership of his command. When most of the officers of his brigade had fallen,

Gen. Buck, with contempt of personal danger and in spite of heavy artillery bombardment and machine-gun fire, traversed the front of his advancing forces, gave correct directions to his organization commanders, and led the first wave of the culminating attack which stormed and captured the town.

BY ORDER OF THE SECRETARY OF WAR:

PEYTON C. MARCH,
General, Chief of Staff.

OFFICIAL:

P. C. HARRIS,
The Adjutant General.

Could there be paid more eloquent tribute to the bravery and courage of an officer than that here solemnly written upon the records of the War Department regarding the conduct of this heroic Texan?

Can any of you hesitate to credit his statement that he not only did not authorize or sanction the issuance of the order forbidding the attendance of officers and men at the same social function, but that he abhors and repudiates the spirit of such an order? I entertain nothing but scorn and contempt for the spirit that would seek to establish social castes among those of the white race, in the armies of the Republic, or among the white citizens of the United States, and have no difficulty in believing that such a view is shared by a man of Gen. Buck's American birth and breeding, and who with an unsurpassed bravery fought on foreign shores to defend the principles for which the United States reluctantly but resolutely drew the sword.

Can you believe that this soldier of the Republic either claimed for himself or sanctioned the claim of other officers for social distinction when upon the battle field he neither sought nor would accept the privilege of safety that might have been his to claim, but with sergeant and corporal and private, in the equality and democracy of danger, he marched and mingled in and about the market place of death? He claimed for his general's stars no pride or prerogative in the red republic of the battle field.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, lines 11 and 12, after the word "attachés" in line 11, strike out the words "and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on that paragraph and all amendments thereto be now concluded, unless the gentleman would like to have five minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I would like to be heard.

Mr. DENT. How much time?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Five minutes.

Mr. DENT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in five minutes.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to the one I offered a few moments ago. The words I would strike out of this paragraph are practically the same objectionable words found in the former paragraph. I do not offer this as a criticism of the War Department. There has been a great deal of criticism, a great deal of fault has been found. I have not indulged in much criticism, although I can truthfully say I trust that some of these abuses I hear about and read about may speedily be corrected. I offer this amendment because I think they are improper words to be included in any paragraph of an appropriation bill. They give too much discretion and repose too much power, confer too much authority upon the officer named. When criticism of this kind is made the question is often asked, can not you trust the Secretary of War, can not you trust the Secretary of Agriculture, and so forth? It is not a matter of distrust at all, or if I were to reply directly to it I would say that rarely does the Secretary of War or the head of a department himself exercise discretion as to the expenditure of the money placed at his disposal. The discretion is exercised by some one down the line, perhaps almost if not at the foot of the line, somebody in whose hands we would not place a large sum of money, some one whom if we knew him we would not rely upon or trust discretion to in all matters. But I submit, gentlemen, this is an improper way to legislate. All possible safeguards should be thrown around the expenditure of money. And I wish again to call the attention of the committee to the improper and slothful methods into which it has fallen, the carelessness and unwillingness to give time or take the trouble of writing properly into the law regulations and restrictions as to how money should be expended,

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. CANNON. This is for contingent expenses, Military Intelligence Division. If you strike that out it would be for contingent expenses. Now, it says "including the purchase of law books," and so forth, and then if you add the other you put in all that surplusage. It says here "and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper." That is, for such other contingent purposes. If the gentleman would really like to have it, in my judgment, in proper shape, he would move to strike out all the paragraph after the words "staff corps," in the fourth and fifth lines, because if you strike out "and for such other purposes" you can not use this contingent fund for anything except what is specially mentioned. I am inclined to think so, but I just call attention to it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think the words to which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has called attention indicate the lines along which the Secretary must travel in spending that money. They are something of a direction with him; they are something of a limitation upon his discretion and authority; but if the words I object to are included there is absolutely no limit to what he may do.

Mr. CANNON. Suppose he wanted some ice. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, could you buy it from that fund?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman has prepared more appropriation bills than any other gentleman in the House, perhaps as many as all the rest put together, and he knows that item after item appear in bills coming from his committee that specifically provide for the purchase of ice, and I know no gentleman who objects more strenuously to unlimited authority than the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BAER. The gentleman remembers that we will be dry after July 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WINGO. I reserved a point of order, and I want to make it on certain language in the paragraph. The language to which I direct the point of order is in lines 8 and 9. The language is "and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad." That is for contingent expenses. It is not authorized by existing law. It is properly carried in the Diplomatic bill in the contingent expenses of the different embassies.

Mr. MANN. It is existing law.

Mr. WINGO. It is not authorized by existing law.

Mr. DENT. Is the gentleman sure he is correct in that statement? It has been carried in this bill ever since I have been a member of the committee.

Mr. WINGO. That may be true, but the statute of limitations does not run on a point like this.

Mr. DENT. But the gentleman's statement that it is not carried in the existing law, I think, is wrong.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Would it be necessary that there be a specific law?

Mr. WINGO. I think so.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. These military attachés are Regular officers, members of the Regular Establishment, on special detail, and this is simply an appropriation to pay for their expenses. It is no different than if it were said "the Army officers who are in Alaska."

Mr. WINGO. But the contingent expenses of all attachés at every embassy are payable and provided for out of the contingent fund in the bill provided for the different embassies.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think the gentleman is in error. The Diplomatic bill does not pay their salaries.

Mr. WINGO. I am speaking of the contingent expenses.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Or the contingent expenses.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. As the gentleman from Minnesota states, this is for the contingent expenses of a military officer of the United States. The Military Intelligence Bureau, under which this item is carried here, is the particular bureau that designates and has charge of that officer, and this is to pay whatever contingent expenses that officer may be to in gaining military intelligence. He is not responsible to the embassy, but to the Military Intelligence Department here in Washington.

Mr. WINGO. That is a new statement to me. But this is not authorized by existing law at all. It very properly is carried under the contingent expenses of the embassies.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know any provision of law authorizing any of the contingent expenses in any of the departments of the Government?

Mr. WINGO. No. I really think a point of order would lie against all these contingent items.

Mr. MANN. Well, if the gentleman is correct, nearly every item could be stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. WINGO. There are several items that I am going to try to get out on a point of order.

Mr. MANN. There are a number of items that are clearly subject to a point of order in the bill; but this is an appropriation for the maintenance of the Army. Now, everyone knows that every department of the Government must necessarily have various contingent expenses. And the creation of the department itself is, in my judgment, a sufficient warrant for an appropriation for the contingent expenses. It would be ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, to say that when we created a department or provided an army we should in detail describe the character of the buttons that the men had to wear.

Mr. WINGO. I agree with the gentleman that would be ridiculous.

Mr. MANN. It would be ridiculous to say that we can not appropriate for buttons because it is not authorized by law. Buttons are no more authorized by law than many various other contingent expenses necessary for the Army, which no one can foresee, in many cases, in advance. Here is a provision which provides for the payment of contingent expenses of officers of the Army abroad under proper provision of law. I do not see how the gentleman can contend we can not make an appropriation for the contingent expenses.

Mr. WINGO. Here is my contention. I agree with the gentleman that the only justification in law for contingent expenses, of course, is upon the theory that the act creating any bureau contemplates, and therefore by implication we are authorized to make, appropriations for all the expenses that are necessarily incident and understood to go with that kind of an establishment which has been created. This is an item for contingent expenses in a military establishment, to pay for contingent expenses, it is true, of a military officer, but while he is in another branch of the service, which has a contingent fund which is provided for by law and which is used by that embassy in paying the contingent expenses of that particular official.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. While these military attachés are attached in a way to an embassy abroad, that is on account of our international relations. We are not authorized to send an Army officer to England unless he is accredited in some way and connected with the embassy. That is our diplomatic relation. That has nothing to do with our power in reference to the payment. And these military attachés must get their pay for contingent expenses out of the Army and not out of the Diplomatic bill. They are not a part of the embassy.

Mr. WINGO. They are so regarded under international law. They are under the control of the ambassadors.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. They are not.

Mr. WINGO. They are directed to report to an ambassador.

Mr. MANN. We have a lot of commercial agents abroad, accredited in a way, that are under the control of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. WINGO. Some of them are; but as to military attachés, they are attached to embassies.

Mr. MANN. They are all accredited in some way and connected with the Diplomatic Service. That is the only way you can get them abroad.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to add a word to that which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has just stated. These military attachés are in no wise a part of the diplomatic forces of the United States. As the gentleman pointed out, in order to send a military attaché or naval attaché to the Court of St. James, we send him there under the direction or under the roof of our ambassador. This man is gathering military information. It would not be of any value to this country to have him report that military information to the ambassador or to the Secretary of State here. That is not the place where it goes.

