

First Lieut. Charles R. Irving, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. William W. Jones, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles C. Hawke, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Noland M. Canter, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Pierre N. Charbonnet, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. James C. Kimbrough, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Meredith R. Johnston, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Merrill K. Lindsay, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. William D. Middleton, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Leon H. Cornwall, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Read B. Harding, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. James W. Duckworth, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Bradford Massey, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edgar H. Howell, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. George W. Snyder, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Paul S. Wagner, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. John A. P. Millet, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joseph D. Foley, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).  
 First Lieut. Lewis A. Newfield, Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Thomas M. Leahy, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).  
 First Lieut. Louis A. LaGarde, jr., Medical Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edward L. Moore, Medical Corps.

#### DENTAL CORPS.

*To be captains with rank from July 13, 1918.*

First Lieut. Samuel J. Rohde, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Leroy P. Hartley, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Frederick C. Daniels, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Nathan C. Pickles, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Robert L. Lowry, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Oliver J. Christiansen, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Timothy Harden, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lawrence K. Anderson, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Timothy F. Leary, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. William C. Webb, jr., Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edward C. Alley, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clinton R. Boone, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. David I. Edwards, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Orville A. Grove, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Roy M. Klsner, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Edward A. Thorne, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lynn H. Tingay, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Claude R. Hollister, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Marhl H. Welch, Dental Corps.

*To be captains with rank from October 4, 1918.*

First Lieut. Walter D. Vail, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Richard K. Thompson, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Leslie S. Harlan, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Neil J. McCollum, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clement J. Gaynor, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Walter A. Rose, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Melvin R. Eiche, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. George Krakow, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Eugene A. Smith, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Jerome L. Fritsche, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clarence J. Wright, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Milton A. Price, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. William H. Hoblitzell, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Francis M. Tench, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Alvin E. Anthony, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. William J. R. Akeroyd, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Fletcher D. Rhodes, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. William D. Caldwell, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Lewis W. Maly, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Arthur T. Burchill, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Glover Johns, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Frederick W. Herms, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harold J. Parker, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Leslie D. Baskin, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Curtis W. Hallam, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. James E. Dean, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Henry L. Hogan, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. John C. Campbell, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Leland S. Wilson, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Benjamin H. Dean, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Dell S. Gray, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. William B. Stewart, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Julius L. Bischof, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles H. Brannell, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. John A. Rowe, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. William T. Williams, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Hooker O. Lindsey, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Alvin D. Dannheiser, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. James R. Conner, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Robert L. Strickland, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Roy R. Newman, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Boyd L. Smith, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Avery G. Holmes, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. George R. Kennebeck, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Alexander M. Smith, jr., Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Horace R. Finley, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Cecil R. Hays, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Roy C. Starr, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harold S. Embree, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Charles L. Andrews, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Byram S. Purviance, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joseph L. Boyd, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Joseph L. Rahm, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Clarence R. Jacobson, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Norman M. Mackenzie, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Richard F. Thompson, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Henry H. Collins, Dental Corps.  
 First Lieut. Adrian C. Ragan, Dental Corps.

#### PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

##### FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Eugene G. Miller, Coast Artillery Corps, to be second lieutenant in the Field Artillery, with rank from November 1, 1918.

##### COAST ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Richard A. Ericson, Field Artillery, to be second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from November 1, 1918.

#### TRANSFER TO THE ACTIVE LIST OF THE ARMY.

##### INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Kelton L. Pepper, United States Army, retired, to be captain with rank from July 1, 1916.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of June 23), 1919.*

##### ASSAYER IN CHARGE OF MINT.

William A. Burns to be assayer in charge of the mint of the United States at Carson, Nev.

##### UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Thomas G. Haight to be United States circuit judge, third circuit.

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

James Clifton Wilson to be United States district judge, northern district of Texas.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

*TUESDAY, June 24, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Infinite Spirit our Heavenly Father, we bless Thee for the high and glorious aspirations which leap like angels from the temples of our hearts, beckoning us ever onward to the higher ideals of manhood. Increase our faith and confidence in Thee and in our own ability, assured that if we work and faint not, we shall reap the rewards of a faithful life, through the promises of the Master. Amen.

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

##### SWEARING IN OF A DELEGATE.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Delegate from Hawaii, Mr. KALANIANA'OLE, is present and desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. KALANIANA'OLE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

##### ORDER OF BUSINESS—WATER-POWER LEGISLATION.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute, to lay the foundation for a request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Water Power Committee, created by a resolution early in this session, authorized a unanimous report upon the joint water-power bill that was reported to the last Congress. There is necessity for prompt action on water-power legislation, due to the long delay in passing any bill. I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the approval of the Journal and the transaction of business on the Speaker's table, the water-power bill be taken up for consideration, not to interfere with conference reports or other privileged matters.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman consulted with Judge SIMS, the ranking Democrat on that committee?

Mr. ESCH. I have, and with other Members. It was the unanimous request of the committee that I make this request.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I will state that I made the motion myself that the chairman resort to all parliamentary methods to obtain this consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

#### CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report on House resolution 79, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution 79.

*Resolved*, That the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills be authorized to appoint an assistant clerk to the Committee on Enrolled Bills, who shall receive compensation at the rate of \$6 per diem during the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

With the following committee amendment:

After the word "House," in line 6 of the resolution, strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following: "payment to commence from date such clerk entered upon his duties."

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the customary resolution that has been offered for the Committee on Enrolled Bills. It has been usual to give that committee an assistant clerk, and last session we made it an allowance at the end of the session.

Mr. GARNER. This is the customary resolution?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

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

Mr. IRELAND. It has been offered each session.

Mr. GARNER. At the same time of the session that this is being offered now?

Mr. IRELAND. It was at the last session. I could not say beyond that. I think the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO], the former chairman of that committee, will verify that statement.

Mr. LAZARO. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON MILEAGE.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I call up House resolution 113, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

#### House resolution 113.

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Mileage be, and is hereby, authorized to hire a clerk for the said committee for a period of two months during the first and second sessions of the Sixty-sixth Congress, compensation of the said clerk to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives at the rate of \$125 per month.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 3, strike out "two months" and insert "one month."

Line 3, strike out the words "the first and second sessions" and insert the words "each session."

So that the amended resolution will read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Mileage be, and is hereby, authorized to hire a clerk for the said committee for a period of one month during each session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, compensation of the said clerk to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, at the rate of \$125 per month.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does anyone know whether we are going to have more than one session of this Congress or not?

Mr. IRELAND. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that if we do not, this would not obtain for any other than the one session.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I merely asked for information.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not satisfy the gentleman, as that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. IRELAND. The Lord Almighty only can tell.

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

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. What is the necessity for the Committee on Mileage having a clerk for a month at the beginning of the second and third sessions of this Congress, if there are to be such sessions? The mileage is paid at the beginning of the first session.

Mr. IRELAND. Is it not paid at the beginning of each session and was it not in the last Congress?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, but what is the necessity for having a clerk to pay mileage for the two following sessions of Congress, when the return is made when we first attend?

Mr. IRELAND. I can only tell the gentleman what we found has been the practice in the past, that a lump sum, I think of \$500, has been appropriated for the hiring of a clerk for the Mileage Committee.

Mr. WALSH. Is this the practice followed by the majority in the Sixty-fifth Congress?

Mr. IRELAND. No, sir. The original resolution cut that in half and the committee without any solicitation from the chairman of the Mileage Committee gave it to him for each session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### MRS. MARY C. ADAMS.

Mr. IRELAND. I have one other, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution 82.

*Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Mrs. Mary C. Adams (widow of Capt. T. D. Adams, a Union soldier) as attendant for the ladies' reception room of the House of Representatives during the Sixty-sixth Congress, at the rate of \$100 per month, beginning on the 19th day of May, 1919, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out, beginning in line 2, the language "Mrs. Mary C. Adams (widow of Capt. T. D. Adams, a Union soldier) as" and insert before the word "attendant" the word "an," so that as amended the resolution will read:

*Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint an attendant for the ladies' reception room of the House of Representatives during the Sixty-sixth Congress, at the rate of \$100 per month, beginning on the 19th day of May, 1919, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### DISTRICT BUSINESS.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of District bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan, in accordance with the order of business adopted yesterday, moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of District business.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, pending that I would like to see if we can agree upon time for general debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. How much time does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. MAPES. I have requests on this side for what will take about an hour and a half, perhaps longer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman suggest three hours—an hour and a half to a side?

Mr. MAPES. Could the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me a few minutes if we divide the time equally and take three hours?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If we do not use it, I would; but the gentleman had better ask for enough time, and if it is not used it can be turned back.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time for general debate be limited to three hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, half to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from Kentucky. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object for the purpose of putting a question, upon what bill is this general debate to be?

Mr. MAPES. There are five bills on the calendar, and debate will be general debate on all of them.



Mr. GARD. Which one does the gentleman contemplate bringing up first?

Mr. MAPES. There are four little bills which will be brought up, one introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER] to put the patrol drivers into the metropolitan police department, and that will be brought up first.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the House resolving itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of District business, with Mr. TREADWAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of District business.

#### INCORPORATING PATROL DRIVERS IN METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill H. R. 3624, a bill incorporating the patrol drivers in the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3624) incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That from and after the passage of this act the patrol drivers in the employment of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia are hereby declared to be members of the Metropolitan police department force of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House, general debate is limited to three hours. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. [Applause.]

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman [applause], in view of the very cordial greeting which has come from the Democratic side of the House as well as the Republican side, I crave your gracious and forgiving indulgence while I indulge in a little personal history by way of preliminary. I was born in Illinois in 1860, but my father was born in Kentucky, in old Kentucky [applause], born in Warsaw, in Gallatin County, in 1818, the year of the birth of Illinois. My mother was born in Lexington, the hub of the beautiful blue-grass region. [Applause.] Both of her parents and both of my father's parents, in other words, all four of my grandparents, were born in the Old Dominion [applause], and there is a host of cousins now near Bowling Green, in Caroline, in Carline County, old Carline County, in the forks of the Mattaponi, and just about 110 years ago yesterday my father's father married his sweet cousin and put her on a pillion behind him and rode through the Cumberland Gap into that country when Kentucky was the dark and bloody ground, head erect, eye alight, soul aloft, afraid neither of God, man, nor devil—well, afraid of God, that is all, but not of any two-legged thing that walked this world of ours or any mortal man. My grandfather's grandfather's name was Michael, a Virginia Irishman, an Irish Virginian, and nobody trod on the tail of his coat at all, at all. [Applause.] Fifty years ago, when all families like mine were divided, five of my name laid down their lives for the Stars and Bars and five for the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.] And on my side it reads, "Union soldier, killed at Shiloh; Union soldier, killed at Donelson; Union soldier, killed at Vicksburg," and on my cousins' side it reads, "Confederate soldier, killed at Malvern Hill; Confederate soldier, killed at Spottsylvania; Confederate soldier, killed in the Wilderness." Of this Illinois-Kentucky-Virginia and Irish strain, thank God, I come.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a card which I have received through the United States mail, which card, in my humble opinion, is a challenge and an insult not only to myself but to every Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress. I will read this card; it reads as follows:

AURORA, ILL., June 18, 1919.

HON. RICHARD YATES,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The United States Supreme Court will determine whether the eighteenth amendment is legally a part of the Constitution of the United States.

Why should you be called upon to accept responsibility for a bill to enforce that amendment until it has been passed upon by the body whose function and duty it is to decide upon the constitutional legality of a measure so vital to the interests of 100,000,000 people?

I shall be sternly and irrevocably opposed to you or any other Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress who votes in favor of any bill providing for the enforcement of this amendment. Furthermore I demand, as one of your constituents, that you use every effort in your power to repeal on or before June 30 the so-called Sheppard amendment to the Agricultural bill.

Very truly, yours,

BISHOP HOTEL BAR.

I have already received five decks of these cards. [Laughter.] I have one here from a brewing company, the Best Brewing Co., of Chicago; one from the Ruehl Brewing Co., of Chicago; one from the Fred Sehring Brewing Co., of Chicago; one from the Brand Brewing Co., of Chicago; one from the Wacker & Birk Brewing Co.; one from the Home Brewery, Elston Avenue, Chicago; the Meyer Brewing Co., of Bloomington, Ill.; one from the Mascoutah Brewing Co., Mascoutah; the R. Stecher Brewing Co., of Murphysboro; and the Cairo Brewing Co., of Cairo, Ill.; the Halliday Hotel, of Cairo; the Bradford Hotel, of Bradford; the Taylor House, of Havana; the Ayers Hotel, of Harvard; and the Columbia Hotel, of Aurora. By every incoming mail I receive a new deck; yesterday's mail brought me such a card as this from men named as follows: Lauff, Batz, Kohn, Weiss, Stump, Schuck, Berthold, Meyer, Laadt, Bremer, Kessler, Nolte, Borgman, Wiegand, Hagemann, Altzeiger, Bramdoetter, Lauritzan, and Ladenberger. [Laughter.]

I have not seen such a list until I saw in this morning's paper that by a majority of 237 to 137 Haniel von Heimhausen is signing the treaty of peace. [Laughter and applause.] And Haniel von Heimhausen did not sign the treaty of peace until ex-Finance Minister Schiffer and Gustave Bauer and Adolph Greber and Count von Pozadowsky-Wehner had delivered bitter speeches.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, when I call the ignoble roll of these anti-Constitution men, these bulldozing correspondents of mine. I do not mean to criticize loyal men bearing German names. I know that thousands upon thousands of men in Illinois are descended from such men as Franz Siegel and Carl Schurz and Osterhaus and Rosecrans and Heintzelmann and Turchin and Knobeldorff and Schneider and Koerner and Hecker and a host of other men who in Prussia in 1848 fought a tyrant king and came to America for liberty and fought and died in America for liberty. Oh, the men on that glorious roll would never have ordered me to nullify the Constitution. I can not imagine Francis A. Hoffmann, my father's lieutenant governor, calling on me to violate the Constitution!

I presume a thousand more cards are on their way, and I know that some Members of this Congress have already received some cards of this brand. I know my friend MADDEN has received a few. Not only is this an elevating and uplifting card, but it is an interesting and instructive card. This threat against an American Congress by the brewers and barrooms of Illinois is not the voluntary act of individual citizens voicing the citizen's opinion for the purpose of enlightening his Representative in Congress; it is the result of the organized propaganda, which seeks to set at naught the Constitution of our blood-bought country and seeks the overthrow of its form of government; an organized propaganda, so well organized that it can afford to pay for the wholesale printing of threats against the Congress of America. This card is printed on both sides.

Mr. SIMS. Is not the address also printed?

Mr. YATES. Yes, sir. It is printed on the back, and it is printed on the front. Not only is the fearful and affrighting message which it bears to us Congressmen printed on the back, but the front page of this card, containing my address, has been also run through the printing press. My name and address appear in large type, much larger than any typewriter can produce, and it is manifest that the number of cards sent and to be sent to me is to be so large that to write or typewrite my name would be burdensome, and accordingly, for the first time in my life, I am honored by having the undivided and absorbed attention of a printing press, paid for by the check book of the brewers and the barrooms. I have heard that Ben Franklin once said, "A drop of ink makes a million think." Franklin was right; but the barrooms go him one better. They evidently think that, with enough ink, they can make a million drink and Congress shrink. [Laughter and applause.]

At any rate, a real printing press has devoted itself for some time to the pleasing task of printing my name and address on these cards, of which I have hundreds, so that the appearance is as follows:

HON. RICHARD YATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WASHINGTON, D. C.

This extremely fascinating and complimentary card refers to the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, and then goes on to say:

I shall be sternly and irrevocably opposed to you, or any other Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress, who votes in favor of any bill providing for the enforcement of this amendment.

It is somewhat refreshing to an old, hardened, confirmed campaigner to be threatened with the "frightfulness" of oppo-

sition. For myself, and I think I voice the sentiment of every man in this House, I care little that the Bishop Hotel bar, of Aurora, Ill., will oppose me, not only "sternly" but "irrevocably." [Applause.] It is a safe bet that the Bishop Hotel bar never, never did vote for me. [Laughter.] I fondly hope that it never did, and I fervently pray that it never will. Opposition! Why, every Member of Congress thrives upon opposition. It is the breath of life to every public servant in America who has any red blood in his veins. I venture to say that every Member of this House welcomes opposition. For myself I am not easily frightened; the threat of defeat is not alarming. The specter of defeat does not unnerve me. Kipling says that both triumph and disaster are impostors; neither is what it pretends to be. I have met defeat so often that its appearance does not disturb me. Its appearance on the horizon rather fascinates. Roosevelt said:

The reason why men love war and politics is that they are the greatest games that there are; there is the gamble, the game, the uncertainty welcome to every man not a weakling or a mollycoddle. It was Abraham Lincoln who once said: "And if I should be defeated I am too familiar with disappointment to be distressed by it."