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

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The place where it goes is through the military channels to the General Staff of the Army. While the military attaché may be at the embassy, or may have an office at the embassy, he may be in one sense attached to that embassy; but he is really a missionary of the Army, working for the Army, and he reports to the Army. All the information he obtains is placed in the possession of the Army and is for the benefit of the Army, and the allowances for contingent expenses are not to enable him to accomplish or perform any duties apart from that which customarily belongs to that position, but they are to enable him to perform the work which may be necessary in handling his position, which is one authorized by law.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I wanted to make that statement first.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand from the statement of the gentleman, these military attachés are not appointed by the Secretary of State, but are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Certainly. This much must be admitted: A military attaché is an individual of such a character that foreign governments usually exercise some little discretion as to receiving him. They are consulted before he is appointed; ordinarily they are consulted before a man is appointed. For instance, if we contemplated sending a man to France at the present time as military attaché we would consult the French Government to see if such and such a man we desired to send was satisfactory to the French Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under whose jurisdiction are these officials?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. They are exclusively under the jurisdiction of the War Department to which they belong.

Mr. WINGO. Is that true—that the American ambassador has authority to send home a military or naval attaché?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I have not heard of such a case.

Mr. WINGO. Has he not done it?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not know as to that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The head of the Military Intelligence Department states specifically that this sum is necessary to pay the extraordinary expenses of the attachés. He states specifically that these men are responsible, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] states, to the Military Intelligence Department, and this is his estimate of the amount they ought to have for their contingent expenses.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman will recognize that these men are doing work that is not diplomatic at all. They are not spies, but they are skilled observers, sent out to get information of every possible and conceivable character that would be advantageous to obtain from a military standpoint.

Mr. WINGO. We have a separate force that we appropriate for as military observers?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman from Minnesota will admit, as the gentleman indicated here, that without doubt if an ambassador should report to the Military Intelligence Bureau here that a particular man would be objectionable to him, that man would be withdrawn. But that would not mean that in all respects the man was not answerable to the military department.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes. This is work which the ambassador could not attend to at all, and therefore he, the military attaché, has expenses that are peculiarly incident to this work.

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

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. How much of this money is expended in that way?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. We ask for \$200,000. We reduced the entire estimate of appropriation from \$800,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. SISSON. The amount of this item before we got into the war was very much less than that, was it not?

Mr. WINGO. Yes. It was \$11,000.

Mr. SISSON. Is there any particular reason why you allow such a large sum as this at the present time? Most of this sum, of course, will go to pay the military attachés.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The reply to that question, made by Col. Dunn, in charge of this branch of the service, was that this particular branch of the Government had been allowed to become practically inactive. We had one officer in charge of the Military Intelligence Bureau here in Washington, with these attachés acting without sufficient funds. The experience of the war has proven that the Military Intelligence Department is one of the most important branches of the Army, and we are attempting now to build it up to something like the proportions the country demands. The War Department thinks it should be vastly more than it is.

Mr. SISSON. I understand that in troublous times we must have military attachés, and I can understand the delicacy of such matters in war times, and therefore you put in this item, which can be expended with liberality. But what I am asking the gentleman is, Is not this item very large, even taking that fact into consideration?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The Committee on Military Affairs thinks this is a very moderate sum, upon the showing made before the committee by that department.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, before the war, in former bills, this whole item only represented \$11,000. Why should we change now and say that the contingent expenses of an embassy abroad or any of its staff, including the military and naval at-

tachés, should be appropriated for separate and distinct from the contingent fund of the embassy? There is no authority of law to do it. They never have been paid out of this particular fund, although they have carried this kind of an item for years in the Army bill, but the largest amount ever spent for all these purposes heretofore was \$11,000 before the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. Sisson. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The size of the item has nothing to do with the propriety of the item.

Mr. Sisson. The size of the item was referred to in reply to the suggestion that they have always paid the expenses of these military attachés out of this fund. But \$11,000 would have paid the contingent expenses of very few of them at the rate they propose to allow them.

Mr. Cannon. Mr. Chairman, what is this? A point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. A point of order has been raised. The Chair is trying to get at the facts.

Mr. Cannon. It is on account of the military attaché?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The contention, as the Chair gathers it, is that this is an expense that is not carried in the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. Cannon. Where is it carried, then?

Mr. Wingo. In the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill.

Mr. Cannon. Oh, I am quite sure that the Diplomatic bill never has carried it. These people are in the military service.

Mr. Foster. It is not in the Diplomatic bill at all.

Mr. Cannon. It is not in the Diplomatic bill. When they are assigned to this duty as military attachés, they get the contingent expenses necessary for them to have. They are paid in this bill. They get their salaries from the Army bill.

Mr. McKenzie. Will the chairman of the committee yield for a question?

Mr. Dent. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKenzie. I do not have a copy of the current law before me, but, if the chairman will remember, the officers representing this branch of the Military Establishment asked for some new language enlarging the powers of this department, and in the committee I made a point of order against all new language that was proposed to be interjected into this item; and I now ask the chairman of the committee whether he struck out all the new language, and whether the language in the bill is the language of the current law?

Mr. Dent. It is. This language has been carried in this bill ever since I have been a member of the committee.

Mr. Wingo. It has been stated here that the contingent expenses are not carried in the Diplomatic bill. They are so carried to the tune of over \$1,000,000.

Mr. Foster. For these men?

Mr. Wingo. It includes these men, and out of that fund they have been paid heretofore.

Mr. Foster. Oh, no.

Mr. Miller of Minnesota. The gentleman is mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair ask one or two questions, because a determination of the parliamentary status depends upon a question of fact. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Arkansas to state that these expenses that are referred to here have been paid out of another appropriation and never have been paid out of this appropriation?

Mr. Wingo. My understanding is that heretofore, before the war, this particular branch of the service, which is sought here to be provided with a contingent fund, had a very small contingent fund of only \$11,000, which covered everything; that while it carried the language of these military attachés, students, and interpreters, yet, as a matter of fact, all the contingent expenses of all attachés, clerks, and employees were paid out of the contingent fund of the different embassies and legations. Now it is sought to create a separate contingent fund. That is the position I take.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it the contention of the gentleman from Arkansas that this is not a proper military expense?

Mr. Wingo. That it is not authorized by law; that primarily it is an expense of the Diplomatic Service.

The CHAIRMAN. Why is the payment of a military attaché not a proper military expense?

Mr. Wingo. The payment of his salary is a proper military expense, but this is a contingent expense while he is acting as an attaché at a diplomatic post.

The CHAIRMAN. If he is an Army officer, drawing an Army salary, and incurs a contingent expense, why is not that an Army expense?

Mr. Wingo. He incurs these expenses as an attaché of a diplomatic unit, and his contingent expenses while acting with that diplomatic unit are properly payable out of the contingent expenses of that particular post.

The CHAIRMAN. If a particular Army officer, drawing an Army salary, is assigned to do a particular work, and in connection with that work incurs certain expenses, the Chair can not see why that is not an appropriate Army expense, to be paid out of the contingent allowance for Army expenses. So far as the Chair has been furnished with any information, it has been of an argumentative character; and, dealing with that, the Chair thinks this is clearly an Army expense, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. Wingo. The other point of order which I reserve is on this language, about which there can not be any question that it is not a proper charge against the Military Establishment:

The cost of special instruction at home and abroad, and in maintenance of students and attachés.

These students and interpreters are also cared for out of the contingent fund of the Diplomatic and Consular bill, a fund of over \$1,000,000, and plainly that is not a part of the Military Establishment.

Mr. Miller of Minnesota. If the gentleman will read the language in the Diplomatic and Consular bill he will see that the kind of students there provided for are not at all the kind of students provided for in this paragraph. They have no more connection than a Hottentot has with a New Yorker on Fifth Avenue.

Mr. Wingo. There is a very close connection; that is the kind of students they are.

Mr. Miller of Minnesota. If the gentleman wants to have the facts right, the students provided for in the Diplomatic bill are student interpreters in China and Japan.

Mr. Wingo. Will the gentleman tell me what those students are?

Mr. Miller of Minnesota. If the gentleman can read he can find them for himself. We provide for student interpreters attached to the legations or embassies in China, Japan, and Turkey. Here is a provision in the Diplomatic bill for 10 student interpreters in China and Persia.

Mr. Wingo. The gentleman misses my whole point of order. I am not talking about the pay of these students; I am talking about the contingent fund.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair ask the gentleman, Do these students belong to the Military Establishment?

Mr. Wingo. No.

Mr. Miller of Minnesota. Why, yes; they do.

Mr. Wingo. They are appropriated for in the Diplomatic and Consular bill.

Mr. Anthony. Mr. Chairman, it has been the custom for years, at least before the war, for the Government to send Army officers away for instruction to foreign schools of foreign Governments. They send them there for military instruction. That has not the slightest connection with the Diplomatic and Consular Service.

Mr. Wingo. That is provided for in a different fund. This is contingent expenses of the Military Intelligence Division and General Staff Corps.

Mr. Anthony. How do we pay the expenses of these students?

Mr. Wingo. They are paid out of a specific appropriation.

Mr. Barkley. Does the gentleman contend that the ordinary expenses ought to be paid by the War Department and the contingent expenses paid by the Diplomatic Service?

Mr. Wingo. The contingent expenses are not the same as salaries.

Mr. Cannon. What is the difference between paying salaries as such and the maintenance after you put them on duty? They have to have water; they have to have a place to live.

Mr. Wingo. There is absolutely no difference, but there is a distinction between salaries and a contingent fund, between the contingent fund and maintenance and the pay fund. You specifically provide for the maintenance, and then you undertake to provide that out of the contingency fund you may pay expenses that can not be foreseen.

Mr. Cannon. The expenses, every dollar, must come out of the Treasury Department. If these are to be paid at all, their salary can be paid from this appropriation in the Army bill, and then there must be, according to the gentleman's theory, a second audit of the contingent expenses. If it be true that the contingent expenses are chargeable to the Diplomatic Service, that would be audited by the State Department, so you would have two audits.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Alabama if these students are a part of the Military Establishment?

Mr. DENT. That is my understanding; they are being detailed under the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Military Establishment provides for their pay?

Mr. DENT. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, they are a part of the Military Establishment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some member of the Military Affairs Committee tell us what these students and attachés are. Where is there any authority for the Military Department maintaining students that are not authorized by law?

Mr. ANTHONY. This Government is in the habit of receiving at its service school representatives of foreign governments as a matter of courtesy, and in return we send representatives of our Army to schools in foreign nations for the purpose of keeping up to modern ideas. That practice has prevailed for a number of years to my knowledge.

Mr. MANN. And a proper practice. Are the students referred to here, "maintenance of students and attachés," Army officers?

Mr. ANTHONY. All that I have ever known are Army officers sent over there for instruction, and they come back and bring new ideas.

Mr. MANN. It seems rather queer language, "maintenance of students and attachés." If he is an Army officer, he gets his salary and gets his allowance. How is he maintained in addition to that—out of the contingent fund?

Mr. ANTHONY. I want to say that practically all the military attachés we have sent abroad were the sons of rich men, men able to pay their own expenses.

Mr. MANN. I know; but these are not military attachés.

Mr. ANTHONY. They have their expenses paid.

Mr. MANN. We have already provided in this paragraph for the military attachés sent abroad, but here is an item for the maintenance of students and attachés. I presume, having been in the bill before, no one on the Committee on Military Affairs has asked for information about it.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know what additional information the gentleman wants.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman "thinks, perhaps," and that is all. He has not stated as a fact that these are Army officers sent abroad and maintained by the Government out of the contingent fund.

Mr. ANTHONY. All I know have been Army officers.

Mr. MANN. I know; but I do not know whether the gentleman is talking about what this item refers to.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add that in my experience—and it is not particularly great, not any greater than that of any other Member—I have had opportunity to make inquiry, and I have received information respecting this item. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] tells the literal truth. While the term "students" is used, I do not think it is—

Mr. WINGO. As a matter of fact, you have no authority of law for it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am making a statement, and after a time may be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas. These are officers who were in the capacity of students located in some foreign country. For instance, the gentleman from Kansas cited one. He might be in a school for cavalry in France or in Italy. I would like to especially mention that several of our officers had the very good fortune to be sent to France to study artillery some six years ago, and it was a godsend to America that they went there. That is this class of men. Rather than curtail the item, we ought to enlarge it, because they are the men who have kept our Army in touch with the progress of the military art.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Minnesota state from his own knowledge that this item of maintenance of students refers to that class of officers?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am sure that it does.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman be sure? This is all guesswork.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I can not say that I know it of them all.

Mr. WINGO. The officers the gentleman is talking about are military observers.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Not necessarily.

Mr. WINGO. But they have been.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to answer this question: Can he

refer the Chair to some authority which justifies this item? The point of order has been made, and the burden is upon the chairman of the committee to refer the Chair to some authority that supports it. This thing is taking up a disproportionate amount of time.

Mr. DENT. I can not put my finger upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair will sustain the point of order.

By unanimous consent, Mr. CARAWAY was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: To strike out "\$200,000," in line 13, and substitute "\$114,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, strike out "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$114,000."

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the regular order that the gentleman is demanding?

Mr. DYER. A vote upon the amendment. Debate is exhausted upon this section and all amendments thereto.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is right about that.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment a short time ago. Was it ruled out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman get recognition from the Chair?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Page 3, lines 11 and 12, after the word "attachés," in line 11, strike out the words "and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Minnesota) there were—ayes 25, noes 12.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY OBSERVERS ABROAD.

For the actual and necessary expenses of officers of the Army on duty abroad for the purpose of observing operations of armies of foreign States at war, to be paid upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures were necessary for obtaining military information, \$25,000.

Mr. DYER and Mr. MILLER of Minnesota rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I did not know the gentleman from Minnesota was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I was on my feet before the gentleman, and for that reason I was recognized. Certainly I could not discuss it more intelligently than the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to this part of the bill upon which we are now engaged, and especially because of the action of the House a moment ago in an affirmative vote in view of the motion to reduce expenditures in the preceding paragraph from \$200,000 to \$114,000, and that in the face of the statement made by the chairman of the committee that the amount had already been reduced from the estimate submitted by the War Department from \$800,000 to \$200,000. It seems to me that this is perhaps the most important item in this bill, bar none. It is very difficult for us or for any people to throw off habits long formed, customs, ideas, established usages, and now we must recognize one thing, it seems to me, to start with, and that is that we have a Military Establishment. We have a Military Establishment that has cost a good deal of money. We have one that has just performed a signal service to the country and to the world. Now, we should do, it seems to me, one of two

things, either abolish the Military Establishment, because we do not want it any more and do not care for any service that it can render, or we should support this Military Establishment in a scientific, sensible, and, you might say, sane manner. If we are to do this latter, then we should give heed to the latest military thought and to the experience we have recently had. A fool perhaps can never get wisdom, but the membership of this House certainly represents a very high grade of intelligence, and I am sure we get wisdom from day to day. Officers of the Army, about whom we have heard so much to-day, likewise are a high grade of men, and they get wisdom, so that what they know to-day may be better than what they thought was knowledge yesterday, and so with ourselves. When we entered this war we had a General Staff which had been with us for several years and had done some conspicuously good work, but that which our military men stood aghast at was the fact that in the General Staff work they never recognized that part to which military intelligence belonged. Any observer, any student, any participant in the great war through which we have just passed knows that the most important part of any army, bar none, was the intelligence branch. The German Army had it developed to the highest possible point of efficiency. They indulged in activities and in ways that we do not approve and that we do not propose to imitate, but they had developed their branch of intelligence in their general staff until it was a marvel of efficiency and was the real reason why they were able to do such wonderful things, even though the world was pitted against them. The French, next to the Germans, had the most perfect intelligence branch of their general staff, and in some respects it was as good as the German. It was almost as good, on the whole, and in some branches perhaps superior. It was the bulwark of the allied army. The British Army had no general staff comparable with the German or the French, and in their general staff they had no military intelligence branch worthy of the name. The British Government and the British officers told you, I know, who visited there and studied, as they told me, that one of the things they first had to do was to build up an intelligence branch, and they would that they had started years back to do it; that before any movement, big or little, in offense or defense, could occupy the attention of a commanding officer up to a platoon commander, a battalion commander, or a brigade commander up to an army commander, prepared to do all and his best, the guide for that all was the work of the intelligence branch of the staff.

We have had nothing of the kind in this country. Our Army at the outset had nothing worthy of the name. We have during this war, by reason of appropriations and power in the hands of military officers, built up an intelligence branch that is splendid, to say the least.

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

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

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

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Is it a fact that the greatest intelligence branch of any army in the world was maintained by the Russian Army?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Not in the least degree. The gentleman is certainly misinformed.

Mr. WALSH. That is my information, gathered from reading.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. They had a spy system honeycombed with inefficiency and graft, and it was not worth a single kopeck that they ever paid for it. The German system was infinitely efficient; the French system infinitely efficient and patriotically superb.

As I was saying a moment ago, the British democracy had no intelligence branch on their staff. We had none. We have during this war built up one, and a good one, and now it should be maintained. I repeat it, if I may, for emphasis, that if we are to have an Army at all let us have an Army that is efficient; let us provide them with the instrumentalities they need in order to scientifically do their work. It may be again, as it has been time and again during the last two years, that the lives of many hundreds and even thousands will be saved by the intelligence work of that branch of the staff. We do not want to make war either for offense or defense, but the world knows we will fight if necessary. But if we are going to fight, let us fight with a superior intelligence, as we know we can fight with a supreme courage. And the way to equip ourselves is by the experience which we have had recently, and perpetuate the institution which they have built up—the intelligence branch of the Army,

that requires ramifications out through the countries of the world; that requires a headquarters at Washington; that requires reasonable appropriation; and instead of \$200,000—a paltry sum—they might easily use a million or more.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I certainly will.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman from Minnesota seems to be pretty well posted on this matter. I would like to have him explain to the committee what are the functions of the intelligence department in peace times?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It certainly is a large contract to submit to me in the three or four minutes which I have at my disposal. I could give a catalogue of a great variety of activities. But let me cite the gentleman to this, that we are not now in peace times, quite. We hope to be soon. In peace times you build your military strength. It was in peace times that the intelligence branch of the German Army gathered the material that enabled the German Army to stagger the civilization of the world. It was the accumulation of military intelligence in peace times that enabled the French Army to beat the Hun, with all their efficiency and intelligence and strength. It seems to me the part of wisdom on our part that we should maintain this branch of the Military Establishment, this modern and most extremely important branch of our Army.