I myself, Mr. Chairman, have run for city, county, Federal, and States office, always opposed, never unopposed. I was soundly and roundly thrashed in Illinois, away back in 1892 for Congressman at Large, by a great Democrat, Gen. John C. Black, the year Gov. Altgeld carried Illinois, 27 years ago; I was elected judge of my county, a strong Democratic county, the very next year; rode every rod of every road, got out in the mud, lifted up the gate, fought off the dogs, called on the voter and his wife, and carried the county. [Laughter.] I have fought the best steel in the bravest and most untimid fighting Democracy of my county, district, and State. Yet this barroom thinks it can scare you and me. In 1918, last year, two of the most capable and eloquent champions who ever led the Democratic cohorts of Illinois were pitted against me. My majority was 142,000, and every man in Illinois knew exactly how I would vote on this question, for I have never lied to our beloved people. Yet this Aurora bartender has been led to believe that he and the brewers can silence me—and you. These Illinois brewers and bars have figured it out they can fill me with fear. The cemeteries of Illinois are full of the foes of my tribe and of men who, like me, hail not only from Illinois but Kentucky and Virginia and Ireland. Such men are hard to kill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five additional minutes.

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

Mr. YATES. However, the absurdity of these people, sitting in their dark back rooms, running their printing presses, trying to frighten such men as you and I, my colleagues, is excelled and overshadowed by a thing which is not ridiculous; it is a thing which is outrageous, insolent, arrogant, disloyal, and an act of treason. [Applause.]

What is it these conspirators, who send these cards broadcast to be signed and mailed by their dupes, what is it they make their deluded followers do and demand? What is it they would punish you and me and every Member of the Sixty-sixth Congress for? They propose to punish us for enforcing the Constitution.

We have such a thing as the Constitution of the United States. We have this eighteenth amendment, proposed to the legislatures of the several States by the Sixty-fifth Congress on the 17th of December, 1918, and declared in a proclamation by the Secretary of State, dated January 29, 1919, to have been ratified by the legislatures of 36 of the 48 States. This amendment is now part and parcel of the organic, fundamental law of the land, higher than any statutes or all statutes. I insist that this eighteenth amendment to the American Constitution is as much a part of the Constitution as any other part of that immortal instrument. And when any man, rich or poor, big or little, strong or weak, asks me and you not to enforce this amendment he asks you and me to ignore and defy and nullify the Constitution. When he does that he is the public enemy [applause], the enemy of all the Constitution stands for, of all the great Washington warred for, of all the great Lincoln died for.

These men seem to think this is a small thing to ask—merely to ask that I nullify the Constitution and stultify myself. But it is not a small thing. A million men have died, and a million women have agonized, that our country might be the beacon light of liberty and the last hope of humanity; and we here today on this floor are the expression of the potentiality of that hope and purpose. We can not escape our duty, we can not

nullify the Constitution and stultify ourselves, and at the same time be true to the men and women who from Bunker Hill to San Juan Hill, and from San Juan Hill to the Belleau Wood and the Meuse-Argonne, have written the name of American valor and freedom so high that kings and emperors and sultans and czars and mikados will keep off of us for a hundred years.

And, gentlemen, I think we ought to recall to ourselves more often than we do that we here on this floor are the representatives of the last hope of humanity. And I want you to pardon another personal allusion.

Three days before he died my father said to me, "I have served eight years in the Legislature of Illinois and four years as governor, six years as United States Senator, and four years in the lower House." Then he said, "My son"—and I remember it, because in three days he was dead—"My son, I want you to grow up and serve the American Republic, and to remember always that the ideal public service for an American is in the House of Representatives, the American House of Commons." [Applause.]

He came here first in 1850, traveling by stage to the Illinois River, and then by boat to St. Louis, and another to Cairo, and another to Pittsburgh, and thence by stage to Washington. He was the "lone-star Whig from Illinois." And after 69 years I, by 142,000 majority of my people and his people, have come here. And I would rather hold a seat in this House than in any body on earth. [Applause.]

The bartenders and brewers of Illinois are telling me what to do and telling you what to do. The fact is that this postal card and the conspiracy which conceived and inspired its cowardly threat is, as I have already said, and as I want to repeat, an impertinent, insolent, arrogant, disloyal, traitorous thing, instigated by the devil, sprung straight up from hell. I am the Representative at Large, not the representative at small, of this postal-card writer, and I want all the people of my great district—for my district is the most magnificent district in America, the whole magnificent State of Illinois—to know the kind of threat being sent to us Representatives. Against this threat of bartenders and brewers I pit my official oath. The ideal public service for an American is service in this House, the American House of Commons. I would rather have a seat here than in any body on earth, and I will keep its high and mighty official oath in spite of all the bartenders of or in America. So help me God. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had four minutes remaining to him of the time allotted to him by the two gentlemen.

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

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAPES. There are on the calendar five District bills. The general debate is limited to three hours. Can we not now take up a bill under the five-minute rule and reserve the balance of general debate, and go on and finish the general debate later?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman inquires if this bill can now be read for amendment under the five-minute rule?

Mr. MAPES. Yes; and then, reserving our general debate, go on with it afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks if general debate can be resumed afterwards?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House there are three hours of general debate on the five bills. The Chair will state that, unless objection is made, this bill can be laid aside and the others taken up in due course, with the time remaining for general debate in addition.

Mr. MAPES. I ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be read for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That from and after the passage of this act the patrol drivers in the employment of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia are hereby declared to be members of the Metropolitan police department force of the District of Columbia.

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

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

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill. It was introduced and passed in the last Congress without a dissenting vote, but the Senate failed to pass it on account of the congestion of business there at the end of the session.

It provides for correcting the apparent injustice done to the patrol drivers here in the city of Washington and simply classifies them as patrolmen, so that they can become beneficiaries, if they so choose, under the pension act that was passed two



or three years ago applying to members of the police force. At that time the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia were not aware that the patrol drivers were not under that act the same as the patrolmen, and now the members of the committee are desirous of correcting that mistake.

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

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman states that it is the purpose of this legislation to make the patrol drivers part of the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia. I desire to direct the attention of the gentleman to the somewhat peculiar language that is used in this act:

\* That from and after the passage of this act the patrol drivers \* \* \* are hereby declared to be members—

And so forth. It seems to me that the language could be very much simplified by saying that "Hereafter the patrol drivers in the employment of the Metropolitan police department shall be members of the Metropolitan police department force of the District of Columbia." The language which has been used, while it might convey the same impression, is unnecessarily cumbersome. You say, "From and after the passage of this act 'they' are hereby declared to be," and so forth. Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment stating that "Hereafter the patrol drivers shall be members of the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia"?

Mr. WHEELER. I can not see any difference.

Mr. WALSH. That is what you want to do?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. There is no need of declaring that "from and after the passage of this act" they are declared to be something.

Mr. WHEELER. I see no objection to the gentleman's suggestion.

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

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. I have no objection to the gentleman's bill, provided it is understood that these men who are declared to be members of the police department shall, before they shall enjoy the benefits of certain insurance which the policemen have, stand the same sort of examination that the policemen undergo. You will understand there is a difference between the tests; and I suppose, of course, the gentleman understands that the rules for admission to this service will be the same rules as apply to admission to the police department?

Mr. WHEELER. I will say to the gentleman that some of these patrol drivers have been in the service for 23, 24, and 25 years, and nearly all of them have been in the service for 15 years. They could have stood the physical tests when they first entered this department, but could not now.

Mr. Sisson. I am sure they could not, so far as the age test and other things are concerned.

Mr. WHEELER. Physical tests.

Mr. Sisson. Yes; physical tests, perhaps. I am not so much interested in those who are now in the service as in those who are to come into the service hereafter. I am interested in seeing that the same regulations should apply in the future to the admission of patrol drivers as those entering the police force.

Mr. WHEELER. The patrol driver, if classified as a patrolman, would necessarily have to take the same physical and mental examination as a policeman.

Mr. Sisson. Of course, that need not necessarily follow. They might make some regulation as to the height, size, and physical capacity of a patrolman which would not necessarily apply to a driver.

Mr. WHEELER. An applicant must take an examination now, the same as a patrolman.

Mr. Sisson. I did not understand that to be true.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Line 3 strike out the words "from and after the passage of this act" and insert the word "hereafter," and in line 5 strike out the words "are hereby declared to" and insert "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this is simply to correct the language in accordance with the suggestion I made to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER]. It accomplishes the purposes which he states this measure was intended to accomplish and puts it into language of which there can be no doubt, and which is a little less cumbersome.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. GARD. I am interested in the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts and also in the text of the bill. Is it the purpose to transfer these patrol drivers to the police department?

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. GARD. It says now they "are hereafter declared to be members of the Metropolitan police force." Does that mean that they get on the police force without passing an examination or complying with any of the regulations governing the present police force?

Mr. WHEELER. They have to comply with them now.

Mr. GARD. Their status now is that of chauffeur.

Mr. WHEELER. They are sworn in to do police duty when called upon in time of trouble, and when they reach that point or that place they are called upon to make arrests the same as regular policemen, and to-day they have just two shifts, while the regular patrolmen have three shifts. They work 10 or 12 hours a day.

Mr. GARD. I am not in opposition to the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. It will rest with the superintendent of police whether he will transfer any of these drivers to be regular patrolmen or not. I imagine that on account of their experience and skill as patrol drivers he will keep them exactly where they are now, and the only object of this bill is to put them in a position where they can come in under this pension provision if they so elect.

Mr. GARD. The object is twofold, to give them shorter hours and give them an opportunity for taking out insurance.

Mr. WHEELER. Not necessarily shorter hours.

Mr. GARD. What I want to know is whether this act covers the patrol drivers into the police force automatically, and what the provision will be for the future. Suppose a patrol driver resigns and his place must be filled. How must it be filled in the future?

Mr. WHEELER. By the applicant taking an examination. If he is appointed as a patrol driver, the superintendent of police can tell the station captain that he must work the same as the other patrol drivers, 10 or 12 hours, or whatever his hours of duty may be.

Mr. GARD. Would it not meet the purpose of the bill if you strike out the phrase "in the employment of the Metropolitan police department," and provide that "hereafter the patrol drivers of the District of Columbia," and so forth?

Mr. WALSH. That would include the patrol drivers driving ambulances in the health department.

Mr. WHEELER. The superintendent of police can detail any patrolman for any duty, for 10, 12, or 24 hours if he desires to do so, and he can detail these 23 patrol drivers exactly where they are to-day, and they will perform exactly the same service and for the same number of hours.

Mr. WALSH. At the suggestion of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. REED] I desire to modify my amendment by including in the language stricken out in line 3 the word "the" before "patrol drivers."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts will be incorporated in his amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. May we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be reported again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Line 3, page 1, strike out the words "from and after the passage of this act" and insert the word "hereafter," and in line 5 strike out the words "are hereby declared to" and insert the word "shall."

So that as amended the bill will read:

That hereafter patrol drivers in the employment of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia shall be members of the Metropolitan police department force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GARD. I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts by striking out in addition thereto the words "in the employment" appearing in line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARD moves to amend by striking out, in line 4, the words "in the employment."

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, what is the purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GARD. The purpose of the amendment is to clarify the section so as to make it a more readable legislative section. Then it will read:

That hereafter the patrol drivers of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia shall be members of the Metropolitan department force of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALMON. Does that change the meaning of it in any way?

Mr. MAPES. I doubt whether the amendment does anything to the bill one way or the other, but I have no objection to it.

Mr. SISSON. As the bill now reads, it might be construed that this simply covers those who are now in the service, and will not apply to those who may be in the service in the future.

Mr. WALSH. No; it says "hereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, the bill was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

#### WATER SUPPLY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill (H. R. 1713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] calls up H. R. 1713, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAPES. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIEHLMAN], but in his absence I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to address myself to the provisions of the bill now under consideration, but to avail myself of the privilege of devoting my entire time to general debate.

I desire to address myself particularly to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, first to that provision of it which relates to the "half-and-half" plan of paying the expenses of the District of Columbia. I also desire to address myself to what is known as the rent amendment which the Senate has placed upon the bill.

Whenever the question of the "half-and-half" has been up in previous Congresses a great deal of time has been consumed in addresses made upon that subject. Strange to say, this time that subject so far has not been debated at all. There are more than 100 new Members in this House, who, I take it for granted, know little or nothing of the question. When the District of Columbia appropriation bill does come up, only 35 minutes have been set aside for general debate. It appears unmistakably that there is a disposition somewhere to throttle the discussion of this question and leave but one side of it presented—that side presented by the local press.

I do not believe that those who have not had ample time in which to study this question can vote with any degree of enlightenment without knowing at least something of it, and I do not believe many Members of this House have had an opportunity to learn much of it. Therefore I hope I may be pardoned for going into that subject in a short and concise way.

Formerly there were three municipalities in the District of Columbia; one the city of Washington, another the city of Georgetown, and the other the county of Washington. By act of Congress, February 21, 1871, these three municipalities were merged into one—the District of Columbia. Since that time there has been but one municipality here. By the act of February 21, 1871, a new form of government was established for the District of Columbia. There was a local legislature and a governor. During the three years that form of government was in existence the District of Columbia was run into debt to the extent of about \$52,000,000. There was no hope that that debt could be paid and the city further improved, as it should be, without levying an enormous tax on the people of the District.

Therefore, in 1878, the United States Government stepped in and said, We will pay one half of the expenses of the District

of Columbia and the District of Columbia will pay the other half. That, of course, was intended to run only so long as the emergency might require.

The act of 1878 established what is now called the "half-and-half." It has been running from 1878 until now. It is now proposed to repeal it in the alleged offensive legislative way of placing a repeal rider on an appropriation bill. That manner of repeal, according to the local press, is most offensive, most unfair, most injurious, and ought not to be tolerated.

By the act of 1878, which created the "half-and-half" plan, the rate of taxation in the District of Columbia was \$2.50 on the hundred dollars. That was repealed by a rider on an appropriation bill, and the rate reduced to \$1.50 on the hundred.

Later, by a rider on an appropriation bill, it was provided that real estate, for the purposes of taxation, should not be valued at less than two-thirds of its real value, and since then the two-thirds rate has been adopted, and the assessor has stated in his testimony before the District of Columbia Committee on several occasions that that is the plan. Therefore, when you value property at only two-thirds of its value, and tax it at \$1.50 a hundred, you tax it practically and effectively at only a dollar rate.

Now, by two riders on appropriation bills the rate of taxation has been reduced from \$2.50 a hundred to \$1 a hundred. Then, again by a rider on an appropriation bill, just as is proposed now to be done, the tax was taken off of jewelry for the benefit of the rich in the District of Columbia.

Then, again by a rider on an appropriation bill, the tax was taken off of intangible property.

You can search the archives and the Library of Congress, among the papers of the local press, and you will not find one word of protest against doing those things by riders on appropriation bills.

Prohibition has been brought about for the District of Columbia by placing a rider on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. I can go on and recite for the next hour various and sundry instances where legislation for the benefit of the taxpayer in the District of Columbia has been had by riders on appropriation bills. And there has been no complaint.

But now, when you come to do something for the taxpayers of the States in this Union, up goes the hue and cry that it is to be done in a monstrous manner by a rider on an appropriation bill. That protest is untenable and no heed should be given it.

The real estate people control all legislation that relates to the District of Columbia. I cited an instance a few years ago where a woman living near the end of Chain Bridge had a horse, a cart, and a cow, and upon these pieces of property she was taxed at the rate of \$1.50 a hundred, because personal property is taxed in the District of Columbia at that rate. Yet at that time the person who owned millions of intangible personal property paid no tax.

I cite another instance, and it was this: That a tenant in the house of his landlord paid a tax at the rate of \$1.50 a hundred on his belongings, while the owner of the real estate paid only a dollar a hundred; and that condition exists here to-day. Is that right? But it must be borne in mind, you must not be deceived by the oft-made assertion that the rider which is now on the District of Columbia appropriation bill undertakes to increase taxes in the District of Columbia, for it does no such thing. The rate of taxation upon real estate is left just the same—\$1.50 upon three-thirds and \$1 upon two-thirds. There is now no proposition, nor has there been one, to change the rate of taxation, notwithstanding that Judge Prouty, the eminent jurist who represented an Iowa district in the Halls of Congress, stood here one day and read a list of 40 cities—20 immediately above in population of the District of Columbia, and 20 immediately below the population of the District of Columbia, and each and everyone of the 40 cities paid a greater tax than is levied on property in the District of Columbia.

Mr. YATES. Would it disturb the gentleman to ask him a question at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. What does the District of Columbia cost the Nation altogether?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The present appropriation bill, with the appropriations for the District of Columbia carried in other bills, amounts to about \$16,000,000 a year. Under the "half-and-half" plan, the States bear half of that and the District of Columbia bears the other half.

As I was saying, Judge Prouty produced that list here, and its accuracy stands to-day unchallenged. Some gentlemen were here at the time from the State of Indiana who were voting in favor of the continuance of the "half-and-half" plan. I then



wrote to a number of cities in the State of Indiana, and found that they were paying not a dollar rate, but that many of them were paying as much as \$10 on the hundred. As soon as they saw that, and the names of the towns and cities that were paying it, most of them changed their votes.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. OGDEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that tangible personal property is not subject to taxation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I said that intangible personal property at that time was not subject to taxation.

Mr. OGDEN. And it is now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. About two years ago intangible personal property was made taxable at the rate of three mills, I believe, according to my recollection.

Mr. OGDEN. Is it the gentleman's contention that there ought to be a correction in that regard?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I was not discussing that at all. Judge Prouty's demonstration, demonstrated by naming the 40 cities nearest in population to the District of Columbia, showed that the District of Columbia paid a smaller rate in taxation than any of them. Take, for instance, the city of Louisville, from which my colleague comes. His constituents pay a city tax, also a county tax, and a State tax; and they also pay a tax for the pensions of the school-teachers, a tax for the benefit of the police pension fund, and also a bridge tax, if I am correctly advised, and a road tax. The taxpayers of the District of Columbia pay but one tax. When you add up the various taxes paid by the taxpayers of the city of Louisville, the metropolis of the State from which I come, it amounts to more than \$3 on the hundred, and yet these people are complaining because they are compelled to pay \$1 on the hundred. There is no disposition to disturb that.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. How about the real estate valuations in the District? Is the property valued at its full value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I venture the opinion that the gentleman can buy very few pieces of property in the District of Columbia according even to the three-thirds valuation that the assessors first place upon them.

Mr. KEARNS. Is it a supposition that the property is assessed at three-thirds or two-thirds of its value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The supposition is that they value each piece of real estate at its full value, and then take two-thirds of that for taxable purposes.

Mr. KEARNS. In most States real estate is taxed at full value.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is not so here, and the assessor will tell you, if you call him up, that he assesses it for taxable purposes at a two-thirds value. When I said a moment ago that the gentleman would be able to buy very few pieces of property in the District of Columbia at the valuation put on by the assessor that statement must be qualified by an example shown a few years ago, when the District of Columbia was inquiring into the methods of assessment in the District. At that time it was found that in the tax book relating to property lying in the fashionable northwest the figures on the assessor's books had had a pen run through them and immediately above a smaller figure written until \$10,000,000 of taxable property were lifted by that process; and then, if you turn to the poorer section of the city, the southeast, the part of the District where the humble homes of the working classes of the District are, it was found that those \$10,000,000 were placed on that by again erasing the figures and writing immediately above them larger figures.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. Has the gentleman any information as to what authority or influence appoints the assessors?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that a good many years ago, by a rider on an appropriation bill, the assessor and, I think, two of the assistant assessors, were made the excise board, the board to pass upon liquor licenses in the District of Columbia, and there went with that a provision that they should not be removed except for serious cause, alleged and proven.

Mr. LAYTON. The gentleman, I think, has not answered my question. Who appoints them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia appoint them.

Mr. LAYTON. Are there any facts available as to whether the two-thirds of the assessment upon real estate in the city represents the actual three-thirds of its value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; it shows just the reverse. On one occasion I heard the assessor himself testify that he construed the law to mean that he could not assess it at more than two-thirds of its actual value.

Mr. LAYTON. I mean, do they hold the actual value in mind when they apply the two-thirds?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. They are supposed to, and I believe they do.

Mr. FOSTER. And who appoints the commissioners?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The President of the United States appoints two civilian commissioners of the District Commissioners, who must reside in the District of Columbia. The third is an Army officer, who must have the rank of major. He is the head of the engineer department, which lays out roads and highways, bridges and sewers, and things of that character.

A few years ago, when the appropriation for the District of Columbia was about \$13,000,000 I divided that, pro rata, among the people of the United States, and then by that process ascertained what each State was paying. That at that time was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have several copies of that over at my office, and if any gentleman wishes to see what his State was paying when the appropriation was \$13,000,000 I will be very glad to furnish a copy of it. As I was saying a few minutes ago when interrupted, it was established by Judge Prouty that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia were paying a smaller tax than any other municipality in all the country comparable in size with the District of Columbia. Then the advocates of the "half and half" in the District of Columbia answered and said that while that might be true they were paying a greater per capita tax. That means nothing. Property and not persons is taxed. If John D. Rockefeller lived here and all of his property was assessed here, can not you see that the per capita tax would go up and up? A dozen men could pay large taxes and a hundred thousand pay no tax, and yet the per capita would be large, but the rate would be just the same. That is the fallacy upon which they are undertaking to base the statement that they are heavily taxed in the District of Columbia. Why, one of the papers recently said that the District of Columbia paid more income tax than the State of Kentucky. That is true. I am sorry of it. I am sorry that Kentucky is so poor. I am sorry that Kentucky, poor as she is, is called upon to pay half the taxes for the rich men of the District of Columbia. A dentist is employed for the school children here, and it is in this appropriation bill which comes up to-morrow—to plug the teeth of the school children with gold or what not. The children down in Kentucky and in every State of this Union have their pennies taken from their pockets to help pay that. Nurses are employed at the schools, and the nurses in Kentucky and in every State in this land are taxed to help pay those nurses. Schoolbooks are bought for the children of the millionaire here, and the school children in Kentucky and in every State of this Union are taxed to pay for them. Only recently my clerk received a communication from one of the big real estate concerns of this town wanting to sell her a piece of property here, and made the statement that the purchase should be made because the United States Government would pay half the tax for her. The plan as proposed in the rider that is on the appropriation bill is this, and it must not be misunderstood, that property in the District of Columbia should be taxed at a fair rate. Let that rate bring much or little, but when it has been collected let it be expended, all of it, and then whatever else ought to be appropriated for the purpose of making this the greatest and most beautiful city upon the earth should be contributed by the United States Government. In the rider upon the appropriation bill, however, is a limitation that the amount contributed by the United States shall be less than one-half of the total appropriation.

That had to be in the amendment, in the rider if you choose to call it that, else the Chair, in presiding over that bill, would have ruled it out of order on a point of order made.

There is in the District of Columbia an organization which, I believe, is called the Real Estate Brokers' Association, and the real estate brokers from other parts of the country are now, or at least yesterday or the day before were, the guests of this local organization. I find in the Washington Post to-day this article which I hold in my hand, a part of which I will read. I clipped it from the Washington Post less than an hour ago. I read:

Mr. Ackley was replying to an address of welcome by Charles Fairfax, president of the local association, on behalf of the visitors, who were en route to the annual convention of the National Association of Real Estate Boards at Atlantic City. He said that the out-of-town realtors were pleased with everything in Washington except the prices charged in restaurants.

"When we come back to Washington again," he said, "please have the restaurateurs show a little mercy on our pocketbooks." The speaker suggested that the Washington real estate men could decrease their deficits by making Members of Congress pay higher rents. "Go as far as you like," he added, "with raising rents of Congressmen."

Yet you are called upon, when real estate people from outside come here and advise the local real estate people to raise rents on Congressmen, to retaliate for that by voting in favor of having their constituents dig down into their pockets to pay half of their taxes.

Last session I read a letter from the treasurer or financial agent of the local real estate organization, saying that the out-of-town realtors had contributed to the fund with which they were seeking to pass legislation affecting rents. Mr. Worthington—I forget his initials now—is the man who wrote the letter. I am sorry I did not bring it over to-day, but I did not know I was going to have the opportunity to make this address on this occasion.

I sincerely trust that the conferees who will have charge of the District of Columbia appropriation bill will write a proper amendment as a substitute for the no-account thing which now appears as a rider upon that bill. I hope they will take the time to go into the subject carefully and thoroughly, doing injustice to nobody, but justice to the oppressed, and in this town their name is legion.

In one week here, according to the records kept by Capt. Peyser, about 1,100 persons came in to do war work and nearly a thousand of them were compelled to leave. That thing kept up. They called it "the turnover," I believe. More than 80 per cent of those that came had to leave. And that went on, not that week alone, nor that month alone, but it has gone on from then until now. The salaries that you gave them will not support them. If you increase their salaries, the profiteers take it away from them a minute and a half after they get it.

Who has paid the expense of bringing these thousands and thousands of clerks here and then paying their way back? The taxpayers of this Nation have paid it. The beneficiaries of it are the landlords of the town, and yet you are called upon to pay half of their taxes, and they want it done without having the subject discussed; and it would not have been discussed and there would have been no opportunity to discuss it except for the general debate on this bill which is now before the House.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I yield that time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky lacked eight minutes of using an hour himself. He had one hour and a half.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Then I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

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

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we are on the water bill, I want to call the attention of the House to the present law and the present water rate in this District, and I am really sorry that more Members are not here so that they may learn something about the District of Columbia affairs. I shall not read all of the report of the engineer commissioner in reference to this matter. The minimum charge to each premise allows the use of 7,500 cubic feet of water per annum, which is 56,000 and some odd gallons of water.

In other words, the ordinary householder in Washington rarely has to pay more than the minimum rate. If you will investigate the water rates throughout the United States, you will find that in many cities the householder will pay nearly as much per month as it paid in the District of Columbia per year, because 56,000 gallons a year are about what the average family will use, certainly unless the laundering is done on the premises.

Therefore the water rates in the District of Columbia are not only lower, but very much lower, than the water rates in any other city in the world. In the smaller towns of 25,000, 30,000, 40,000, or 50,000 the water rates will range all the way from \$2.50 a month to \$4 or \$5 a month. In my little town I pay between \$50 and \$60 a year for water, but the smaller cities have to pay a proportionately higher rate. It is doubtful whether you will find a city in the country where the ordinary user of water will not pay at least \$24 a year or something like \$2 a month for water. Yet in the District of Columbia they pay this low water rate.

How is that brought about, do you say? I do not want the District of Columbia to pay to the Federal Government one

cent of profit because the waterworks belong to the Federal Government.

When Jefferson Davis was Secretary of War they had a great deal of sickness in Washington, and at that time the buildings and grounds of the Capitol were under the Secretary of War. That was before the creation of the office of Superintendent of the Capitol. Jefferson Davis, Secretary of War, recommended to Congress that the water system be built by the Federal Government. The District of Columbia then had less than 40,000 people. A bridge was built across Cabin John Creek on which to carry the water mains, and the name of Jefferson Davis, Secretary of War, was carved upon the bridge. You will remember that during the Civil War the Federal soldiers who were guarding that bridge chiseled off the name of Jefferson Davis, and that Theodore Roosevelt, when he was President, had the name of Jefferson Davis restored to its place on the keystone of the bridge. I call your attention to that solely to remind you that for a number of years after it was built the water plant of Washington was operated by the War Department and the people of the District of Columbia were permitted to use the water at such rates as the War Department might fix.

Now, in the Senate they have asked that the \$400,000 used for the extension of water mains be increased to \$450,000, and they are complaining now that the revenues of the water department of the District of Columbia will not pay the expenses, because they have had to increase the wages of their labor, and coal, which is a considerable item in the running of the pumping system, has increased 100 per cent in value. Notwithstanding that fact, the District Commissioners have declined to make any increase in the water rates in the District of Columbia. I do not know whether it is because they fear the public or not; but in every other city in the world when the water companies owned by the city or privately operated companies do not pay expenses the water rates have to be increased. But in the District of Columbia they have the Federal Treasury out of which the District lives. Notwithstanding the fact that they have in the District of Columbia as good water as there is in the world, a magnificent plant built absolutely by the Federal Government, the whole original investment paid for out of the Federal Treasury, yet the District Commissioners have declined to raise the water rates one cent, and now they are asking in the District bill that meters be put upon all the Government buildings and that the District Commissioners be authorized to charge the Government for the water that comes out of its own plant, when the Federal Government built it for its own use and, as a matter of grace, permitted the District people to use it. Now, I know that my colleagues on the committee know very well that I would not have a man in the District of Columbia pay more than a fair and just rate.

So I ask our conferees, when they consider this matter, that they go into it carefully and, instead of increasing the charge upon the Treasury of the United States, that they put a small increase on the water rates in the District of Columbia and let the operation of this plant pay its own expenses. It would be an interesting thing to go into the original cost out of the Treasury of this water system. But this is one of those peculiar bills in which we are not particularly interested as a matter at large. When it comes to the ordinary citizen of the United States, his contribution is small, but Congress ought to look to this matter.

I will say here by way of parenthesis, my friends, that service on the District of Columbia appropriation bill has always been wished upon me. I have always gotten from under it whenever I could honorably. When I was first asked to go upon this subcommittee I rebelled. For two or three weeks my friend, Mr. Fitzgerald, who was then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, labored with me to induce me to go upon that subcommittee. I went upon it under protest, but having gone upon it I have tried to do my duty, and when I see these things that I do not believe are just and right I bring them to your attention. I give you the facts as they appear to me, because I believe it is my duty to do it.

Now, of all the broad leagues of land over which our flag floats, the District of Columbia is the only spot set apart as the seat of the Federal Government. When the fathers of the Republic conceived the idea of locating the capital and having the activities of the Federal Government on a small district that Congress alone should control they were wise. My regret is that they did not have the experience then that we have now. When the Canal Zone was established there were certain profiteering real estate men who wanted to get control of that and to have a local government there.

But Col. Goethals, to his credit be it told, said "No; we bought that zone to build a canal, and it ought to be operated



by the Federal Government for the purposes of the canal and for those purposes alone."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. Will the gentlemen yield me a little more time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am sorry, but every minute is promised.

Mr. Sisson. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield me a little more time?

Mr. MAPES. I have promised more than I have, but I will yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. Sisson. There are so many of these things that are of interest that I can not complete my statement which I intended to make; but it is my judgment that if Congress had bought for the Federal Government all the land in the District of Columbia, which it could have done for a song at that time, and if it had run this District as a governmental seat and kept out of it those men who invest their money here and expect to make profit out of the Treasury, it would have been an ideal system.

But let us not lose sight in legislation of the fact that the purpose of our fathers in establishing this Government was that Congress could control it absolutely as the seat of government and not be interfered with by the local government.

After it had been run a while opportunities for our old friends, the real estate people, people who loved to live close to the Capital, the Capital commenced to be built up, and now the only source of profit here, and it ought to be the only source of profit, if you let people live here, comes out of the Federal Treasury. Every real estate man, the banks, everybody who lives here, primarily, the money comes out of the Federal Treasury to keep the city up.

Therefore we have got into this atmosphere, where men selling their goods, the grocer, the men dealing in clothing, the men renting real estate, it is necessary that they shall get enormous appropriations out of the Treasury, so the whole business organization in the District of Columbia is looking to the idea of getting every dollar they can out of the Treasury, because in that way only can they increase their profits and increase, as they say, the beauty of the Capital City. It is not so much the aesthetic side, however, as the profit side of it that they are interested in.

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

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] for his courtesy in yielding the floor to me for a brief statement.

While I voted in favor of every motion designed to limit or reduce the appropriation for clerk hire for Members of Congress contained in the joint resolution which we have just passed, it is quite possible that the amount appropriated may all be needed during this year. While the Army is being demobilized and while the soldiers are getting their insurance looked after, and obtaining bonds which they paid for during the period of their service, and many other things occasioned by the World War, there will be need of much extra clerk hire. One good thing about the clerk-hire resolution is that it only applies to the year beginning July 1. My belief is that at the end of the fiscal year the amount of correspondence and activity at the departments of the Government will be substantially reduced. For that reason I think we should prepare and enact a permanent law which will provide a reasonable amount for clerk hire, which need not be greater than the amount carried in the regular appropriation less the amount of the bonus. In other words, the amount added for the bonus this year may be deducted from the amount provided by law to be paid in the future. This will still leave a fair allowance for clerk hire for each Member, which ought to be satisfactory. It will furnish a commendable example of economy to the heads of the various departments of the Government. To my mind it is the only consistent thing we can do; that is, while insisting upon economy upon the part of department officials to practice it ourselves. I am going to urge this view upon the members of the Committee on Appropriations, and I hope other Members will do the same in the interest of economy in public expenditures.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Zihlman].

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the bill, H. R. 1713, now pending before the House provides that the Secretary of War be authorized and directed to appoint a commission of five members to make full investigation of the sources of water supply from rivers and streams in the prox-

imity of the city of Washington, with the view of increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia.

Five engineers are to be appointed, three from the Engineering Corps of the United States Army, one from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, and one from the engineering department of the District of Columbia.

This commission are to report their findings and recommendations to the Secretary of War at the earliest practicable time, with information as to the sources of supply, estimates of the probable cost of a project or projects for the transmission of water sufficient to augment the present water supply of the District of Columbia.

The bill provides for an appropriation of \$15,000 to carry out this work.

As has been repeatedly set forth in the local press, the consumption of water in the District of Columbia has been equal to and has many times exceeded the safe maximum carrying capacity of the existing conduits. During the heated term of last year more than 70,000,000 gallons of water were consumed in a single day, and the estimated safe daily capacity is about 65,000,000 gallons.

I desire to read at this point an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of June 8 in reference to the necessity of providing an additional source of supply:

#### THE WATER-SUPPLY PROBLEM.

In the matter of the water supply of the District there is no better informed authority than Gen. W. M. Black, Chief Engineer of the Army, who was at one time engineer commissioner and has had direct and close acquaintance with the situation for years. Gen. Black, in a statement printed in another part of the Star to-day, says that there is urgent need of additional facilities for the supplying of Washington with water and that work on this extension should be promptly started. But Gen. Black holds that such remedies as that of pumping additional water into the reservoirs from the river below Great Falls will not meet the case and will serve only as an emergency palliative. The real need is for an additional conduit. To pump more water into the Dalecarlia Reservoir means to put a heavier burden upon the single line now existing.