There is one other subject I want to say a word on, because I do not want to trespass on the time of the committee, before I leave. We have had a great deal of discussion in the past two days on military matters. It is not surprising that gentlemen will differ on many of the principles involved in our military system and our military life. I have noted, however, with some degree of concern, as others have, perhaps all of you, the general disposition to find fault and complain at this hour. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon] entertained us with a very vigorous exposition of his views, and whether or not we agree with him, we are all ready to take off our hats to him and say, "Gordon, you always stand by your convictions and you let the world know where you stand." [Applause.] I like that kind of a fighter, and not the kind of man who in private will say a thing and come out in public and try to dodge it because he thinks somebody will not like his position. It seems to me if we are going to gather one further lesson from the war of recent times we have got to change another habit which we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel like asking the committee for an extension. So this nugget of wisdom I will postpone for some other time.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may have five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman from Minnesota will not take the time now.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am very grateful to my friend from Pennsylvania, but I do think the committee should read a while.

Mr. MANN. We have read scarcely three pages of this bill. It is much more important to pass the bill, from the point of view of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], than to talk about it, although we always love to hear the gentleman talk.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman will permit, I was led to make the observations I made for fear some gentleman would move to strike out this item here. I thought some one would be encouraged to take the whole life, soul, and breeches out of it.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

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

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

Mr. MANN. I want to know something about this item. This item is to pay the expenses of observing operations of the war abroad. Will the gentleman say it is submitted merely as an item for possible use, or is it submitted with the expectation that it will be actually used, the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I think it is fair to state that it is a possible contingency. I do not think any money was used in the last two years of this war out of this appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I supposed it was an appropriation to be used if a situation arose where it would be necessary.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota always speaks interestingly, and usually accurate is the information that he gives. But I think his criticism is unjust when he accuses me of striking the life out of the item for the Intelligence Department. I think I have had occasion, perhaps, to know as much about the Intelligence Bureau as the gentleman. I have a dear friend who is connected with that bureau, and I suspect I know as much about it as the gentleman from Minnesota, and I admire the work of that bureau as much as he does; but when we give them ten times as much as they have had heretofore for the purchase of law books and books of reference and subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, and things like that, I think we have been pretty liberal. We have not cut the life out of it when, where they had heretofore only \$11,000, we give them for contingent expenses—not for salaries, but little expenses that can not be classified and appropriated for in advance—when we give them over ten times as much, or \$103,000 more, than they ever had before. I think they can get along very well on that sum for contingent expenses, and I think they may be ready to cut down to such extent as may be necessary, the same as any other department.

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

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman suppose it will be possible at any place to make a reduction in the amount of a billion dollars or a hundred million dollars in this bill without somebody crying, even if it amounts to only 50 cents, that the whole country will be destroyed?

Mr. WINGO. No. I expect there will be a howl. The remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota remind me of the fact that it is hard to get away from old ideas. It is hard to get men in public office to cease thinking that the only way they can maintain the efficiency of their offices is to continue to add to their appropriations. That is a vital fault in men who have enthusiasm for their work, or for their bureau or department—to reach out and get more funds. Such men frequently think that the possibilities of good service to the Government are only limited by the amount which they can get out of the Treasury for their activities.

I do not complain of that. It is for us to pass upon the necessity of each case, and I, knowing what I do about the intelligence department, feel that I am about \$100,000 extravagant when I favor giving them \$114,000 for a contingent fund.

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

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I heartily agree with the philosophy of the gentleman, that he has stated so ably; but it is a peculiarity of the Military Intelligence Section that its work is largely contingent, is it not?

Mr. WINGO. No.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. What we know as the Military Intelligence Section makes studies of various conditions—social, economic, political, and military—in the countries with which we may be at war. That is one of their functions.

Mr. WINGO. Well, you may name almost anything and I will agree that it is included in what the intelligence department believes are its functions. I know one of those gentlemen, and I love him, and he thinks he has authority to investigate and look into almost anything.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. We have in this branch of work little that is distinctly routine, that can be foreseen and provided for to the last detail. It is to a large extent contingent, is it not? It is a diffusive study.

Mr. WINGO. No. I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman in his idea at first blush, but if you get down to it you will find that they can reasonably anticipate any expenditure by classification, if not by particular detail.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I thought that one of their functions was to follow the current of affairs that might unexpectedly develop in any country as to which we were interested in having information.

Mr. WINGO. They will do that, anyway.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. They will have to do it, even if they incur a deficiency.

Mr. WINGO. Does not the gentleman think that \$114,000 will give them all the law books and magazines and periodicals they need to read? Their traveling expenses are taken care of. Their automobiles are furnished. Their telephone and telegraphic bills are paid. Appropriations are made for everything—traveling allowances, subsistence, commutation of quarters, and everything else. What is there that you do not cover?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Do they not have some agents abroad?

Mr. WINGO. Oh, yes; they have agents abroad, and they are taken care of.

Mr. DENT. I thought we had disposed of that.

Mr. WINGO. I did, too; but my genial friend from Minnesota resurrected it after we had gone by it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SERVICE SCHOOLS.

To provide means for the theoretical and practical instruction at the Army service schools (including the Army Staff College, the Army School of the Line, the Army Field Engineer School, the Army Field Service School and Correspondence School for Medical Officers, and the Army Signal School) at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., the Mounted Service School at Fort Riley, Kans., and the School of Fire for Field Artillery, and for the Infantry School of Arms at Fort Sill, Okla., by the purchase of textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, the purchase of modern instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction, employment of temporary, technical, or special services, and for all other absolutely necessary expenses, to be allotted in such proportion as may, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, be for the best interests of the military service. Not exceeding \$300 per month may be used for the payment of \$100 per month to a translator at the Army Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., \$100 per month to a translator at the School of Fire for Field Artillery and \$100 per month to a translator at the Infantry School of Arms, Fort Sill, Okla., to be appointed by the commandants of the schools named, with the approval of the Secretary of War, \$75,000.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information. I will ask the chairman of the committee what is the necessity for the provision from lines 11 to 18, inclusive? It may be very proper, but I want to know what is the necessity for it. What is the need of these translators out at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.? Are they Indian translators, or what are they?

Mr. DENT. The testimony before the committee on that subject was that these men were doing very valuable service out there. I will ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] to explain that.

Mr. WINGO. What translators are they?

Mr. ANTHONY. They are translators whose services are used in translating military books and publications in foreign languages for the benefit of the student officers who are detailed from various branches of the Army.

Mr. WINGO. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. While we are on this item I want to make a statement for the information of the House. If there is one branch of the military service that has demonstrated its great value and utility in the present war, it has been the service schools that are provided for in this paragraph. Some of the Members of the House have, thoughtlessly perhaps, made observations reflecting upon some of the graduates of these schools. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] the other day, for instance, rather unfairly, I thought, referred to the "Leavenworth clique," meaning the graduates of the service school at Leavenworth, when he referred to some of the injustices that had befallen officers of the National Guard in France. The gentleman overlooked the fact that because of the operation of the service schools for the past 20 years, when this country finally got into the great war it found it had a considerable body of highly trained officers who were not only the peer and the equal of the high ranking officers of the armies of the other great nations of the world but that we had an abundance of men skilled in military strategy and the art of war who were the superiors of the men in any of the armies of Europe with whom they had to cope. And because they had received the benefit of the wonderful training provided by these service schools it happens that a very large percentage of the commanders of our army corps, of our divisions and our brigades, were graduates of the Leavenworth service schools, placed in these high commands because of their splendid qualifications, all the result of the advanced education afforded by these schools.

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

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KREIDER. How are the men appointed to these schools, or how do they enter the service?

Mr. ANTHONY. The men are detailed by the Secretary of War. It has been the custom to detail at least one officer from each regiment to attend the particular service school which covers the branch of the Army to which he is assigned.

Mr. KREIDER. Are these men limited to graduates of West Point?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; they are not. In fact, the service schools are partially intended to take in hand men who need brushing up, as well as men who have special qualifications for higher study, and who are given opportunities to broaden their military education at these institutions.

Mr. KREIDER. Are they chosen from the privates?

Mr. ANTHONY. Many of them have risen to commissions from the ranks. The gentleman understands that they are already officers of the Army before they are assigned to these schools.

Mr. KREIDER. Commissioned or noncommissioned?