The Dalecarlia project has two merits—cheapness and speed of execution. It can not be regarded as a solution of the water-supply problem. Its proposal has had the good effect of drawing attention sharply to the case and possibly it will result in a speeding of congressional action to the end of quick decision upon a definite plan of water extension.

Always, as Gen. Black says, the question of the wholesomeness of the water to be supplied to the people of Washington stands paramount. Secondly comes the question of sufficiency. Where can more water be obtained? The Great Falls can be dammed higher and more water impounded, or somewhere farther north in Maryland a wholesome supply can be found for distribution both to the local community and perhaps to some consumers in Maryland. There should be no delay while the relative merits of these two plans are considered. The urgent need is for more conduit lines here. For in any case the Great Falls supply will remain the stable resource of the District for a long period, even if another project is developed drawing a supplemental supply from a more distant source. And, furthermore, a second conduit is necessary to permit repairs and cleaning, which now are impossible with the single conduit in constant use.

This summer should witness action by Congress appropriating a large sum, not for further survey, for there have been surveys enough, but for immediate work on a new conduit. Whether Great Falls dam is raised or pumps are installed at Dalecarlia, more conduit capacity is a necessity. Washington will continue to grow and not even the most drastic water economies will bring the total consumption down to the point of safety of margin. It takes a long time to build a conduit. Work should be started on one this year.

There have been a number of investigations made of the territory in the proximity of the District, and an elaborate report was submitted to Congress in 1912 by Col. W. C. Langfitt dealing with the various projects for increasing the supply and also with the question of developing the water power at Great Falls for supplying light and power.

Since that time there have been a number of developments. Mr. Robert B. Morse has submitted a plan for securing an additional supply from the Patuxent River and utilizing both the Middle Patuxent and Little Patuxent as a source of supply as well as the Patuxent proper. In his report Mr. Morse outlines a plan somewhat different from the plan submitted by Col. Langfitt, in that the water is to be brought in a conduit to an open cut and not through a tunnel. This water is to be brought into the District by gravity, and it will eliminate the pumping of 20,000,000 gallons per day to the first high level.

The drainage areas of the three Patuxent valleys are shown in the report to be very sparsely settled. There are no villages of any size upon the whole area of 320 square miles which would be used. No railroad or electric line is within the area and most of it is far from any mail line of travel.

In addition to this report there has been submitted by Mr. Asa Phillips, sanitary engineer of the District, a plan for increasing the supply by means of pumping water into the Dalecarlia Reservoir, which would double the existing supply now available.

The provisions of this bill were submitted to Maj. Gen. W. M. Black, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and I desire to

insert his letter written to me under date of July 5, 1918, in reference to a similar bill, H. R. 12549:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1918.

Hon. F. N. ZIHLMAN,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo, relative to H. R. 12549, to create a commission and appropriate funds for investigating sources of water supply for the District of Columbia.

As you know, this question has been studied several times during the past decade, and three methods of augmenting the supply have been seriously considered: (1) A new aqueduct from Great Falls paralleling the present aqueduct; (2) a storage reservoir on the Patuxent River, with an aqueduct to the District; and (3) a combined water supply and water-power development in the Potomac River near Great Falls. In 1913 recommendation was made to Congress (H. R. 1400, 62d Cong., 2d sess.) that the combined power and water-supply project be undertaken, or if increased water supply only were to be considered, that the parallel aqueduct from Great Falls be constructed, but no action has been taken on any of these recommendations.

In the meantime some additional information regarding the Patuxent River as a source of supply has been received and a board has been organized, at the request of the Secretary of War, to discuss the feasibility and advisability of undertaking the development of the water-power project at Great Falls. In view of these facts, it would seem advisable to have the entire subject thoroughly investigated by a commission authorized by Congress in order that that body may have before it as a basis of early action for the increase of water supply a well-considered recommendation embodying the results of previous investigations as well as a careful study of present conditions.

The bill H. R. 12549 will probably provide satisfactorily for the necessary investigations, but it may be that the following revision, which is suggested for your consideration will make the measure a little more specific:

Change from the last three words at the end of line 8, page 1, to the period in line 10, page 2, to read as follows: "whose duty it shall be to make, under the direction of the Secretary of War, a full investigation of practicable sources of water supply in the District of Columbia, or within a reasonable distance from said District, with the view of increasing its water supply, and to report to the Secretary of War, with their recommendations, at the earliest practicable time, a project or projects for augmenting said supply, commensurate with the present and future needs of said District; also of the Federal military and other reservations contiguous to said District, and also of the territory embraced within the jurisdiction of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission; the said report to be accompanied by estimates of the probable cost of such project or projects, and by maps, dates, and information sufficient to give a clear understanding of what is available and what the said commission recommends."

Very respectfully,

W. M. Black,  
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

I desire also to insert a letter from Brig. Gen. John G. D. Knight, late Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, under date of June 27, 1918:

ENGINEER COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
Washington, June 27, 1918.

Hon. FREDERICK N. ZIHLMAN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I note with interest that you have introduced a bill to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia. I, for one, thank you for action which I trust may receive timely support.

It is necessary to reiterate the warnings of those whose duty it has been and is to supply and distribute water for the District of Columbia. To these has been added that of our President while saving for the community the water supply of the White House fountains.

For many years, with selfish ends, attention has been invited to the need of an increased water supply. Now we find ourselves part of a community not limited by District lines, and alive not only to our own needs but also to those of the garrison across the Potomac.

I earnestly hope relief may forestall calamity.

Very respectfully,

JOHN G. D. KNIGHT,  
Brigadier General, United States Army, retired,  
Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia.

In the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, authority is given to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into a contract to furnish water to territory adjacent to the District of Columbia at rates to be based on the actual cost to the United States and the District, including an interest charge of 4 per cent per annum, and a suitable allowance for depreciation.

The interests of the District are safeguarded by provision limiting the amount so furnished to 3,000,000 gallons per day, and providing that that amount of water could be spared without jeopardizing the interests of the United States or the District of Columbia.

It is manifest that it will be impossible to carry out the terms of that act or to furnish water to the military camps and reservations in the vicinity of Washington unless the present supply is augmented either by the plan suggested by Mr. Phillips or the building of an additional conduit parallel with the present conduit, or utilizing the Patuxent River valleys.

The latter would furnish water from a very sparsely settled area and provide a much softer grade of water, which would materially decrease the filtering cost. This bill merely provides that the commission shall investigate these sources and make a recommendation to the Secretary of War, which report shall be submitted to Congress by him.

As so forcefully set out in the editorial I have just read, work should commence on this project in the immediate future, and it is hoped that plans can be submitted which will enable the commission to report in ample time to allow the surveys to be made during the coming winter season.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state what is the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission is a board created by an act of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, recognized by the Federal authorities in the District appropriation bill of 1918, whereby the District Commissioners were authorized to enter into negotiations and contracts with the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission for the purpose of supplying water, provided it does not jeopardize the water supply of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. It has no jurisdiction within the District.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. No jurisdiction within the District, except that it is given authority by the State of Maryland and that authority has been recognized by the Federal Congress in the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

Mr. WALSH. Might I ask the gentleman one further question. He says "one from the engineer department of the District of Columbia," who is to be appointed on this commission. Does that mean one of the engineers of the District?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. One of the engineer corps of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. The engineer corps, that is simply a member of the commission who is the engineer?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I understand they are civil engineers connected with the District of Columbia government. Within the past two weeks one of these engineers had made quite an exhaustive study of the subject and made recommendations as to the feasibility and practicability of getting a water supply at a very nominal cost.

Mr. WALSH. I was wondering why the member of this commission from the District should not be the engineer commissioner himself, instead of permitting the Secretary of War to select some other member of the corps. It seemed to me, as this so vitally affects the District of Columbia, the engineer commissioner might well be chosen to be a member of this special board.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that I had an interview with the resident engineer commissioner about this bill. I submitted it to him, and he at first stated that sufficient investigation had been made on the project, that he himself had made an investigation some years ago. I laid before him additional data and plans that have been brought out since investigation was made, and after studying these plans and the letter submitted by Mr. Robert B. Morse, civil engineer, Col. Kutz, the present resident engineer commissioner, came before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, both last year and this year, and recommended the exact language of this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Gen. Knight is not the engineer commissioner now.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Gen. Knight, who died a few days ago, wrote a letter urging the passage of this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Has his successor been appointed?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. His successor, Col. Kutz, who was succeeded by Gen. Knight, resumed his duties as resident engineer commissioner immediately on his return from abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint a commission of five members, three of whom shall be selected from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and one from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and one from the engineering department of the District of Columbia, whose duty it shall be, under the direction of the Secretary of War, to make full investigation of the sources of water supply from rivers and streams in the proximity of the city of Washington, with the view to increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia, and to report their findings and recommendations to the Secretary of War at the earliest practicable time, said report to be accompanied by data and other information as to such sources of supply, together with estimates of the probable cost of a project or projects for the transmission of water sufficient to augment the present water supply of the District of Columbia commensurate with present and future needs, including the territory embraced within the jurisdiction of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and Federal military reservations contiguous to the District of Columbia. Such report shall be submitted to Congress by the Secretary of War with his recommendation. And for the purposes herein authorized there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by and under the direction of said commission upon vouchers to be approved by the Secretary of War, and a detailed statement thereof shall accompany the commission's report.



Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may be authorized to correct the spelling of the word "augment," in line 7, on page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WALSH: Page 1, line 7, after the word "and," strike out the words "from the engineering department" and insert "the engineer commissioner."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, although the Secretary of War will select three members of this commission from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, yet it would seem that on a project to be investigated as important as this the engineer commissioner of the District, who has intimate knowledge of the needs of the District of Columbia and who is in close touch with the operations of the War Department, ought to be a member of this particular board rather than that we should permit the Secretary of War to appoint one of his subordinates to that position. Under the language of the bill, three engineers will be appointed from the Army. Of course, the engineer commissioner of the District is of the Engineer Corps of the Army. One would be appointed from the suburban sanitary commission, which is a commission under the jurisdiction of the State of Maryland. Then the Secretary may appoint, not the engineer commissioner, who is responsible for the engineering problems and their solution in the District, but one of his subordinates. Unless there is some serious objection to it, I think it would be better to put the engineer commissioner on the board, who will probably have to do with carrying out this program of increasing the supply after the plan has been agreed upon and authority has been received from Congress to go ahead. I offer the amendment in line with the suggestion made a moment ago in the question that I asked the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN]. I understand the language of the bill is satisfactory to the engineer commissioner; but we must remember that we are not legislating here to satisfy the engineer commissioner but to satisfy the needs of the District, and that it is within our prerogatives to include him upon this commission.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. Has the gentleman followed this situation: The engineer commissioner of the District of Columbia is a very busy man. Every day he is looking after the duties of his office, supervising the building of streets, enlarging of the water mains, supervising the erection of buildings, and he is extremely busy.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I have thought of that; but he has plenty of assistants to do that, and I think that his assistants would be more competent to supervise these municipal improvements than, perhaps, they would be to sit as a member of this commission, which is to consider a very comprehensive plan, than to be member of a board whose personnel may be such that the assistant might not have the experience and qualifications required that the engineer commissioner himself would.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. The bill authorizes the Secretary of War to appoint three members from the Corps of Engineers of the Army, and, of course, the Engineer Commissioner is detailed from the Army, so that the gentleman's amendment would give the Secretary of War or the engineering force of the Army four members out of five. Does not the gentleman think it would be well to have some one who is perhaps permanently connected with the engineering department of the District rather than an officer detailed from the Army to represent more particularly the District end of it?

Mr. WALSH. The question that arose in my mind was giving authority to select a subordinate of the Engineer Commissioner to pass upon and recommend plans for improving and extending the water supply of the District, so that he might be able to say to his superior, the Engineer Commissioner, "This is what I think about it, provided the others agree with me."

Mr. MAPES. There may be subordinate officers who would have more knowledge of this particular subject and be better qualified to serve on this particular board than the Engineer Commissioner himself.

Mr. WALSH. I doubt that very greatly.

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

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I call the committee's attention to this feature of the bill, that it is not intended solely for the purpose of supplying water to the District of Columbia proper, but there are certain areas outside of the District that

desire to make arrangements so that they may get their water from the District, thereby taxing the supply of the District of Columbia beyond the capacity which the District of Columbia itself could properly demand. I do understand that the growth of the city has been such that there is some uneasiness expressed, whether real or not—it may be more a fear than a real trouble—that the supply of water is not equal to what it should be for fire protection of the District proper.

My own judgment is that we ought not to embark upon any plan to endeavor to supply from the Federal plant any of the communities outside of the District of Columbia. That matter has been before the Committee on Appropriations on several occasions. As certain communities in Maryland contiguous to the District of Columbia continue to increase in population that demand would be greater. Now, in order that they may get water they will find it, of course, infinitely cheaper to take their water at the very cheap Washington rate than it would be to establish a plant of their own. Now, you will find that a large amount of the influence behind this bill is prompted by that fact. I do not undertake to say there is anything improper about it, but personally I do not believe that Congress ought to undertake to expend money out of the Federal Treasury in extending its plant to supply water for anybody except the District of Columbia, which is absolutely under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

One clause here would indicate that in addition to these communities it was also intended to supply certain military activities. I presume, of course, that refers to Fort Myer and other communities like that. That might perhaps be cheaper for Fort Myer probably to take water across the river and get it from this plant, but what I am afraid of is that you will by this bill establish a precedent, and as communities begin to build up around the District of Columbia that each of these local separate incorporated towns and cities will want to attach themselves to the Federal plant for the purpose of getting water at a rate at which perhaps they could not get water otherwise.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will yield.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, I am sure the gentleman appreciates that this is not putting into effect any such plant as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. Sisson. I realize that fully.

Mr. WALSH. It is only an investigation, and it has to be passed upon by the Congress later.

Mr. Sisson. My reason for calling attention at this time is for the purpose of letting the Record show what we are likely to meet, in order that Congress should be put upon notice when they pass this bill, if they do pass it.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. As I stated a few moments ago I do not see the necessity for this amendment. The language of this bill providing for the appointment of a member of the engineering force of the District of Columbia was passed upon not only by the present resident Engineer Commissioner, but by his predecessor in office, Gen. Knight, and it seems to me in view of the fact that the Engineer Corps of the Army will have three engineers upon this commission if it is created by act of Congress it would be advisable that one if not more than one of the members of the commission should be a civilian engineer and that the Army is adequately represented. The duties and responsibilities of the Engineer Commissioner are sufficiently onerous to demand all of his time and talents, and no good purpose can be served by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Now, in reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] I may say there has been an effort in the past to supply water to the territory adjacent to the city of Washington and the District of Columbia, and that need has been recognized and met by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia. That committee has recognized that fact, and in the bill providing for the appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, was specified ways and means whereby this could be accomplished upon the payment of the actual cost of delivering the water, including an interest charge at 4 per centum per annum and a suitable allowance for depreciation, this matter having been acted upon by the committee of which the gentleman from Mississippi was a member, and probably was chairman of, and that subcommittee having this matter in charge. This has all been gone into and acted upon by both the House and Senate, and I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment. In line 14, page 2, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

Mr. MAPES. The committee will accept that amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to get two minutes. I want to state to my friend from Maryland that while this item has been carried permitting certain citizens of Maryland to use the water company my friend realizes that it went on in the Senate, and my friend also realizes the influence in the Senate and the particular Senator who happens to be chairman of that subcommittee and the insistence with which it was pressed, that in order to get legislation it was necessary to be held up to some extent, but I will say it never went on in the House or with the approbation of the House or with the approbation of the subcommittee or with the approbation of the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be temporarily laid aside, and when the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union arises that the bill be reported with amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the bill was laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

#### PROTECTION OF GAME, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill H. R. 1190, a bill to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1190) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. WALSH. I object. I think, as it is a short bill, it should be read.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. Temple having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 552) to reimburse W. B. Graham, late postmaster at Ely, Nev., for money expended for clerical assistance, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

#### PROTECTION OF GAME, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1190) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful, within the District of Columbia, for any person at any time to buy, sell, or expose for sale, or to have in possession for the purpose of selling, any game bird. For the purpose of this act the following shall be considered game birds: The anatidae, or waterfowl, including brant, wild ducks, geese, and swan; gruidae, or cranes, including little brown, sandhill, and whooping cranes; rallidae, or rails, including coots, gallinules, and soras; or other rails; limicolidae, or shore birds, including avocets, curlews, dowitchers, godwits, knots, oyster catchers, phalaropes, plovers, sandpipers, snipe, stilts, surf birds, turnstones, willets, woodcock, and yellow legs; columbidae, or pigeons, including doves and wild pigeons; gallinae, or grouse, including wild turkey, pinnated grouse, ruffed grouse, or any kind of grouse, and quail; reedbirds, or ricebirds; marsh blackbirds.

Sec. 2. That nothing herein contained shall prevent the right of any person to take or kill any of the wild fowls or birds in section 1 of this act mentioned when the same shall be so taken or killed by virtue of the authority of a license duly issued by the proper authorities of said District of Columbia for scientific purposes.

That any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act shall be fined not less than \$25 nor more than \$100, or be imprisoned for not more than one month, or both so fined and imprisoned: *Provided*, That each bird mentioned in this act so had in possession, bought, sold, exposed for sale, or had in possession for the purpose of sale shall constitute a separate offense.

Sec. 3. That nothing in this act shall prevent the sale at any time of Hungarian dark-necked pheasants, ring-necked pheasants, Mongolian pheasants, or mallard ducks when the same shall have been raised in captivity; of the sale of game birds alive for propagating purposes: *Provided*, That the same is done under such requirements as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 4. That all acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Frear].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a few suggestions regarding a national budget, and in doing so I will say that I hoped during this session to give this subject the time and effort it deserves, but having been unexpectedly drafted several days ago by the Speaker's appointment into the House War Department investigation, I can only offer a few observations and express hope that the tremendous importance of the national budget problem will be understood and its enactment will be urged vigorously by my colleagues. We must not delude ourselves through press reports into believing that an effective budget law is in sight. In my judgment, the struggle has hardly begun, the obstacles are many, and the effort to get a comprehensive measure instead of a weak compromise makeshift will challenge the best efforts of those who desire a real budget system.

Congress is constantly assailed in the press and by reputable business organizations throughout the country for extravagance and wasted time. Mistakes are sometimes excusable, but we can not remain blind to merited criticism for extravagance and wasted time that result from premeditation or without excuse. In no legislative body in the world is time of greater value than here—time for consideration of national legislative policies, time for over 400 Members to express individual judgment based upon public sentiment they represent, time for legislative investigations of administrative weakness that give publicity and invite penalties for evils found in all administrations as long as government prevails, and time intelligently to legislate.

Every student of the subject knows that our Government's legislative financial policy invites waste of both public money and public time. Ours is the only Government in the world without a businesslike budget system, and the only reason this Government was not adjudged bankrupt long ago is because of our ability and readiness to tax to the limit and to negotiate loans now quoted below par, which future generations are pledged to pay.

#### ENORMOUS INCREASE IN APPROPRIATIONS DEMANDS A NATIONAL BUDGET.

Apart from the enormous increase in appropriations annually, reaching over 400 per cent in four years, and an increase in our bonded indebtedness of several thousand per cent within the same four years, we have contracted extravagant legislative habits with these lavish expenditures. Every locality and every special interest that can bring itself within a constantly broadening rule of Government aid is now on the job. The doors are thrown open wider than ever before to Federal aid, and all opposition, constitutional or otherwise, is swept aside whenever a breach can be made in the Federal vaults. Worthy and unworthy projects knock at the Treasury doors, hand in hand asking for help. Congress tries to recognize the rapidly increasing claims of many committees with varied interests and at the same time to press down the brakes, but the good and bad alike are linked together with bonds of mutual interest.

River and harbor improvements anywhere and everywhere, creeks, rills, and rivulets, good, bad, and indifferent, are bunched in the same bill. Public buildings for village crossroads persistently ask for money. Irrigation ditches to cost hundreds of millions of dollars to meet demands of land-bonded communities; flood-control contributions from the Treasury to reclaim hundreds of millions of acres of private lands that still remain in the wet column; drainage schemes which go joyfully on with extravagant irrigation projects; water powers to make nitrates, fertilizer, and incidentally to make millions of dollars for their promoters; highways that reach from wherefore to whence; Army cantonments that have removed the blue-sky limit on real estate purchases and beat Ruth Law's altitude record; new arsenals that turn out trainloads of munitions soon to be obsolete; aviation contracts that smell to heaven; Hog Island shipyards that were properly christened in wine, water, and waste; and scores of other activities directly financed or indirectly receiving help from the Federal Treasury in times of war and peace; millions for armies of idle employees, employees engaged in useless surveys and interminable researches, gathering carloads of valueless statistics, and peregrinations from Maine to Mexico and Alabama to Alaska, pursuant to instructions from new and old bureaus of the Government; bulletins, pamphlets, and publications sufficient to cover the State of Texas, only a small part of which are read and not 1 per cent digested—these "activities," as they are called, have increased beyond all estimates within recent years.

No responsibility is fixed, because the different bureaus all work independently on the principle of grab jurisdiction and get all you can while you are getting. That is only a partial list of comparatively new fields of Government activities now engaged in helping individuals and localities which are financed



by direct taxes, including 2 cents per dish on ice cream. Knocking at the doors of Congress every session for increasing appropriations, these activities now reach tremendous proportions. How do we meet them? How does Congress provide? How does it function?

#### PRESENT PATCHWORK APPROPRIATION BILLS AND METHODS.

Mr. Chairman, a dozen or more appropriation committees of the House annually grind out patchwork appropriation bills without relation to each other, without knowledge of the aggregate amount to be appropriated, without definite knowledge of sources of revenue to supply the money, with slight knowledge of the comparative needs of bureaus, and frequently by bills that mean indefensible legislative compromises. Members of committees are generally selected because they are interested in the development of some particular department or bureau or locality project. Few men would consent to serve on the River and Harbor, Public Buildings, Public Lands, or other committees that may be named, excepting for the fact that they are primarily interested in some local "improvement," and large appropriations for hundreds of items are the price of the compromise bill. The papers back home, boards of trade, and influential committees advise their Representative or Senator that he is expected to bring home the bacon, and the price of failure in more than one case in this day and generation means political defeat. These potent influences are with Congress to-day in its appropriation bills. What unbiased judgment can be given by committee members under such conditions?

No other country in the world would endure this absurd and wasteful system that grows more menacing to the Federal Treasury every session. Ours, the most enlightened country, as we profess to believe, is the most backward and most unbusinesslike in its financial legislative methods. Individually, men in Congress to-day are as able, honest, and upright as any of their predecessors in past years, and arguments against extravagances and wasted time appeal to the average Representative, but we are confronted with long-established practice that places over 200 Members of the House on appropriation committees, on committees that enjoy influence and honors among those who come before them as suppliants for appropriations—honors as precious as are earrings to the statesmen of Timbuctoo.

Chairmen who are pictured and featured in the press, who enjoy especial privileges because of seniority, naturally will oppose changes in the present order of things, and this opposition must be overcome by argument and convincing proof that existing conditions can exist no longer. Every civilized country in the world has some form of budget system excepting the United States. Here irresponsibility has built up vicious unbusinesslike methods which I have briefly described.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to know how the budget system will help these matters.

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman will wait a few moments I will explain it to him. He is doing as Members of this House frequently do, interrupting a preliminary statement before it can be made.

Your party is pledged in this matter, and your President and mine has said you want it. You ask me how a budget system will help matters. Gentlemen should inform themselves on such matters. But if not I will offer a few suggestions.

#### ALL POLITICAL PARTIES DEMAND A NATIONAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic, Progressive, and Republican party platforms have all demanded the enactment of a budget system. None has yet been seriously considered by the American Congress, while proposed "investigations" postpone definite action for years to come unless public sentiment and congressional responsibility can be aroused to the situation. There is no pride in discovery of the necessity for budget legislation, nor for bills or resolutions proposed by Senators or Representatives. Let the credit go wherever it may. What the country wants is action and early action, and I offer these remarks to that end. Delay has been sought on every pretext since ex-President Taft started the agitation many years ago, and so-called budget bills that seek further delay are among the most dangerous methods of avoiding the issue.

The plan for a comprehensive budget system is not hard to understand, although details may require careful consideration, and the fact that every country in the world excepting our own has a budget system is answer to all questions of policy.

Let me first briefly describe present legislative methods and how they will be improved under a budget plan. For years the different departments of Government have submitted to the Speaker annually an estimate of proposed expenditures for the next fiscal year. These estimates are frequently double the amount that the bureau or department expects to get or does

get. When received, the department estimates are assigned by the Speaker to 14 different appropriation committees of the House. These committees organize and then call before them the heads of departments and bureaus directly affected by the bill to be prepared by the particular committee. Hearings are had by every committee, generally reaching hundreds of printed pages, with many thousands of pages of printed Appropriation Committee hearings in the aggregate. No individual Representative could intelligently read one-tenth part of the total hearings, if he had any desire to do so; and as a matter of procedure, only a handful of members can be kept in attendance in the committee, while efforts to preserve committee quorums are notoriously hopeless. Dry details of appropriations are not inviting to the average Representative. Finally, the chairman of the committee proceeds to prepare a bill for expenditures for that particular department or bureau for the next fiscal year. Sometimes the chairman is aided by employees of the department, with such other assistance as can be had. Committee members may help, but from the very nature of the work, which is frequently technical and always drudgery, the course of preparation is as indicated. The legislative appropriation ship is thus launched and started on its career without sails or rudder.

#### OMNIBUS BILL FORK BARRELS MUST END.

If the bill affects particular localities, like the River and Harbor Committee bill, liberal appropriations in amount and distribution are sought to be equitably scattered, with the aid of bureau chiefs, who soon ascertain the custom and reasons for the custom, until, "irrespective of partisanship," enough votes are equitably distributed to pass the bill. The Public Building Committee bill, that only carries authorizations, is probably the most scientifically constructed pork barrel that ever comes before Congress, and therefore is the easiest to identify. It carries one or more buildings or sites for a safe majority of the Members to insure its passage. Generally all the way from 200 to 300 districts will be found to have been provided for in this bill. One is now pending before the committee that may come out of hiding, like a German submarine, trying to torpedo the Federal Treasury.

If submitted separately instead of in omnibus measures, not one-half of the items would get to first base; but in unity there is legislative strength.

After the appropriation bills are reported to the House, numbering from a dozen to 15 or more every session, the fight for recognition on the floor of the House then occurs, and thereafter for months the attention of the House is occupied with these patchwork, loosely prepared, and hurriedly thrown together bills carrying in the aggregate many billions of dollars. When the dozen or more bills get before the House, ordinarily covering a period of 10 to 15 weeks or more for discussion, it becomes difficult to keep a quorum of 100 Members present in the House. Frequently the number in attendance is less than a score, or under 5 per cent of the House membership. Other committee hearings, other official duties, and primarily lack of interest in interminable appropriation details and in discussion of subjects foreign to the bill before the House explains the situation.

Proposed amendments offered by Members to strike out or reduce items will fail nine times out of ten, because the committee is bound by an unwritten rule to stand together on every item in the bill, and the familiar appeal to "stand by the committee" is a continuous slogan. No matter how bad the item or amount, when once reported it goes through. Efforts to increase amounts on particular items sometimes succeed when the mover of an amendment interested in some particular project or item gets his friends on the floor when the committee is caught napping. If he fails in his effort to increase or insert in the House, true to form, he takes his amendment and grievance to his Senator, where the result is brought about in committee or on the floor of the upper House and is put through in conference. It is a legislative burlesque with statesmanship accompaniment.

#### LEGISLATIVE FOLLY IN DEALING WITH FINANCIAL PROBLEMS.

Mr. Chairman, during the passage of the \$800,000,000 military bill this month, when many items of the bill were subjected to severe criticism, the 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee, the Interstate Commerce Committee, and different appropriation committees, including over 200 Members, were in practically continuous committee sessions. Little more than a corporal's guard at times was on hand in the House to consider an Army bill that was admittedly cut over \$300,000,000 from the same bill passed by the House four months before and then killed in the Senate. Lump-sum items of practically \$100,000,000 each appeared in the military bill, covering

scores of miscellaneous purposes, important and unimportant in character. In a bill cut from \$1,117,000,000 to \$809,000,000 and carrying many doubtful items which had been attacked in the preceding session, only a small minority of the House was kept in attendance. That is substantially the history of legislative consideration of every appropriation bill, big and little. When the same bill gets to the Senate a little matter of seventy or eighty million dollars is reinstated just to show where real authority rests.

Every Member is cognizant of the facts, but under the present lack of any system he is powerless to act.

Let me give a few examples of legislative folly within the past few days that speak for themselves. It is a matter of recent history that eight appropriation bills, after many months' consideration last year in the House, were passed to the Senate, where they failed in the legislative discard last session. Then they aggregated over \$3,000,000,000. Again hearings were held this session on these same eight bills; again they were prepared and reported; and again attacked and defended on the floor in a series of attempts at economy—largely for political effect, it was claimed. I say "attempts" advisedly, because any attempt to prepare or consider an appropriation bill in the usual way is unbusinesslike, wasteful, and a legislative farce.

#### SURREPTITIOUS STATESMANSHIP ON A \$12,000 SIRUP ITEM.

Take the Agricultural bill for illustration, which, after having been passed by the House and killed by the Senate last session, was again hastily prepared this session and again reported to the House carrying \$32,000,000, a reduction of several million from the amount recommended by the senatorial committee last session. This bill had to be passed by Congress before the 1st day of July, 1919, or the Agricultural Department would be stranded. About 30 legislative days remained when debate was begun in the House on this Agricultural bill on May 27, and debate on the bill ended on June 4, or 8 days, including 5 legislative working days. One amendment to reduce a \$12,000 sirup item to \$5,000 was vigorously debated and developed much latent statesmanship, until finally Majority Leader MONDELL was obliged to lecture the House for its unbusinesslike, dilatory tactics. Hundreds of other items were discussed in the 5 days' debate on the Agricultural bill. At that rate of progress of 5 days for a \$32,000,000 bill, the military bill, carrying \$800,000,000, or the naval bill, carrying \$600,000,000, would consume about 80 out of the 25 remaining days prior to July 1, or 80 days out of 25, with other bills to follow. This absurd situation was complicated by the further fact that other matters sometimes have the right of way. After such conditions were untangled, the Senate also had to give intelligent consideration to all of these same bills. Folly? It is worse than folly; it is downright incompetency, for which we are accountable, and both branches of Congress must accept their full share of responsibility. This is done regularly under a plea of confession and avoidance.

With several billion dollars in appropriations hanging fire, the Agricultural bill carrying less than 1 per cent of the total to be appropriated was given one-sixth of the legislative time remaining for discussion in the House, and then it went to the Senate. That policy can not find an apologist in Congress, and yet when the District of Columbia appropriation bill followed, on June 4, it carried less than \$15,000,000, or one-half of 1 per cent of the total appropriations to be passed in the remaining 25 legislative days left to the House and Senate. The District bill took four more legislative days of the precious time remaining before the end of the fiscal year, while the great military and naval bills, carrying \$1,319,000,000, and containing many hundreds of items, received less than a week's consideration.

Let me call attention to other evidence of our display of collective legislative wisdom and business methods. Congress is required by present practices to give nearly 10 per cent of its legislative time to the District of Columbia. "District day" occupies the center of the stage, like a turbulent town meeting, once or twice every month, and the appropriation bills and other District legislation, like the poor, are ever with us. A city of the size of Milwaukee or Cleveland is constantly figuring in the center of the ring. Washington papers feature in pictures and laudatory articles those who favor a so-called half-and-half taxing scheme, inaugurated about the time the tables were handed down to Moses on the mount. Annually, semiannually, and even by-weekly this momentous problem comes before Congress. Girded to the loins for battle, the antagonists on the half-and-half District tax, backed by the Washington press, little and big, struggle in Titan conflict on this momentous tax question for Washington.

#### SIXTEEN MEMBERS PRESENT DURING AN APPROPRIATION-BILL DEBATE.

What matters whether military, naval, railroad, or other appropriation bills pass, so long as half and half retains its grip. Champions are crowned with laurel wreaths, while Goliath Philistines are roasted and toasted and slingshot into temporary oblivion as both ends of the Capitol become a sewing circle debating society with the half-and-half tax a bone of contention on which to sharpen teeth of able statesmen. For many precious minutes on the District appropriation bill the House discussed the salary of one Beeler and his assistant, who tried to untangle the local street car snarl. Explanations were demanded and given time after time. At the close of the first day's debate in the House on the District bill, Judge GARD, of Ohio, said to the Chair, "There are hardly 20 people in the Hall, and I move that the committee do now rise." In other words, out of 435 Members less than 5 per cent would stay to listen to the discussion. A vote on an item at that time showed 6 ayes and 10 noes, or 16 men, good and true, were present. That was all that could be mustered at a time when several billions of dollars in appropriation bills were waiting passage, with less than 25 legislative days remaining in which the Senate and House must enact all these appropriation bills into law.

I have given some side lights on two or three bills that have been taking up the time of Congress under the present system or lack of system. Is it any wonder that waste of time and money is incalculable under this childish, absurd practice, that would merit a schoolmaster's castigation if infants in the primary department were guilty of like conduct? How much longer will kindergarten customs govern Congress?

I believe I have fairly described some things for which intelligent men—statesmen, Congressmen—for the last half century have been to blame. No responsibility for bills, no limit to appropriations, no relation to revenues, no intelligent or businesslike way of handling the legislative financial interests of the greatest Government in the world. Such inefficiency in a large part will be remedied by the adoption of a real budget system.