Mr. ANTHONY. Commissioned officers. They are selected for the purpose of bringing them up to the very latest and most advanced methods of the art of war, so that they shall have a much greater knowledge of the handling of troops in larger bodies than the training with the ordinary organizations of the line with which they have heretofore been trained. They are given the very latest developments in the higher branches of military strategy, and it was due to this splendid education that these men were able to so satisfactorily solve the great problems they were called upon to face in Europe. Our service schools, and particularly the School of the Line and Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, have proven to have been tremendous assets and to have contributed largely to the splendid laurels achieved by American arms on European battle fields.

Mr. FIELDS. Of course, this may be properly termed a post-graduate course in military science, may it not?

Mr. ANTHONY. Absolutely; a postgraduate course in military tactics. It is brought to them from all corners of the earth. As I said, nearly 75 per cent of the men in the high command of our forces were graduates of these schools. They not only themselves were qualified, but immediately after the Army went to France they established a staff school at Langres, France, and practically every one of the instructors and directors and officers of the Langres staff school were graduates of the Leavenworth service schools. They there took charge of the advanced training of the officers of the National Guard and of the National Army who had no previous higher military education or experience in staff duties in handling large units of men, and in a comparatively short time they were fit for high command. When the history of this war is written these service schools will naturally be given credit for much of this great work.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. At this juncture, when we have been talking about students, I think the committee will indulge me with time enough to tell—and it will only take a few minutes—of a brilliant student, the son of James D. Hughes, of Toronto, Canada. He was a very brilliant young man, who answered the call soon after the war broke out and paid the supreme sacrifice. Somebody in speaking of the war referred to the deaths as the feeding of the guns, and some one else spoke about not being willing to raise their sons for the Army. Dr. Hughes, with that in mind, wrote a few verses dedicated to his son. The verses were printed in the European edition of the New York Herald, and I would like to read them.

THE SON.

(By Dr. James D. Hughes.)

God gave my son in trust to me;
Christ died for him, and he should be
A man for Christ. He is his own
And God's and man's; not mine alone.
He was not mine to "give." He gave
Himself that he might help to save
All that a Christian should revere,
All that enlightened men hold dear.

"To feed the guns!" Oh, torpid soul!
Awake, and see life as a whole.
When freedom, honor, justice, right,
Were threatened by the despot's might,
With heart aflame and soul alight
He bravely went for God to fight
Against base savages whose pride
The laws of God and man defied;
Who slew the mother and her child,
Who maidens pure and sweet defiled.
He did not go "to feed the guns."
He went to save from ruthless Huns
His home and country, and to be
A guardian of democracy.

"What if he does not come?" you say?
Ah, well! My sky would be more gray,
But through the clouds the sun would shine
And vital memories be mine.
God's test of manhood is, I know,
Not "Will he come?" but "Did he go?"
My son well knew that he might die,
And yet he went, with purpose high,
To fight for peace and overthrow
The plans of Christ's relentless foe.

He dreaded not the battle field;
He went to make fierce vandals yield.
If he comes not again to me
I shall be sad; but not that he
Went like a man—a hero true—
His part unselfishly to do.
My heart will feel exultant pride
That for humanity he died.

"Forgotten grave!" This selfish plea
Awakes no deep response in me,
For, though his grave I may not see,
My boy will ne'er forgotten be;
My real son can never die;
'Tis but his body that may lie
In foreign land, and I shall keep
Remembrance fond, forever deep
Within my heart of my true son,
Because of triumph that he won.
It matters not where anyone
May lie and sleep when work is done.

It matters not where some men live;
If my dear son his life must give,
Hosannas I will sing for him,
E'en though my eyes with tears be dim.
And when the war is over, when
His gallant comrades come again,
I'll cheer them as they're marching by,
Rejoicing that they did not die.
And when his vacant place I see
My heart will bound with joy that he
Was mine so long—my fair, young son—
And cheer for him whose work is done.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

CONTINGENCIES, HEADQUARTERS OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS, DISTRICTS,
AND TACTICAL COMMANDS.

For contingent expenses at the headquarters of the several territorial departments, territorial districts, tactical divisions and brigades, including the Staff Corps serving thereat, being for the purchase of the necessary articles of office, toilet, and desk furniture, stationery, ice, and potable water for office use when necessary, binding, maps, technical books of reference, professional and technical newspapers and periodicals, payment for which may be made in advance, and police utensils, to be allotted by the Secretary of War, and to be expended in the discretion of the commanding officers of the several military departments, districts, and tactical commands, \$15,000.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to ask the chairman or some member of the Military Committee where the provision comes in for the purchase and maintenance of the automobiles used by Army officers.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. There is an item for transportation for the Army later in the bill, on page 29, and all the automobiles under the new organization are purchased by one authority.

Mr. FLOOD. Does it provide that these generals and colonels shall have a separate automobile for their personal use?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. No, sir.

Mr. FLOOD. How many passenger automobiles are assigned especially for the use of Army officers in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I asked that very question of an officer in charge of the Motor Transport Service of the Army, and he stated that the total number of automobiles assigned for the use of the officers of the Army in the District of Columbia were less than 200.

Mr. FLOOD. Less than 200! What use have they for 200 passenger automobiles?

Mr. TREADWAY. If the gentleman will yield, I had a letter to-day from Gen. Drake, who is the officer the gentleman from Nebraska refers to, and I am quite certain that the number he gives was 260 or 246 used in this city, 120 in use in New York, and various numbers in other places. I also asked Gen. Drake a few days ago what the consumption of gasoline was by these specially assigned cars in Washington, and he said it was 1,068 gallons a day for the use of the Motor Transport Service. It is nothing more or less than a free taxi service.

Mr. FLOOD. What I was asking about was the number of passenger automobiles that are paid for out of the appropriations made in this bill and used by Army officers.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is the information I am endeavoring to give the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. My information accords with the gentleman's.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not mean to say that there are 260 passenger automobiles in the Adjutant General's Department?

Mr. TREADWAY. That is the inquiry the gentleman made.

Mr. FLOOD. No; I mean in the entire War Department.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. I made a subsequent inquiry which the gentleman answered in reference to the number of automobiles used by officers in the War Department in Washington.

Mr. KAHN. In all the departments?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. And now it seems there are two hundred and sixty-odd.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I presume the definite figures have been given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. When I asked the question in the committee hearing

evidently they had not been computed, for they said there were less than 200.

Mr. FLOOD. Is this bill going to carry an appropriation authorizing the use of any such number of automobiles by Army officers in the city of Washington?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. This bill does not authorize nor does our committee attempt to determine the number of automobiles that shall be assigned to these different departments from the appropriation. We appropriate a certain amount of money for the Motor Transport Corps, and it is up to the departments to use those automobiles where they think they are essential to the conduct of the Army.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Who is the officer who is responsible for assigning these automobiles as they have been assigned in the past?

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

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The information that is given to the committee is that now the purchase of automobiles is concentrated in one department of the Army, called the Purchase, Storage, and Traffic Division, in which they purchase all of the automobiles and automobile trucks, and everything of an automobile character, for the Army, and any bureau requiring those vehicles must apply to that particular department for them. Then this particular division, the Purchase, Storage, and Traffic Division, as I understand it, passes upon the necessity for those vehicles for that particular bureau applying, and when it is to the satisfaction of the Division of Purchase, Storage, and Traffic, and it goes up to the Chief of Staff, and I suppose eventually may be approved by the Secretary of War, the automobiles are purchased.

Mr. FLOOD. Is there nothing in this bill to prohibit that?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say to the gentleman that I do not think this committee can undertake to say how many automobiles should be used, whether a certain officer shall have one or not. That is a matter for the administration of the Army.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Does not the Congress appropriate for certain officials that it thinks should have automobiles?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. No.

Mr. FLOOD. It does for the Secretary of War and other Cabinet officers, and if there is any reason why Army officers should have automobiles at Government expense, why should not an explicit appropriation be made for that purpose?

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

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think perhaps this may be giving a wrong impression if it gives the impression that each officer has an individual automobile—

Mr. FLOOD. A great many of them have. I have a list of them who have automobiles assigned to them individually.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That, of course, turns, just as my colleague says, upon the responsibility of those who are in command of the Army.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That they need them.

Mr. FLOOD. Congress ought to fix it so that no one, however high in command, can have the right to assign them.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Does the gentleman think that he or I can determine whether The Adjutant General of the Army ought to have an automobile?

Mr. FLOOD. I think I can determine it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think I can determine it.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I have very great respect for the ability of these gentlemen, but I doubt if they can do that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can not the gentleman say whether or not every morning from 9 to 9.30 o'clock the streets of Washington should be filled with automobiles carrying young officers, 26 or 27 years of age, who are lolling around the cars, whistling, smoking, being taken down to their offices, when God knows it would do them a lot of good to get out and walk? The streets are full of automobiles lugging these loafers down to their offices.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have confirmed the statement I made a few moments ago by telephoning to my office in reference to the letter to which I referred. This letter states that in the District of Columbia there are 260 passenger automobiles in use by the Army. One hundred and fifty-two of them

are in general service in this city, leaving a balance of 108, which, I take it, are especially assigned to particular officers. Just what he meant by that I am not certain, but 152 of them are in general service. The total in use is 260. The consumption of gasoline is 1,068 gallons per day, which would mean, at 25 cents, a cost of over \$250 a day for gasoline alone, to say nothing of the upkeep of the cars and the paying of the men to drive them.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman state the cost of these automobiles to the Government?