MR. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. FREAR. I always yield to our distinguished ex-Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri.

MR. CLARK of Missouri. Has the gentleman any remedies to suggest by which Members can be kept here?

MR. FREAR. I am going to divert for a moment, if permitted. By the adoption of a budget system we can keep Members here, because we will save at least two months of legislative work every year by the adoption of such a system. Members will remain in attendance when important matters are considered. We are here to-day, presenting the most ridiculous spectacle in the world. We are here with the District of Columbia appropriation simply acting as a board of aldermen. That work ought to be taken from the floor of the House, and then 30 days will be sufficient time to give to the consideration of an annual budget.

MR. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman has never answered the question that I asked him. It was if he had any suggestion to make about how to keep Members in attendance here?

MR. FREAR. I suggested to the distinguished ex-Speaker, and I tried to make it as clear as possible, that it will be helped by the adoption of a budget system. Members will not come and listen to the kind of discussion we have had in the last two hours on this floor. They have more important business to perform elsewhere.

MR. CLARK of Missouri. How would a budget system induce men to come here to-day and listen to this debate about the water question and things of that kind?

MR. FREAR. It would take away all the appropriation detail matters and give time for questions of national importance. Now, if the gentleman from Missouri will pardon me, there is no other way, in my judgment, whereby you can do it. Its adoption is a proper thing not only in the saving of time, but in removing many present criticisms that are justly lodged against Congress.

#### PRACTICAL FEATURES OF A REAL BUDGET SYSTEM.

What is a national budget system? I will not attempt to discuss the subject technically, because, while the general plan is simple and easily understood, matters of technical detail or ramifications of the system are not important to consider. Congress has neither the time, training, nor desire to master such details. Briefly, an efficient budget system includes, first, a businesslike preparation of estimates of expenditures by the President or the administration acting through the Secretary of the Treasury or other agency. As the administration spends the money, it should know what money is claimed to be needed.



This statement of departmental estimates carefully prepared by one who will be held responsible for all the items and the total amount contained in the preliminary budget should be in lieu of the unrelated estimates now furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury under the several acts of 1884, 1901, and 1906, at which latter date President Taft tried to make a beginning, but failed.

When an intelligent report has been carefully compiled by the administration the budget reaches the next step. Second, the administration budget should be placed in the hands of an auditor general, comptroller, or other agent of Congress, *appointed by Congress, and acting independent of the administration.* This official, with whatever technical aids and clerical help may be required, will make a complete analysis of the budget, comparing its items with prior bills, cutting down wherever practicable to do so, and making a complete audit or accounting on behalf of Congress, which he represents, a duty now imperfectly performed by nonexpert Congressmen year after year. This report will be presented to Congress in the early days of the session, having been prepared in advance by competent experts. Thereafter comes the last and most important step of all.

Third and last, the auditor general's report having been audited on behalf of Congress by expert accountants reaches the stage for legislative action, and is referred to a budget committee, preferably a joint committee of the two Houses. This committee takes up the auditor's report and gives whatever hearings may be found necessary. The bill or budget is jointly considered throughout by the single joint budget committee, and then it is reported to the respective Houses of Congress for passage, but first by the House. The bill then is passed by both Houses.

Mr. Chairman, this budget procedure should be hedged about so that increases in items of appropriations can be made in committee only by two-thirds vote and no increase shall be in order by an individual Member on the floor. The administration's budget and congressional action then become matters of record responsibility. Congress must appropriate for actual needs or be held justly and politically responsible. Emergency appropriations can be similarly checked, but practically all unnecessary waste in time and money will be eliminated by this plan, according to the experience of other countries, and *any real budget system must have only one budget committee.*

#### BUSINESS METHODS SHOULD SUPPLANT INDEFENSIBLE PRACTICES.

This general plan for budget legislation, with some modifications, is adopted by other countries where an effective system is in use. It is the only way to prevent many of the evils now existing, and for that reason possibly it will meet opposition in both House and Senate from those whose present position of influence, power, and prestige on appropriation committees would be radically affected or possibly end. It would prevent river and harbor pork barrels, because the River and Harbor Committee could not prepare bills or insert items other than those presented by the administration. It would effectually squelch the public-building pork-barrel scandal because necessity and not legislative pull would determine what waterways would be improved and what buildings erected. Bucolic statesmen who sometimes have charge of such measures may fume and storm at this "surrender" of legislative perquisites, but men who desire to do public business on business principles will welcome the reform.

From such sources as thrive on political pull, opposition will come to any radical change, and no man will discount the strength of that opposition at both ends of the Capitol, but, like an aching tooth, present practices must be plucked out and an efficient substitute provided. The budget will meet every requirement. It does meet such needs in all other countries of the world, and that is a safe test, whereas ours fails in all important essentials.

Let me briefly discuss plans now before Congress, introduced at this session, and in doing so I call attention to the fact that a familiar method of preventing legislative reform is to introduce measures that emasculate the substantive features of a proposed reform, and yet pretend to favor it. Oftentimes this is unconsciously aided by those unfamiliar with the ends to be reached or with the general subject.

#### THE LONG FIGHT FOR A NATIONAL BUDGET MUST SUCCEED.

The experience of other countries has brought the budget system into pronounced favor. For years it has been urged in this country; bills have been introduced, resolutions asking for its adoption have been offered, and advocates of the budget have been urging it upon Congress in both House and Senate. I make no pretense to especial activity, but realizing that the best argument in favor of a budget would be to expose present inefficient extravagant methods, I have to the best of my ability since my first election to Congress openly opposed several pernicious bills

that have made congressional legislative methods a by-word and a joke. In 1914 I opposed the river and harbor bill for several days on the floor of the House, exposing its waste and fraud as I viewed it. That bill was killed in the Senate. Every such bill offered since that time has been exposed, and a position on the committee for several years did not effect my course. Members of the River and Harbor Committee and of the House have stated that a decided improvement in bills has resulted, but I am frank to say that no bill prepared as such bills are prepared can ever bear any semblance to a bill based on governmental necessities.

Opposition to the public-building extravagance is known to many Members and has been frequently expressed in debate. No omnibus bill has passed the House during the six years I have been a Member of this body, although it has been a constant Barkis. I take no special credit for that result, but, supported by leading members of the Democratic administration and by many members of my own party, I have tried on the floor and elsewhere to stop the notorious pork-barrel practice that is a stench in the nostrils of the American public.

This was all preliminary to active work on a budget plan, which, to my mind, is the only effective way of ending such objectionable legislative practices. Over a year and a half ago I spoke for a budget bill in the House and introduced resolutions urging its passage. Ever since that date I have urged it, as have other Members of the House and Senate, in season and out. Three measures are before Congress at this time that should receive your consideration. Those introduced by myself are House joint resolution 83, introduced May 30; House bill 4061, introduced May 30; House bill 3738, introduced May 28; and one or two other minor bills. House joint resolution 83 and bills 4061 and 3738 are all that directly affect the plan I submit. Other bills are designed to take from the Treasury Department governmental activities that should be undertaken by other departments and in order that the Treasury Department may be free to take over many important duties that would come to it under a budget system.

Bill No. 4061 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall gather together all departmental estimates and make them into a tentative budget, which he shall furnish the President by November 15 of each year. No resolution or bill can compel specific action by the President, but every President will hail the chance to present in a businesslike manner the facts which he is unable to properly place before Congress under existing methods. Bill No. 3738 provides for an auditor general, who, acting as an employee of Congress, takes over certain duties now performed by the Treasury Department and, in addition, proceeds to audit, improve, and, where possible, reduce the estimates furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury. In order to remove him and his corps of assistants from the control or influence of the administration he is to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, in concert with the majority and minority leaders of the House. The budget is to reach this auditor general and his corps of assistants by November 15 every year, and by January 15 he is required to present it to the House.

#### THE MOST IMPORTANT LINK IS A SINGLE-BUDGET COMMITTEE.

House joint resolution 83, which is the most important link in the budget plan, provides for a change of rules in House and Senate, so that, instead of a score of committees in the two Houses wasting months of legislative time, overlapping each other's duties and jurisdiction, with enormous financial waste, House joint resolution 83 provides one joint budget committee of both Houses will receive the budget reported by the auditor general and, after such hearings as may be necessary, held in joint committee session, will report the approved budget to the House and Senate for discussion. So far as practicable, the plan is hedged about by simple, direct methods for protecting the Federal Treasury from existing waste and insures a large saving of legislative time and of money.

The resolution and bills were prepared by me, but taken from other measures offered in the past, with such changes as might be desirable. No pride of authorship exists, nor are these bills or the resolution urged in the precise form presented, but any plan that fails to give Congress a complete control over the auditor general's appointment and activities and that fails to place in the hands of one committee the entire control of the budget will fail to give needed relief.

#### THREE BUDGET PLANS THAT HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED.

Mr. Chairman, I have been asked to state the distinction between this plan described and the so-called McCormick plan introduced by Senator McCormick in the Senate, and the Good bill, H. R. 1201, introduced by Representative Goop in the House.

Senator McCormick has secured action by the Senate Rules Committee, creating a special Senate committee to "investi-

gate" a budget system. The Senate may be in advance of the House, notwithstanding the House is the body in which all revenue bills and appropriation bills originate, and we should not be backward in advancing this reform. In my judgment, if the McCormick resolution and accompanying bills introduced last session become law, the American Congress will have a strong, efficient budget system. I suspect we have both received aid and inspiration from the same source, from Mr. Collins, an expert accountant and clear thinker, whose work on the budget is a masterpiece of concise argument.

The McCormick resolution, submitted in House Document No. 1006, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, provides for a committee of 40 members, which, for the sake of securing a legislative center rush to put through the resolution, is a good move. House joint resolution 83, which I introduced, provides for a joint committee of both Houses, made up of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate, consisting of about the same number. This latter plan was proposed because for 76 years the Ways and Means Committee was the budget committee of the House, and since the organization of Congress it has been the committee charged with the duty of raising revenues. This duty, when performed by a budget committee, should be combined with that of passing upon appropriations and expenditures. In addition to these reasons, I believed hearings on present bills might proceed more expeditiously; but I am free to say that whether that committee or a special committee is selected, it will be hailed by every advocate of legislative economy as a great improvement over the present system.

The provision in my resolution for joint hearings, joint consideration, and simultaneous report to the House and Senate is a matter of detail that could be provided in any change of rules. In the matter of audit on the part of Congress and in the original preparation of the budget by the Treasury Department the two plans are much alike, doubtless arising from the same source of budget aid furnished Congress.

The Good bill is the only other measure that seems to have received special notice, and it is probable that Representative Goon would not insist on limiting his plan to the powers contained in his bill. Otherwise it would only be a makeshift and fail in the vital elements that should compose a budget system. House bill No. 1201, known as the Good bill, suggests a different method of collecting department data and presenting estimates, but provides effectively for the preparation of an administration budget. From that point, however, the plans differ, and the Good bill directs the President to appoint an auditor or comptroller to examine the administration bills as the agent of Congress. The weakness of this procedure in a matter of such momentous importance requires no discussion when compared to a plan that requires the Speaker and majority and minority budget, audited by an official appointed by the President, to be divided among the 14 appropriation committees without any limit as to appropriations and no further semblance to a real budget plan. In other words, the bill is a budget bill only in name. A provision is inserted that a committee will be appointed to "investigate" what further legislation is needed. After many years of budgetary agitation, adoption by every party in a pledge for a budget reform, and after over two years' delay since the last national platforms were adopted, no more effective method of burying a budget system could be devised than to now provide for an "investigating" committee. The Republican Party can not go before the people with any such plan and call it a fulfillment of a specific pledge. I do not assume that is the purpose of this bill, which preserves intact all the present appropriation committees, but its effect is to delay or destroy early budget legislation.

CONTINUED "INVESTIGATIONS" BURIED BUDGET LEGISLATION FOR 10 YEARS.

The most needful link in an effective budget, a single budget, or appropriation committee is absent in the Good bill, which preserves the present House rules and leaves the administration budget, audited by an official appointed by the President, to be divided among the 14 appropriation committees without any limit as to appropriations and no further semblance to a real budget plan. In other words, the bill is a budget bill only in name. A provision is inserted that a committee will be appointed to "investigate" what further legislation is needed. After many years of budgetary agitation, adoption by every party in a pledge for a budget reform, and after over two years' delay since the last national platforms were adopted, no more effective method of burying a budget system could be devised than to now provide for an "investigating" committee. The Republican Party can not go before the people with any such plan and call it a fulfillment of a specific pledge. I do not assume that is the purpose of this bill, which preserves intact all the present appropriation committees, but its effect is to delay or destroy early budget legislation.

Our Democratic friends ignored their platform pledge and also the request of the President for a single appropriation committee. Passage of the Good bill would mean nothing tangible and preserve the evils of which we stand convicted by our own record. Mr. Sherley, former chairman of the Appropriation Committee, declared that the budget was opposed in the House by 200 specific objections and every reason was a membership on one of the 14 appropriation committees. We must overcome

those 200 odd arguments by convincing Members that it is the right thing, the honest thing, to do; the square thing with the country and with our constituents; and that any man who can make good on an appropriation committee that deals in dry details can do better legislative service for his country and receive commendation from his constituents when giving his energies to great national problems, which he will be permitted to do if appropriation committee drudgery is turned over to expert auditor accountants. Then the only function of appropriation committees, apart from the budget committee, will lie in legislative policies for the department represented.

Mr. Chairman, in these few remarks I have spoken with some frankness about present inefficient, wasteful, and scandalous methods of legislating on financial matters of the Federal Government. Members will realize that great moderation has been shown in the terms used and that any private business would be ruined in short order by methods we practice here. Many Senators and Representatives in past and present years have referred to some of our legislation in specific terms of "stealing," "looting the Treasury," and "criminal waste." These men have vainly talked against practices that are nearly as bad to-day as they have been in the past, and the last river and harbor bill, carrying scores of vicious, extravagant projects, with some items of war necessity, and the indefensible public-building pork barrel promised to be introduced in a few days, are testimonials to such bad practices.

RECrimINATION ON EXTRAVAGANCE WOULD CEASE WITH A BUDGET.

For six years the Republican side of the aisle has vigorously charged the Democrats with extravagance, waste, and taking the "blood of the people" for their toll. To this our Democratic friends have retorted, "Republicans are just as bad, and are equally responsible for the preparation and passage of appropriation bills that measure expenditures." Unprejudiced minds must admit both are on trial, and until a thorough, genuine budget system is adopted it will continue to be a case of the pot calling the kettle black. On different occasions I have stated emphatically that individually and collectively congressional standards are higher to-day than ever before, due in part, I believe, to direct primaries that bring direct responsibilities, while temptations of old, offered through powerful lobbies, easy money, and direct methods have disappeared. Not only are standards higher, but in private and public dealings in Congress to-day, whatever may be the popular conception, men are known to their colleagues to be honest and high-principled.

Possibly no Member of this body has spoken more frankly in the recent past against congressional extravagance, or more vigorously denounced specific legislation, than I have done; but my high regard for this great body, individually and collectively, caused me to resent security-league calumny and to demand that we vindicate ourselves and disclose the hypocrisy of those whose bigotry, ignorance, and malice caused them to regard their own kind as supermen, whereas they were only types of the egotistical ass that does not understand people in general. Congress is made up of able men in close touch with their fellow men, and, I believe, is representative of the best elements of citizenship throughout the country, but Congress, individually and collectively, will not respond to public sentiment or throw off inefficient, unbusinesslike ways, wherever political prestige is to be sacrificed, excepting through an upheaval that rarely occurs.

To the hundreds of business and commercial organizations throughout the country, and the powerful press agencies that have voiced a demand for better government legislation through the adoption of an effective budget system, I will say frankly you are no nearer the mark than before you started, excepting for public education that has resulted.

CONGRESS MUST KEEP PLEDGES MADE BY ITS PLATFORMS AND LEADERS.

President Taft was enthusiastic about overturning present wasteful conditions, but a decade has passed without any appearance of budget reform for which he worked. President Wilson made a direct appeal from the Clerk's desk of the House two years ago for a single appropriation committee, but not one move has been made by Democrats or Republicans to bring about that single needed reform. All the political parties in their national platforms have demanded genuine budget legislation, but not one move has occurred to secure specific reform, excepting individual efforts to that end. Any real move will encounter blind switches and legislative sidetracks by way of further "investigations." Congress does not care for all the resolutions and petitions in Christendom, whether issued by commercial or other organizations, because Congress has heard that men have innocently signed petitions to hang themselves, and Congress ordinarily responds only to direct action.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat how a budget plan works.



After the preparation of the budget is made by the administration, no matter what party it may belong to, a full statement will show what the probable expenditures of the Government will be for the next fiscal year. That is provided for in one of the bills I have introduced and which I shall attach to my remarks. Other Members have introduced similar bills. A second bill I have introduced provides for the appointment of an auditor general or accountant, and with his force of men he will take this administration statement, the same as is done in other governments, and he will go over the various items of the budget, make comparisons with the preceding year, and reduce items wherever practicable—work that is done to-day by the average Member of Congress. We are not fitted for the work. We have neither the time nor training to give to it. That ought to be looked after by technical gentlemen, accountants, experts acting for Congress, men who can make the comparisons. And then the budget goes to the budget committee of both House and Senate. That ought to be presented at the beginning of the session.