Mr. TREADWAY. The upkeep of them is all I was referring to. The price of gasoline alone would be \$250 a day for the convenience of men riding around the streets of Washington. Some of these men are assigned chauffeurs, and I think that we figure that the cost of each man is about \$2,000 a year. Is it not?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The chauffeur draws the pay of his rank, whatever it may be.

Mr. TREADWAY. He is a private, probably, and he draws a private's pay, as well as the cost of his clothing and his board and general expenses.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. But it costs the same as any other soldier.

Mr. TREADWAY. It costs the same as any other soldier. These cars cost the Government not less than \$150 to \$200 per month, and two-thirds of them are used as a convenience to certain officers, and they specify those that they care for or want. That is all they are good for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

That purchase and exchange of typewriting machines, to be paid for from this appropriation, may be made at the special price allowed to schools teaching stenography and typewriting without obligating typewriter companies to supply these machines to all departments of the Government at the same price.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. WINGO. Well, I make the point of order on the paragraph. It is plainly subject to the point of order.

Mr. DENT. What is the paragraph?

Mr. WINGO. Purchase of typewriting machines; page 6.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the chairman desire to say?

Mr. DENT. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I offer the customary provision we put in other bills covering this very question.

Mr. STAFFORD. Before the Chair rules—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked the chairman of the committee if he wished to say anything on the point of order, and he said he conceded it; therefore, the Chair sustained the point of order. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 12 insert the following paragraph:

That no part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used during the fiscal year 1920 for the purchase of any typewriting machine at a price in excess of the lowest price paid by the Government of the United States for the same make and substantially the same model of machine during the fiscal year 1918; such price shall include the value of any typewriting machine or machines given in exchange, but shall not apply to special prices granted on typewriting machines used in schools of the District of Columbia or of the Indian Service, the lowest of which special prices paid for typewriting machines shall not be exceeded in future purchases for such schools: *Provided*, That in construing this section the Commissioner of Patents shall advise the Comptroller of the Treasury as to whether the changes in any typewriter are of such structural character as to constitute a new machine not within the limitations of this section.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman makes the point of order, I am ready to be heard.

Mr. DENT. I make the point of order.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, the provision is a limitation upon expenses. It was passed on about three different times in the last two years. It is the identical language which Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Courts, of the Committee on Appropriations, worked out several years ago to cover this question. It is carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill and it has been carried in other bills heretofore, and it is plainly in order on the ground it is a limitation that actually worked out a saving of thousands of dollars. Under the Holman rule it is plainly in order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman withhold the order for about three minutes?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman is going to reserve the point of order—well, go ahead, we will save time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas has just made a point of order against a paragraph that would have resulted in a distinct saving to the Government, but he now substitutes a provision that will entail additional expense on the Government. He has offered as an amendment a provision that has been carried for a number of years in the legislative appropriation bill granting a privilege to the Government in the purchase of its typewriting machines at a special price, but the provision which he offers does not extend the privilege of the lowest price for these typewriting machines that is granted to schools. That was the purpose of the paragraph carried in the report of the committee. It was intended that in this Coast Artillery school all typewriters which were to be used in that school were to be furnished at the special price accorded by manufacturers of typewriters to schools generally.

Now he proposes as an amendment a provision that does not grant to this school the rate that is extended to schools generally. I think the gentleman was under a misapprehension of the facts when he made the point of order and when he offered this new amendment. I know he is sincere in his desire to economize, but I think he should withdraw his point of order on the paragraph that is carried in the bill and withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Why should this department have a provision in the bill and get a lower price on its typewriters than various other branches of the Government?

Mr. STAFFORD. The typewriting concerns have established a special price for typewriters—

Mr. WALSH. But that was not my inquiry.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am answering the gentleman in my own way. For typewriters when used by typewriting schools generally. Then the legislative bill carries a provision providing for the purchase of typewriting machines at a price that has been fixed for some years by the manufacturers. But that price is still higher than the price the typewriting machine companies supply the machines to schools for. This provision here was to sell to the artillery school these machines at the same price for which they agreed to supply them to the schools generally.

Mr. WALSH. What is the use of purchasing the typewriters? They have enough there now to build a fence with.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentleman would have been consistent if he had made a point of order and had stood pat.

Mr. WALSH. I do not know what the gentleman means by "standing pat."

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is young in politics, or otherwise he would be thoroughly versed in that technical phrase.

Mr. WINGO. Is the gentleman going to insist on his point of order? I am ready for the Chair to rule on it. I shall not take the time of the committee, except in reply to the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The gentleman is in error when he thinks that the provision that went out on my point of order is a saving. It has been tried and found not to be a saving. The provision that I offered was a provision that was included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill that we passed, and is in the identical language worked out by Mr. Chairman Fitzgerald of the Appropriations Committee several years ago. There is not any justification for the typewriter companies to refuse to furnish to every department of the Government typewriters at the lowest price that they furnish them to any department of the Government.

But if they furnish machines to one branch of the Military Establishment at a certain price, I can not understand why they can not furnish the same machines to every other branch of the Government at the same price. I think the gentleman was mistaken when he said that this item would have saved money.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no question but what this would have saved money.

Mr. WINGO. I did not rely upon my own information, but I went to those whom I thought knew, and they said it would not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman state who those persons are?

Mr. WINGO. And it would nullify the provision I have offered, which is in the legislative bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Who are those persons who said it would not?

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman can easily ascertain. I know what the typewriter companies have been trying to get. The Auditor of the Treasury has passed upon this question, and under his rulings we saved \$5 a machine on every machine the Government bought.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WINGO. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 12, yeas 22.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. A point of order was made and sustained on the paragraph beginning with line 14 down to line 19. Does that include line 13?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order, as the Chair has it marked in the bill, includes line 13.

Mr. WINGO. Thirteen to nineteen.

Mr. MANN. If the Clerk has it that way, all right; but the question has arisen lately, and has bothered the man in enrolling the bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER.
SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY.

Telegraph and telephone systems: Purchase, equipment, operation, and repair of military telegraph, telephone, radio, cable, and signaling systems; signal equipments and stores, field glasses, telescopes, heliographs, signal lanterns, flags, and other necessary instruments; wind vanes, barometers, anemometers, thermometers, and other meteorological instruments; motorcycles, motor-driven and other vehicles for technical and official purposes in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of communication or signaling systems, and supplies for their operation and maintenance; professional and scientific books of reference, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, and maps for use in the office of the Chief Signal Officer; telephone apparatus, including rental and payment for commercial, exchange, message, trunk line, long distance, and leased line telephone service at or connecting any post, camp, cantonment, depot, arsenal, headquarters, hospital, aviation station, or other office or station of the Army, excepting local telephone service for the various bureaus of the War Department in the District of Columbia and toll messages pertaining to the office of the Secretary of War; electric time service; the rental of commercial telegraph lines and equipment and their operation at or connecting any post, camp, cantonment, depot, arsenal, headquarters, hospital, aviation station, or other office or station of the Army, but not including payment for individual telegraph messages transmitted over commercial lines; electrical installations and maintenance at military posts, cantonments, camps, and stations of the Army; fire control and direction apparatus and matériel for Field Artillery; salaries of civilian employees, including those necessary as instructors at vocational schools; supplies, general repairs, reserve supplies, and other expenses connected with the collecting and transmitting of information for the Army by telegraph or otherwise; experimentation and research for the purpose of developing improvements in apparatus and methods of signaling, including machines, instruments, and other equipment for laboratory and repair purposes; purchase, lease, construction, alterations, and repair for such buildings required for storing or guarding Signal Corps supplies, equipment, and personnel when not otherwise provided for, including the land therefor, the introduction of water, electric light and power, sewerage, grading; roads and walks, and other equipment required, \$4,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the word "purchase," on page 6, line 22; and on page 8, in line 9, I make the point of order against the word "purchase" and the word "construction."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DENT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Creating, maintaining, and operating at technical schools and colleges, and at established flying schools, courses of instruction for aviation students, including cost of construction, equipment, and supplies necessary for instruction and subsistence of students, and excluding pay of military instructors and extra pay allowed candidates for commission (cadets) while at flying schools; extra pay allowed candidates for commission (cadets) while at flying schools; vocational training in trades related to aviation, including the employment of necessary civilian instructors, purchase of tools, equipment, materials, machines, textbooks, books of reference, scientific and professional papers, and instruments and material for theoretical and practical instruction at aviation schools; purchase of supplies for securing, developing, printing, and reproducing photographs made by aerial observers; purchase of aviation supplies and equipment to be furnished Air Service organizations to be established during the year, and to maintain and replace the equipment of organizations already in service; establishment, enlargement, equipment, maintenance, and operation of aviation stations, balloon schools, fields for testing and experimental work, including the acquisition of land or any interest in land, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise; improvement of such land and making same suitable for the purpose intended; procuring and introducing water, electric light and power, telephones, telegraphs, and sewerage; purchase of stoves and other cooking and heating apparatus, kitchen and table ware, and furniture and equipment for kitchens, mess halls, officers' quarters, barracks, hospitals, and other buildings, screens, lockers, refrigerators, and all other equipment; purchase, manufacture, and installation of all kinds of machinery, tools, material, supplies, and equipment for repair and maintenance of aircraft, buildings, and improvements of aviation stations and balloon schools, and testing and experimental stations, or property or appliances used in connection with aviation at home and abroad; payment of mileage to officers of the Army traveling on duty in connection with aviation; salaries and wages of civilian employees in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as may be necessary, and payment of their traveling and other necessary expenses; actual and necessary expenses of officers and enlisted

men and civilian employees of the Army and authorized agents sent on special duty at home and abroad for aviation purposes, including observation and investigation of foreign military operations and organizations; experimental investigation and purchase and development of new types of aircraft; necessary expenses incidental to the administration of the Air Service; all damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad, \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That claims not exceeding \$250 in amount for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post and approved by the Director of Military Aeronautics: *Provided, however*, That the claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of \$150,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire first as to the necessity, at the beginning of the paragraph, of "creating, maintaining, and operating at technical schools and colleges and at established flying schools courses of instruction for aviation students." Why should we provide here for sending Army boys to technical schools and colleges? How much of it is proposed to be done?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will state to the gentleman that they have a practice of sending certain students to highly developed technical schools in certain mechanical lines, like the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in Boston, to give certain instruction that those institutions give better and more cheaply to the Government than we could afford to establish ourselves schools to give that sort of instruction.

Mr. MANN. If it is limited to that, I can see a good reason for that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That is the purpose stated.

Mr. MANN. The War Department some time ago entered upon quite a program of sending people to schools throughout the country, most of which was useless extravagance. Is it proposed to continue that through this item, or is it simply to take men who are already in the Army in the Aviation Corps and send them to technical schools?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. That was the information given to the committee, that there were certain men in the service that might require this special technical instruction, and this was to give them the power and the authority to send them there.

Mr. MANN. Well, connected with the language in line 16, providing for "vocational training in trades related to aviation," of course, they might start to educate anybody they pleased, in or out of the Army. Now, what do they propose?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I have no information about that, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois. I do not think the committee was given any information as to what was contemplated there.

Mr. MANN. Of course, I know how these items get into the bill. During the war probably there was occasion for all this language, but now that the war is over there is probably no reason why the General Government should undertake to teach everybody in the country through the payment of tuition and expenses. It seems to me that where it is practicable we ought to begin to eliminate from the Army bill language which was expressly emergency language for the war.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I agree with the gentleman as to that.

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

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It seems to me that the language in the opening section does not refer to what the gentleman on the Committee on Military Affairs referred to at all. It refers to establishing, creating, and maintaining courses of instruction, not maintaining students at those places at all. It seems to be designed to support courses of instruction in these various institutions rather than to send students there for education.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the word "creating" mean here? Does it mean creating schools?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Courses of instruction.

Mr. MANN. Connected with the rest of the language, "including cost of construction, equipment, and supplies necessary for instruction and subsistence of students, and excluding pay of military instructors and extra pay allowed candidates for commission (cadets)," I could not understand what that meant after reading it over a good many times, because it is followed by "extra pay allowed candidates for commission (cadets) while at flying schools."

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The reason for that particular language is, as I understand it, this: There had been at one time an allowance of pay of \$100 a month to these cadets who were students in the schools learning to fly, and later that law was

changed so that these cadets received only the pay of enlisted men, if that was their rank. The statement was made to our committee that these men, while they were being trained, were in the most hazardous position, that they were the men who principally got hurt.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is now seeking to explain the reason for a part of the language in the bill. But here is what I direct his attention to:

Excluding pay of military instructors and extra pay allowed candidates for commission (cadets) while at flying schools.

And then in the next line:

Extra pay allowed candidates for commission (cadets) while at flying schools.

First, you exclude it and then you include it in identically the same language. First you say it is not, and then you say it is.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I know the reason for the appropriation was given to us, that those men should receive that pay for the reason I stated. Why it should also be excluded I can not say.

Mr. MANN. I should like to ask the gentleman in reference to giving authority to enlarge the aviation stations, to buy new land and improve it as they please, and construct all the buildings they may choose to construct upon it. Is it not time for us now to say to the Army, "If you want to buy new land for a station, tell us what it is and tell the committee what you want"? If they want to construct a lot of new buildings, instead of giving to them \$10,000,000 to use as they please, when we know that as we now see it—possibly not as we would have seen it if the war had continued, but as we now see it—there have been cases of gross extravagance in the purchase of land which was not needed.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say to the gentleman that I think it was the intention of the committee to give no authority for the purchase of more land for these aviation training schools.

Mr. KAHN. Except in those cases, as I recall, where the negotiations for the purchase had been practically concluded.

Mr. MANN. But this is for the next fiscal year. If they have concluded negotiations for the purchase of land without any money to pay for it, they ought to come before Congress and ask for the money for that purchase and not try to slip it into the bill.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I will say to the gentleman that this appropriation of \$10,000,000, as he can readily see, is simply an estimate or guess. The department came before us asking for this purpose \$17,337,000.

Mr. MANN. Oh, of course, the original estimate, and probably the language in the bill, were drawn before the armistice was agreed upon.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Probably. Now, if I may state, the principal item which induced the committee to grant the money was the experiment and research item. That is, they represented to us that they needed a goodly sum to carry on research work in this great field.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. They asked for balloon research and building \$1,600,000, and then they had a general item for the purchase of undeveloped types of balloons, \$2,000,000. The sum of the items amounted to about \$14,000,000. The committee decided that these items were such as should be given a rather liberal appropriation, so we fixed on a general sum of \$10,000,000, thinking it would be sufficient to carry on this work.

Mr. MANN. I congratulate the Committee on Military Affairs. Aviation in the Army is more important than it is in the Navy. The Naval Committee brought in an item of \$25,000,000, which the House reduced to \$15,000,000. These two combined items will make \$25,000,000 for experimental purposes, which is a very big sum of money.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. A vast sum of money.

Mr. STAFFORD. It ought to be all under one head.

Mr. MANN. Now, on page 11 it provides that all damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad may be paid out of the \$10,000,000 appropriation. It uses the word "all." Then it includes a proviso that claims not exceeding \$250 in amount for damages to persons and private property, resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad, may be settled out of the funds appropriated in this bill. What object is there in having the first provision as to the payment of "all" damages to persons if the \$250 proviso is to stay in the bill?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. It seems to me that it is contradictory language; first, it gives unlimited authority and then limits it to \$250 in each case.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on page 10, line 2, against the word "enlargement," also against the language beginning in line 4, page 10, "including the acqui-

tion of land or any interest in land by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise; improvement of such land and making same suitable for the purpose intended."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit me before he makes the point of order? Would the general language "establishment, equipment, maintenance, and operation of aviation stations, balloon schools, fields for testing and experimental work," not grant authority to the department to purchase land? It says "establishment of aviation stations, balloon schools, fields for testing and experimental work."

Mr. MANN. I do not know. It may be that the comptroller would hold that it would, but my opinion—I had not thought about that part of it—was that they might establish some of these stations on land that the Government now owns, or at some military camp, and that might be a very proper thing to do; but they would not seek to enlarge them, except by the purchase of new land. I do not think we ought to start in on enlarging appropriations to give the department authority now to spend money as they please to buy land.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not a fact that the department has a large number of fields at this time?

Mr. MANN. I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I further reserve the point of order to make other points of order.

Mr. SUMNERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS. Under existing law the Government has leased the ground, where it has constructed very extensive improvements. In fact, I think most of the flying fields in this country are occupying leased ground, upon which the Government has an option of purchase. I presume the contracts of purchase are made under existing law. Does the gentleman think the point of order would lie against the proposed appropriation under which the Government would be permitted to purchase the land upon which it had taken an option under existing law?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War appeared before the committee and assured us that for all the existing training camps and aviation fields they have the money appropriated by this Congress to complete the purchases if they determine to do so. This money would be for the purpose of buying entire new projects.

Mr. MANN. I do not suppose, as a matter of fact, that when the language was drafted under certain conditions that under existing conditions they would ask it. But, notwithstanding, I do not think it is a good thing to keep it in the bill.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I think the committee will accept the gentleman's suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a further point of order against the language on page 11, beginning in line 5, "All damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad." I think the proviso ought not to remain in.

Mr. DENT. I think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Just a moment, if the gentleman will yield. This is not an unusual provision to carry, or, at least, it is not unique.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Mississippi will pardon me, I do not know that I should make the point of order if there was no other language in the bill, but it goes on to insert a proviso that is exactly contradictory.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I think that came about in this way. This same provision with some limitation is carried in the river and harbor appropriation bill. It is for this reason: Sometimes they will, in the improvement and operations of the boats for the Government, smash a little boat, say, valued at \$50.