I have introduced a resolution in this case to have a budget committee composed of Members of both Houses, who will jointly and at the same time consider the auditor general's report. After they have made their examinations and changes and reported to the House, no Member on the floor of this House will have the right to increase the appropriation. This budget committee presents the budget, and its consideration ought not to take over 30 days, compared with several months under present methods, that is the heart of a real budget plan.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I want to consider this proposition, and I want to put my statement before you briefly, if I may. Otherwise I would gladly yield.

When we have passed upon the budget bill the Senate and the House are nearly agreed as to the items, although it goes through the House first, according to the resolution I have introduced.

The budget committee has the preparation of the revenues and the expenditures of the revenues of the Government. That is the proper place for its consideration, the same as in other governments. Every government on the face of the earth has a budget system except ours, and in no other government is there so much carelessness and so much looseness in regard to appropriations. I do not say this is the only practical budget system, but I say that any good budget system that contains the propositions I have mentioned will prove a great improvement over our present system. Of course, you will have to do away with your 14 appropriating committees, having control over 14 to 20 appropriation bills. That is a first and a hard proposal to accept.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to take up the gentleman's time—

Mr. FREAR. I do not feel that I have the right to refuse to yield to the distinguished ex-Speaker.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will get some more time, but this is one of the most important questions that have been discussed since I have been here. Has the gentleman ever figured on these 14 appropriation bills coming from 7 appropriating committees? There are 21 Members on each committee and 7 times 21 is 147. You have 147 Members against you to start with.

Mr. FREAR. I appreciate that, and it is a far larger number than you have stated. The gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley, when chairman of Appropriation Committee, said to me, "You will have over 200 against you to start with." But we are going to make the fight through public sentiment, and we must convince our own membership it is right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not opposed to it. I am just suggesting to you the futility of talking about it.

Mr. FREAR. We have never got anywhere on anything on earth that we have not talked about. I know that the distinguished ex-Speaker, with all the power that he possesses, must be in sympathy with the proposition of saving time and saving money, and—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, of course, and I am in sympathy with getting up some kind of a scheme to induce Members to come here and attend to business.

Mr. FREAR. When we adopt a budget system, which I believe will come in several years, although the newspapers are claiming that it will be indorsed at this session, then we will have Members attend these sessions. I realize the great obstacles that the ex-Speaker has mentioned, and I know the opposition to the project, and what is true here is true with respect to the body at the other end of the Capitol, and Senators are more jealous of their rights, their powers, and perquisites than are the Members of this body. But it has got to come.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is there no chance now?

Mr. FREAR. Because there are over 200 members of committees having appropriating power who do not want to lose their prestige. I have sat on one of these committees, and I know what it means, but they must come to it. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced three bills, or rather one resolution and two bills, which I offered, and, as I show in my resolution, I have selected the Committee on Ways and Means as the one committee of the House to represent the budget. I do not care whether you appoint an independent committee or not. There is not a Member of this House—I do not care who he is—who can not render more valuable service to his country and to his constituents by working on important general legislation than by sitting on an appropriating committee and trying to do detail work such as we try to do for months at a time and in an inefficient manner.

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

Mr. FREAR. Yes. Certainly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Under our Constitution, with a Senate that changes one-third of its membership every two years, and with a House that changes every two years, how in the world can you have a budget governing the whole public service and get anything out of it? As I understand it, in Great Britain, when their budget is turned down, they go to the people at an election. You can not do that here. I suppose that is also so in France, and I suppose it is so in Italy.

Mr. FREAR. If the distinguished Republican ex-Speaker, to whom we all listen with profound respect, as we also listen to ex-Speaker CLARK, and with all due deference to their views, because we learn so much from them, will reflect a moment he will realize that when the Republican Party challenges the record of the Democratic administration or when the Democratic Party challenges the record of a Republican administration we must stand on our record, on the moneys we demand and are voted, and if a Republican Congress does not give a Democratic administration a sufficient amount of money to properly run the Government, the public at large will not retain us in the service, but will turn us out. That is our responsibility. In other countries to which reference has been made they oust the ministry. Here we can not do that. It will take time to make necessary changes, but fundamentally the same principle is at the bottom of it. Under this resolution that I have proposed and under the two bills that are proposed we would have the same situation as exists in Great Britain, where an enormous amount of time and an enormous amount of money is saved compared with our lack of system.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman desired to be notified before his time had expired.

Mr. FREAR. I realize, as both distinguished ex-Speakers have said, that it is hard to attempt to outline in brief time the importance of this subject, but I am going to insert the bills, resolution, and other data, and if you will do me the honor to read them you will find a way pointed out, and you will find I have outlined not only the faults of the present system, but the object to be attained by a new real budget plan.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes. If he can devise a way to get a budget, I would like to hear of it. I am not opposed to the budget. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Not to be taken out of the time agreed upon?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; not to be taken out of the time agreed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] be allowed to proceed 10 minutes more, the time not to be taken out of the time agreed upon.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, can that be done when the time has been fixed by the House?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It has been done a thousand times.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair considers it can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order that the Committee of the Whole House has no authority to increase the time that has been fixed in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is well taken. If unanimous consent is granted, the Chair would consider that it could be done. But the rules specifically provide otherwise, so that the contention of the gentleman from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. FREAR. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that this is not offered as a motion before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not been presented, but the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] made the request, and the Chair will put the request of the gentleman from Missouri if he so desires.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wanted it put, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri requests unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] be extended 10 minutes, the same not to be taken from the time as agreed upon for general debate. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I think that is an extremely bad precedent for us to set, and I very much regret to say that I feel compelled to object. I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin has made a study of the matter, but—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. FREAR. I appreciate the force of the objection and also the generous purpose of the mover of the motion.

I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that this is the most important question before the House in regard to our legislative action. I feel I can give but little time to it. My work in the war-expenditures investigation is marked out, as I said at the outset, and I hope others will undertake the work I began several years ago in company with others to secure a real budget system. I must hurry, for my time is limited.

IF WE FAIL TO GIVE THE COUNTRY A BUDGET SYSTEM ANOTHER CONGRESS WILL KEEP THE PLEDGE.

Mr. Chairman, some economies have been had through exposures of bills on the floor, but unless it is to be a matter of hope and promise early reform can only be reached by active efforts to secure individual pledges from the most conservative, holdfast body in the world—the American Congress. Self-interest is an argument that reaches close to men in public life. The best way to remove self-interest here and political interest of those whose first love is an appropriation committee and prestige in effecting direct action on the Public Treasury is by self-interest in conditions back home. Home constituencies and the country at large must emphasize the fact that the country will no longer tolerate delay or congressional inaction. A real budget will come when Congress is convinced that if it does not give the reform another Congress will be returned that will.

Practical results will be secured by practical means, and a budget system will be had when public sentiment demands the reform.

Briefly, by way of summary, I have attempted to describe, first, the many influences that surround Congress seeking aid and tending to create legislative waste and extravagance in a monetary way.

Second. The absurd and unbusinesslike spectacle presented in handling administrative expenditures through 20 different appropriation committees of Congress, all of which hold separate hearings and pretend to prepare bills and make investigations that can be properly performed only by administration sources, then examined by experts on behalf of Congress, and finally by a single congressional committee that would have matters of financial policy rather than details to consider.

Third. I have given the general effect of an efficient budgetary plan, its purposes, and brief mention of several measures now before Congress.

In conclusion. I repeat what was said at the outset, a comprehensive budget would, in my judgment, save to the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars annually without injuring or affecting adversely a single legitimate public interest. It would save many weeks' time in the aggregate to Members who now fritter away months of valuable hours in the discussion of appropriation bills in committee and in Congress—time that could be used to better advantage by every Member in the consideration of important legislative problems, and would shorten sessions proportionately if we act with judgment.

In other words, it would be a blessing to the individual Member, to the taxpayers who pay the bills, and, last and most important, to the country.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say this is a work that we ought to finish, and individual Members ought to study the whole proposition to bring it about, because, as I said at the outset, every political party has demanded it in its platform. We are pledged to enact it into law. Every country on the face of the globe has a budget system to-day except the United States. We know that it will save weeks and months of legislative time every year. We know it will save probably hundreds of millions of dollars every year if it can be adopted, and we must agree upon it. The obstacles against it consist of the honorary positions that are occupied by men at both ends of the Capitol, high positions which they honestly treasure. Those positions are a matter of personal pride with them. But if we want to save all this time and money to the people, if we want to become more efficient in our methods of legislation, it is our duty to pass a national budget system. [Applause.]

I am presenting brief data in connection with my remarks that are related to the general subject:

*Appropriation bills passed by the House at session ended Mar. 4, 1919, for the fiscal year 1920.*

No.	Title of bill. <sup>1</sup>	Passed House. <sup>1</sup>	Approved. <sup>1</sup>	Total appropriation. <sup>2</sup>
1	District of Columbia.....	Dec. 11, 1918	.....	\$14,091,701.00
2	Post Office.....	Dec. 15, 1918	Feb. 23, 1919	311,495,149.00
3	Rivers and harbors.....	Jan. 11, 1919	Mar. 2, 1919	11,178,164.00
4	Legislative.....	Jan. 15, 1919	Mar. 1, 1919	97,940,411.77
5	Diplomatic and Consular.....	Jan. 22, 1919	Mar. 4, 1919	9,841,661.67
6	Indian.....	Jan. 23, 1919	.....	11,095,597.01
7	Agriculture.....	Feb. 1, 1919	.....	11,671,022.00
8	Second deficiency for 1919.....	Jan. 29, 1919	Feb. 25, 1919	292,714,084.71
9	Pensions.....	Feb. 1, 1919	.....do.....	215,030,000.00
10	Military Academy.....	Feb. 4, 1919	Mar. 4, 1919	2,277,932.20
11	Navy.....	Feb. 11, 1919	.....	720,793,000.33
12	Army.....	Feb. 18, 1919	.....	1,070,529,088.56
13	Fortifications.....	Feb. 19, 1919	Mar. 3, 1919	11,214,231.00
14	Railroads.....	Feb. 21, 1919	.....	750,000,000.00
15	Sundry civil.....	Feb. 28, 1919	.....	851,171,849.25
16	General deficiency.....	.....do.....	.....	26,937,265.03
Total amount of appropriation bills passed by House.....				4,670,129,437.55

<sup>1</sup> Monthly compilations of the war Congress, Apr. 1, 1919, p. 206.

<sup>2</sup> The Chronicle, Apr. 5, 1919, p. 1345.

Note: This table does not include:

1. Appropriations in miscellaneous acts.....	\$1,117,713,436.47
2. Permanent annual and indefinite appropriations (estimated).....	2,074,286,880.00
3. Appropriation to meet deficiency in Quartermaster Corps.....	829,375,295.10
4. Additional expenditures to discharge war contracts (estimated).....	1,500,000,000.00
Grand total.....	10,191,505,049.12

By way of illustration the total appropriation for 1916-17, prior to the war, is of special interest. Also the time consumed by the several bills in different appropriation committees which were reported throughout the session to the House, beginning with January 29 and ending in August.

The total annual appropriation for the year 1916-17, prior to our entrance into the war, reached about \$1,626,000,000, of which amount \$84,290,000 were appropriated by miscellaneous acts, including private acts for relief of individuals, and 14 general appropriation bills were strung along throughout the session, as follows: The Indian bill, reported January 29; the Post Office bill, January 31; the river and harbor bill, February 24; the legislative, executive, and judicial bill on the same day; two other bills reported in March, one in April, four in May, one in June, and two in August. In addition there were five urgent deficiency bills and two resolutions extending appropriations until bills could be passed.

*Total appropriations for the fiscal years 1914, 1915, and 1918.*

[Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1917, p. 652.]

Fiscal year—	
1914.....	\$684,757,270.26
1915.....	674,497,625.16
1918.....	18,881,940,243.79

*Total number of appropriation bills passed by Congress for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918.*

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 14, 1917, p. 7807.]

Regular acts.....	13
Deficiency acts.....	2
Miscellaneous acts.....	3
Total.....	18

*Appropriation bills failing to pass the Senate prior to Mar. 4, 1919.<sup>1</sup>*

No.	Title of bill.	Total appropriation. <sup>2</sup>
1	District of Columbia.....	\$14,093,701.00
2	Indian.....	11,095,597.03
3	Agriculture.....	31,673,022.00
4	Navy.....	720,793,000.33
5	Army.....	1,070,529,088.56
6	Railroads.....	750,000,000.00
7	Sundry civil.....	851,171,849.25
8	General deficiency.....	26,937,265.03
Total.....		\$3,476,261,523.29

<sup>1</sup> Monthly Compilations of the War Congress, Apr. 1, 1919, p. 203.

<sup>2</sup> The Chronicle, Apr. 5, 1919, p. 1345.

<sup>3</sup> These eight bills have again passed the House at \$2,199,000,000.

Total gross debt of the United States, May 31, 1919, \$25,921,151,273; no deduction on account of obligations of foreign governments. Source: Journal of Commerce, New York, June 4, 1919, page 9.



The following extracts taken from my speech in the House of December 14, 1917, on the same subject of budget legislation are added because of the data therein contained:

The following countries have a budget system: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, Netherlands, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Salvador, Serbia, Spain, Siam, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The only great nation excepted from the foregoing list, a democracy that vaingloriously challenges the admiration of the world for its form of government, is the United States.

President Wilson's advice that has been ignored is also submitted at this point.

"It will be impossible to deal in any but a very wasteful and extravagant fashion with the enormous appropriations of the public moneys which must continue to be made, if the war is to be properly sustained, unless the House will consent to return to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication as much as possible avoided."—(President Wilson's address to Congress, Dec. 4, 1917.)

#### PARTY PLATFORMS DEMAND A BUDGET SYSTEM.

The Democratic Party has demanded a change and pledged every member of the majority party to that change when in its platform in St. Louis in 1916 it declared:

"We demand careful economy in all expenditures for the support of the Government, and to that end favor a return by the House of Representatives to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee chosen from its membership, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication in the public service avoided. We favor this as a practicable first step toward a budget system."

President Wilson vainly demands a fulfillment of that pledge.

#### A REPUBLICAN PLATFORM PLEDGE IN 1916.

The Republicans were pledged at Chicago in 1916, at their last national convention, in the following words:

"The increasing cost of the National Government and the need for the greatest economy of its resources in order to meet the growing demands of the people for Government service call for the severest condemnation of the wasteful appropriations of this Democratic administration, of its shameless raids on the Treasury, and of its opposition to and rejection of President Taft's oft-repeated proposals and earnest efforts to secure economy and efficiency through the establishment of a simple, businesslike budget system, to which we pledge our support and which we hold to be necessary to effect any real reform in the administration of national finances."

In a clear, comprehensive work on the budget system, Collins says: "Turning to Congress we face a situation without parallel in the world. Here we can not speak of a budget, but of separate and independent bills drawing on the Treasury. These bills are prepared by about 14 independent committees of the House and 15 of the Senate—29 separate committees, each working independently of each other and of the executive branch of the Government. Ten of these House committees and 8 Senate committees report out all of the bills carrying appropriations, but the other 11 (4 in the House and 7 in the Senate) report out measures for pensions, public buildings, and other things carrying demands on the Treasury, which are met by bills from one of the other committees. . . . In the United States—but nowhere else—the legislative branch of the Government actually prepares in detail every financial measure introduced."

Ford, on "The cost of our National Government," describing another ailment evidenced in public discussions as to responsibility, says: "Congress habitually disclaims responsibility for the results of the methods it employs. Responsibility is shifted from the House to the Senate or from Congress to the Executive, or even to the mass of the people."

"While Congress is fond of viewing with alarm the increase in the cost of Government, it keeps augmenting it by continual efforts to extend congressional patronage by means of appropriations."

Again Mr. Ford says, page 34:

"The true seat of constitutional defect is not in the Senate but in the House. The supremacy of the Senate, now so conspicuous in politics, is a result of the weakness and incompetence of the House. . . . If it is true, as has been frequently alleged in the House, that the Senate pads appropriation bills at its own will and pleasure, practicing what Mr. CANNON describes as blackmail, the charge implies confession of failure on the part of the House to uphold its constitutional authority. It follows that the true way to reform the Senate is to reform the House."

Ex-Speaker Reed, in an article contributed to the magazines in 1897, said:

"It is true we have at present irresponsible government, so divided that nobody can tell who is to blame. Government by committees and of two Houses entirely independent of each other produces some fearful and wonderful results."

That was the opinion of an ex-Speaker of this House 20 years ago, before conditions had reached their present proportions and notoriety.

A great student of finance and public affairs, Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of Appropriations Committee, declared:

"I have repeatedly urged that all the appropriation bills be consolidated in one committee. When I had no thought of quitting this body I made the statement I would willingly retire as head of the Committee on Appropriations and from the committee to bring about this reform. . . . I am glad the President has made this recommendation. I believe it the most important reform that the House can adopt."