Mr. MANN. We do not, if the gentleman will permit me, in the river and harbor bill carry an unlimited authority to any department to settle the claims for damages.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. This is not unlimited.

Mr. MANN. The language to which I have made the point of order is unlimited.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I see his point now.

Mr. MANN. I know how it came about; somebody wrote the first provision, and then somebody else put in a proviso without looking at the first provision.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I was under a misapprehension.

Mr. GORDON. I think, Mr. Chairman, that these two provisions are not necessarily in conflict. In the first place, there is the damage claim. Then it limits the amount that may be paid on any one claim to \$250.

Mr. MANN. First it says all damages, but the proviso covers the whole case.

Mr. GORDON. That is true; but it simply limits the authority of the department to settle any one claim.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

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

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "at technical schools and colleges and," to be found on page 9, lines 8 and 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman will move to strike it out, I will accept such an amendment.

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

By unanimous consent Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. McKEOWN were granted leave to extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, let us finish the paragraph.

Mr. MADDEN. You will never get through with it. When they get through with the points of order we propose to move to strike it out so as to have it rewritten and confine it to the work that should be done under the law.

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.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to serve notice now that it is my intention to-morrow morning to call up for consideration the conference report upon the war-contract bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama gives notice that he will call up the conference report on the war-contract bill to-morrow morning.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 14, 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 Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting list of documents received and the number distributed by the Department of Labor during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1789); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of State submitting deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Department of State for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1790); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Education for traveling expenses, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1791); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1792); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required

by the Commissioner of Pensions for the purchase of metal file boxes for filing papers in pension claims, fiscal year, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1793); 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. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12880) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1064), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOREMUS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15551) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Light-house Service, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1065), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3392) for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1067), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4187) authorizing Anton Hiersche to select other land in lieu of land now owned by him, required for reclamation purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1066), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 15915) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Arkansas City, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 15916) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Toronto, Jefferson County, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 15917) for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a post-office building, courthouse, and other Government offices at Spartanburg, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SUMNERS: A bill (H. R. 15918) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause survey to be made of the Trinity River and its tributaries in Texas, with a view to controlling the flood waters of said stream, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 15919) to provide for the erection of a public building at Rockingham, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 15920) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Grand Rapids, Minn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 15921) donating a captured German cannon and cannon balls to the city of Nortonville, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 15922) to provide for furnishing information with respect to shares of stock offered to the public and prescribing penalties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 15923) for the erection of a public building at Murray, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15924) for the erection of a public building at Hickman, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DELANEY: A bill (H. R. 15925) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New York, borough of Brooklyn, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 15926) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rankin, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 15927) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wingate, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 15928) providing for cooperation between the United States and State Governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 15929) for the extension, remodeling, and reconstruction of the present Federal building at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15930) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Norristown, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A resolution (H. Res. 574) making in order certain new legislation in House bill 15796, notwithstanding the general rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A resolution (H. Res. 575) requesting the President to furnish the Joint Committee on Printing with information relative to periodical publications; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 576) directing the Public Printer to furnish the Joint Committee on Printing with information relative to periodical publications; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BARNHART: A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 69) authorizing the printing of the journal of the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WALSH: A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 70) for printing address of Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE in honor of Theodore Roosevelt; to the Committee on Printing.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to enact such legislation as will create, foster, and maintain an adequate merchant marine for the handling of products of the Pacific Coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Colorado, urging the payment of six months' extra pay and all back pay to all honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California favoring the purchase of Lower California by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio relative to the punishment of William Hohenzollern; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the acquisition by the United States of that peninsula or country known as Lower California; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAYS: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Utah, favoring Federal aid for roads in sparsely settled communities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging Congress to provide means for purchasing and moving of the wheat still remaining in the hands of the farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the acquisition of Lower California, the Coronado Islands, and those portions of the Republic of Mexico contiguous to the Colorado River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial from the State of Idaho, urging Congress to appropriate money for the construction of a wagon road up the South Fork of the Clearwater River, in Idaho County, State of Idaho; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Memorial from 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, which became effective on the 21st day of January, A. D. 1919; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. KNUTSON introduced a bill (H. R. 15931) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hook, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Milwaukee Garrison, No. 90, Department of Wisconsin, Army and Navy Union, United States of America, regarding discharged and disabled soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of Cleveland Clearing House Association, urging change of terms of the next loan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Otto Pfister and others of Cleveland, Ohio, in favor of providing homes, etc., for returning soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of parents and citizens of District of Columbia in mass meeting at Powell School, urging Congress to enact appropriation bill now pending in Senate increasing salaries of teachers of public schools 100 per cent; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Iron Trades Council of San Francisco and vicinity, representing 35,000 American citizens and workmen in the metal and shipbuilding industries, protesting against the award of any contracts whatever to shipyards in China and Japan and asking for immediate cancellation of all such contracts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Dorchester Mothers' and Homemakers' Club at their annual "guest night," with 600 present, urging United States to join league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Tenray Theater Co., Martins Ferry, Ohio, protesting against tax on rental of films; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of East Liverpool, Ohio, favoring return of telephone and telegraph lines to owners at earliest possible date; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of Mrs. J. W. Newell, president Orange County Federation of Women's Clubs, Fullerton, Cal., asking Congress to pass Senate bill 4987, relating to Federal education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of D. J. McCarthy, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging continued Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Jarry J. Cayle, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging continued Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of members of Local No. 608, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Pittsburgh, Pa., urging continued Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 225 citizens of Pennsylvania, urging national ownership and Government operation of all railroads within the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Leroy L. Webster and other citizens of Maine, for Government operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLK: Petition of Hilles & Jones Co., Wilmington, Del., favoring and commenting on House bill 15625, providing for further educational facilities by requiring War Department to loan certain machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade and technical schools and universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of citizens of the State of Rhode Island, urging Congress to enact bill similar to House bill 10550, providing for national ownership and Government operation of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY: Petition of Aldermen Clark, Kaibndl, and Govier, representing city council of Chicago, urging Congress to make suitable legislation whereby each person who was a member of the armed forces of the United States in war with Germany shall be given six months' pay from date of honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Bean Growers' Association of Southern California, urging that a portion of the \$100,000,000 food fund for Europe be used in purchase of beans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of citizens of Pleasant Valley, Fairplay, Plymouth, Red Bluff, Jelly, Auburn, Pittsville, Lookout, Vina, Fall River Mills, Chico, Susanville, and Westwood, Cal.; and Molin, Klamath Agency, and Portland, Oreg., urging repeal of zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Transportation Club of San Francisco, Cal., membership 750, protesting against increase of tax on club dues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pictorial Review Co., of San Francisco, Cal., against the postal-zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wholesale Coal Trade Association, New York City, asking for the return to private ownership of all vessels not needed for the movement of troops, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of citizens of Rensselaer and Albany Counties, N. Y., protesting against luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of 178 citizens of the third Michigan district—Union City, 51; Coldwater, 10; Quincy, 1; Branson, 24; Montgomery, 1; Battle Creek, 10; Albion, 12; Kalamazoo, 5; Bellevue, 1; Charlotte, 18; Osseo, 1; Eaton Rapids, 20; Reading, 1; Grand Ledge, 7; Vicksburg, 1; Marshall, 11; Burlington, 5; Pottsville, 8—for repeal of postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of board of trustees, village of Mountain Home, Idaho, urging appropriation of \$100,000,000 for reclamation of lands in order to furnish employment and homes for the returning soldiers; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petition of Farmers' Institute of Fayette, Ohio, protesting against the rules issued by the Postmaster General governing telephone service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of James P. Gibson Council, No. 181, Knights of Columbus, of Arctic, R. I., favoring self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Board of Trade of the borough of Langhorne, Pa., favoring a reasonable period to allow for the necessary preparation and adjustment by the owners of the great wire systems under Federal control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 14, 1919.

(Legislative day of Thursday, February 13, 1919.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FLETCHER. The first amendment of the committee to the river and harbor bill is in order.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	McKellar	Sherman
Baird	Johnson, Cal.	McLean	Simmons
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Martin, Va.	Smoot
Brandegee	Kellogg	Moses	Spencer
Calder	Kendrick	Myers	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Nugent	Sutherland
Culberson	King	Page	Swanson
Curtis	Kirby	Pittman	Thomas
Dillingham	Knox	Pollock	Thompson
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Trammell
Fletcher	Lenroot	Ransdell	Walsh
France	Lewis	Saulsbury	Weeks
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Shafroth	Williams
Gay	McCumber	Sheppard	Wolcott

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

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] are detained on official business.

Mr. SAULSBURY. The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is absent on account of illness.

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

CORRECTION—FOOD SUPPLIES FOR EUROPE.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President, on January 24 when the Senate voted upon the bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the re-