No higher authority can be quoted than Mr. Fitzgerald, who resigned from this body.

This is the committee of which Mr. GOOP is chairman.

#### REPUBLICAN AUTHORITY ON COMMITTEE EXTRAVAGANCES.

James A. Tawney, ex-chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, in 1909 gave a public statement on this general subject wherein he says:

"The difficulty in practice which the Committee on Appropriations has in keeping appropriations within the estimated revenues arises from the fact that when the several committees which have jurisdiction over the appropriations for a particular department . . . appropriate for expenditures out in the districts and States represented by Members of the House and Senate, the departments for which the appropriations are made can always rely upon the Representatives and Senators in whose districts and States these appropriations are to be expended to support almost any demand they make."

In plain English, both Senators and Representatives in order to get their share of State or district "pork" are charged by the former chairman of the Appropriations Committee with a willingness to support "almost any demand," providing they get their share in the log-rolling game. Mr. Tawney is in harmony with Mr. Fitzgerald, who condemn "Treasury looters." Tawney, ex-Speaker Reed, ex-President Taft, and other Republican authorities condemn the present system.

A proposed real national budget system covered by two bills and one resolution is herewith submitted:

A bill (H. R. 4061) to provide for departmental budget estimates, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury shall, on or before the 15th day of November of each year, submit to the President the following information: A revised statement in summary and in detail of the estimates of expenditures of the various branches of the Government, the said revision of the estimates being hereafter provided for; a statement giving the estimated revenues of the Government for the fiscal year to which the estimates of expenditures relate, and if the estimated expenditures shall exceed the estimated revenue he shall also submit therewith recommendations for new taxes, loans, or other appropriate legislation to meet the deficiency; in like manner he shall also submit to the President from time to time such supplemental, deficiency, or other estimates as may be necessary to meet the needs of the Government.

SEC. 2. That in order that the said estimates of expenditures shall represent the actual financial needs of the Government it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, before submitting them to the President to revise, to consolidate, to unify, to coordinate, to reduce, to diminish, or otherwise to change any item or items in the regular annual estimates, or in any deficiency, supplemental, or other estimates of expenditures for the various branches of the Government in such a manner as may be necessary to effect economies and to prevent waste, extravagance, loss, duplication, and the like.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make such changes in the form of said estimates as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. That in order to provide the administrative organization for the operation of the provisions of this act there is hereby created in the Treasury Department a bureau to be known as the budget bureau, which shall be composed of one director and two assistant directors, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, and such other persons as are hereinafter provided for.

SEC. 5. That the director shall receive a salary of \$10,000 per annum, and the assistant directors shall each receive a salary of \$7,500 per annum. The director shall employ and fix the compensation of such attorneys, accountants, special experts, examiners, clerks, and other employees as he may find necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and as may be appropriated for by Congress: *Provided*, That not more than 10 persons shall be employed hereunder at a salary in excess of \$3,000 per annum and not to exceed \$5,000 per annum for any such person. All employees of the budget bureau, with the exception of those receiving a salary in excess of \$3,000 per annum, shall be appointed from a list of eligibles to be supplied by the Civil Service Commission and in accordance with the civil-service law.

SEC. 6. That the budget bureau shall have and perform all of the powers and duties now held and performed by the Division of Book-keeping and Warrants of the Treasury Department, in so far as they relate to the estimates of expenditures hereinafter referred to, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make such reorganization of said division as may be necessary to accomplish this purpose.

SEC. 7. That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of \$125,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of the budget bureau, including the payment of salaries herein authorized.

SEC. 8. That the submission of the estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury as herein provided shall be in lieu of his presentation of the Book of Estimates to Congress, as now provided by law.

SEC. 9. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 10. That this act may be cited for all purposes as the estimates revision act, 1919.

SEC. 11. That this act shall take effect at the beginning of the fiscal year 1919.

A bill (H. R. 3738) to provide for an auditor general to act on behalf of Congress, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the offices of auditor general, assistant auditor general, and solicitor of the audit office of the United States are hereby created. The auditor general shall be appointed by a committee to be composed of the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives; he shall hold office during good behavior, subject, however, to removal therefrom for cause by a two-thirds vote of the House of Representatives; he shall receive a salary of \$12,000 per annum. The assistant auditor general and the solicitor of the audit office shall be appointed in the same manner as the auditor general, shall each receive a salary of \$7,500 per annum, and may be removed from office for cause by the committee appointing them.

SEC. 2. That on the death, resignation, or other vacancy in the office of the auditor general or of the assistant auditor general, or of the solicitor, his successor shall be appointed in the manner as prescribed above for the original appointment.

SEC. 3. That anything which under the authority of this act is directed to be done by the auditor general may, in his absence, be done by the assistant auditor general, except the certifying and reporting on the departmental accounts for the House of Representatives. The solicitor of the audit office shall be the legal adviser of the auditor general.

Sec. 4. That after the consolidation of the audit forces hereinafter provided for has been effected, the Comptroller of the Treasury shall forthwith be divested of all of his functions relating to the audit of the departmental accounts, and the existing audit offices for the departmental accounts, namely: Auditor for the Treasury Department and all bureaus and offices thereunder; Auditor for the War Department and business under it; Auditor for the Navy Department; Auditor for the Interior Department; Auditor for the Post Office Department; and Auditor for the State Department, and all other branches of the public service not included in the above shall be forthwith abolished.

Sec. 5. That immediately after his appointment the auditor general shall proceed to consolidate and reorganize the audit work of the offices of the above-mentioned auditors and that of the Comptroller of the Treasury, in so far as it relates to the audit of the departmental accounts into one office, to be known as the audit office, of which he shall be the head and for the work of which he shall be accountable to Congress.

Sec. 6. That after the above-mentioned consolidation and reorganization shall have been effected all subsequent appointments in the audit office of officers, clerks, and other persons, except as hereinbefore provided, shall be made under the ordinary rules and regulations of the classified civil service: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to temporary appointments made by the auditor general for a period of less than six months, but such temporary appointees shall not be eligible to reappointment except under the civil-service rules as hereinbefore provided.

Sec. 7. That the auditor general shall have full power to make from time to time orders and rules for the conduct of the internal business of the audit office and to promote, suspend, or discharge any of the officers, clerks, or others employed therein, except as hereinbefore provided: *Provided, however*, That such promotion, suspension, or discharge shall be made upon considerations of efficiency only.

Sec. 8. That each executive department of the Government shall prepare and transmit through the Treasury Department to the auditor general for examination not later than the 30th day of November of each year an account of every expenditure of public moneys made by said departments for the fiscal year ending on the preceding 30th day of June; such accounts shall be submitted in such form and manner as may be determined by the auditor general with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall be known as the departmental accounts.

Sec. 9. That every departmental account shall be examined by the auditor general on behalf of the House of Representatives, and such examination shall determine whether the payments which are charged in the accounts to the sums appropriated are supported by vouchers or proofs of payment, and whether the money expended has been applied to the purpose or purposes for which such appropriation was intended to provide.

Sec. 10. That in order that such examination may, as far as possible, proceed pari passu with the cash transactions of the several accounting offices of the executive departments, the auditor general shall have free access, at all convenient times, to the books of account and other documents relating to the accounts of such departments, and may require the several departments concerned to furnish him from time to time or at regular periods with accounts of the cash transactions of such departments, respectively, up to such times or periods.

Sec. 11. That on the 15th day of each January the auditor general shall lay before the House of Representatives the departmental accounts for the preceding fiscal year as certified and reported upon by him, and in which he shall call the attention of the House of Representatives to every case in which it may appear to him that an expenditure has exceeded the appropriation; or that money received by a department from other sources than the appropriations for the year to which the accounts relate has not been applied or accounted for according to law; or that a sum charged against an appropriation is not supported by proof of payment; or that a payment so charged did not occur within the period of the account or was for any reason not properly chargeable against the appropriation in question; and he shall further call the attention of the House of Representatives to such other facts or information which may show any irregularity in the accounts, whether of loss, waste, fraud, extravagance, or incompetence, which may appear on the face of the accounts as compared with the appropriations, or which may be revealed by the papers on file in the departments.

Sec. 12. That upon the receipt of the appropriation accounts by the House of Representatives they shall forthwith be referred to a joint budget committee to be created for that purpose, which committee shall, after examining the accounts with the report of the auditor general thereon, after the manner to be prescribed by the House, make a report to the House, making such comment and such recommendations as it may see fit.

Sec. 13. That upon the adoption of said committee report by the House of Representatives it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit the recommendations therein contained to the department or office concerned; and, further, it shall be his duty to see that such recommendations are put into effect: *Provided, however*, That where objections are made to the recommendations by the department or office concerned it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to lay before said committee at its next regular meeting, for their consideration, the said recommendation and the reasons for not putting it into effect.

Sec. 14. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 15. That this act may be cited for all purposes as the independent audit act, 1919.

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) to provide for a joint budget committee, composed of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and Finance Committee of the Senate.

*Resolved, etc.*, That the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate shall be a joint budget committee of Congress on and after December 1, 1920.

Sec. 2. That upon receipt by the House of the regular annual or any supplemental deficiency or other estimates of expenditures for the various branches of Government and suggestions for new revenue legislation to meet them from the President of the United States, with his recommendations for their enactment into law, they shall forthwith be referred to the joint budget committee, which committee shall have jurisdiction within the limits hereinafter provided over both revenue and appropriations and no other committee of the House or Senate shall thereafter report any bills carrying appropriations or providing revenue for the Government.

Sec. 3. That the said joint budget committee may call before it such executive officers as it may see fit to examine in connection with the said estimate.

Sec. 4. That said joint budget committee may propose amendments to said estimates by way of reducing the amounts of any item or items of proposed expenditure therein stated, but said joint budget committee shall not have the power to propose any joint amendment which shall have for its effect the increasing of any item or items of the said estimates or of adding new items unless such increase or new items shall be requested by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the authority of the President: *Provided, however*, That said joint budget committee may by a two-thirds vote add new items or increase items in the said estimates.

Sec. 5. That such budget bill, with estimates of expenditures and revenue legislation to meet them embraced in a single bill, may be reported simultaneously to the House by the Ways and Means Committee and to the Senate by the Finance Committee and thereupon may be given consideration in either House, but the bill shall first be passed by the House of Representatives and thereafter by the Senate, with such amendments as may be added thereto.

Sec. 6. That it shall not be in order for any Member of the House to offer any amendment increasing any item or items in the said budget bill except that it be to restore an item or items in the estimates as they were regularly submitted by the President.

Sec. 7. That for the purpose of giving the House immediate and direct information as to the said estimates and of offering explanations in regard to the proposed expenditures of the said budget bill, the heads of the several executive departments may be required to appear in the House and Senate during the time said bill is under consideration to answer questions relating to the provisions of said bill.

Sec. 8. That all rules or parts of rules of the Senate or House in conflict with the provisions of this resolution are hereby repealed.

Sec. 9. This resolution shall take effect on and after the 1st day of December, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That nothing herein contained shall prevent the right of any person to take or kill any of the wild fowls or birds in section 1 of this act mentioned when the same shall be so taken or killed by virtue of the authority of a license duly issued by the proper authorities of said District of Columbia for scientific purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 2, line 10, strike out the words "of the wild fowls or birds in section 1 of this act mentioned" and insert in lieu thereof the words "game birds herein defined."

Mr. WALSH. This is simply to clarify the language and avoid repetition. They have defined what game birds shall be, by setting forth these various classifications, and it would seem to be clearer if, instead of picking out some of the classes mentioned in the definition, we say "game birds herein defined." It would seem to me that that would serve to clarify the section to which the amendment is offered.

Mr. GOULD. The amendment is satisfactory to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act shall be fined not less than \$25 nor more than \$100, or be imprisoned for not more than one month, or both so fined and imprisoned: *Provided*, That each bird mentioned in this act so had in possession, bought, sold, exposed for sale, or had in possession for the purpose of sale shall constitute a separate offense.

Mr. WALSH. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 2, line 16, strike out the words "less than \$25 nor."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of eliminating the minimum penalty. In the imprisonment provision there is no minimum mentioned, and I think it has come to be the recognized practice of Congress in fixing penalties for violations of laws which we enact to provide simply the maximum penalty and not a minimum penalty. I trust the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. That nothing in this act shall prevent the sale at any time of Hungarian dark-necked pheasants, ring-necked pheasants, Mongolian pheasants, or mallard ducks when the same shall have been raised in captivity; of the sale of game birds alive for propagating purposes: *Provided*, That the same is done under such requirements as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of obtaining some information. What is meant by the proviso that "the same is done under such requirements as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia"? Does that mean that the sale is made under the requirements or that they have been raised under the requirements?

Mr. GOULD. I should think it might mean either. If I understand it, in various States the Agricultural Department



frequently has some rule defining the statute, and I assume that would be the procedure to be followed here.

Mr. WALSH. It would seem to me that the language ought to be "provided that the same have been sold or raised under such requirements as may be prescribed by the commissioners," and I move to strike out the words "is done" and insert "have been sold or raised."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALSH moves to amend, page 3, line 2, by striking out the words "is done" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "have been sold or raised."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The question being taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Sisson) there were—ayes 19, noes 16.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of this measure if there should not be a comma instead of a semicolon in line 25, page 2? I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may substitute a comma for the semicolon in line 25, page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to make the change.

There was no objection.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, the bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside, to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

#### PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I call up H. R. 5032, to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan calls up H. R. 5032, which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, incorporated by act of Congress approved March 16, 1896, is hereby authorized and empowered on the petition of the vestry of any parish or separate congregation to give the same right to women to vote and hold office as is now conferred upon men by existing law.

Mr. MAPES. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, it must be admitted that what I shall say has no connection with the bill just read, but in accordance with the time-honored privileges of general debate I shall consume the brief time allowed me in saying a few words concerning America's part in the strictly military activities of the war.

Surviving soldiers of the Civil War and the historians of that war as well have not yet finished the task of fixing the credit due for certain campaigns and the advances made during those campaigns. If that be so in the case of such a war as the Civil War, where only a single country divided against itself is a participant, it will probably be much more difficult in the case of the present great war which has had so many different countries engaged in it that it is not easy to count them. Therefore, in the interest of accuracy and for the possible benefit of the future historian, I hope, I wish to submit a word at this time as my little contribution toward making clear just what the Americans have done in this war, and especially in the last campaign of the war.

We are sometimes called by the people of foreign countries a Nation of braggarts and boasters. Already we see a tendency on the part of some of our foreign friends to say that the Americans are claiming too much credit for the outcome of the war. As a matter of fact, the plain, unvarnished truth as to what Americans did in this war is praise enough for us. All we need do is to establish the truth, and that will be praise sufficient.

The great battles of the world are always a subject of unflinching interest. The battle of Gettysburg in our own Civil War is considered a decisive battle. It was undoubtedly the turning point in the war. The field on which it was fought is familiar to many Americans who have gone there and from an advantageous location have looked over the entire battle field.

Waterloo is considered unquestionably one of the great battles of the world. A few weeks ago I stood at the top of the Belgian monument on that field and looked out over the fields, farms, villages, and other objects familiar in the many books of military history describing that great battle. From that one vantage point I could see them all—the familiar Hougomont farm to the southwest, the little chapel off to the east where Blucher came in, and even in the distance one could see the

village where Grouchy was too far away to reach the battle in time. That was before the day of motor trucks. With our present means of transportation he would have been able to reach the scene in ample time to take part in the battle.

Compare the battles I have mentioned with the great battle that began on September 26, 1918, and ended on the 11th of November, 1918. The battle field of the campaign of which I speak instead of being visible from one point extends from the North Sea to Switzerland, while the active front along which the attack was made reached from the Moselle River all the way to the North Sea.

I have brought here a map which shows all the ground gained by American troops in all the battles of the war. The ground gained is indicated in each case by the criss-cross marks. Observe along the entire front that wherever the Americans have advanced the line at any place you will see the criss-cross marks.

First a few words as to American participation leading up to the final campaign of the war.

The first serious encounter reported that resulted in a considerable casualty list in an American division was the local attack by the Germans at Seichprey on April 20, 1918. The Twenty-sixth Yankee Division was the objective. It was probably intended by the enemy to try out the mettle of the National Guard troops. Cantigny was the first battle in which the American themselves made a real attack. This took place on the 28th of May in the Montdidier sector. Our regulars went forward like seasoned shock troops, made the attack, and gained some 1,600 yards. It was only a local attack, but the way it was planned and executed, resulting in a complete victory, did much to establish the prestige of American soldiers as fighting men.

In both of the operations I have mentioned, our troops were brigaded with French troops or fought alongside of French troops. All through the war some of our troops were brigaded with the troops of the French or the British. It was not until the affair at the St. Mihiel salient, in September, that we had a real American operation conducted by an American Army under American high command. There was some objection to our having an American Army at all. It was advocated by leading Allied officers that we should not attempt to organize a complete American Army, but that we should simply mix in the American troops with the others. If we had done that it is altogether probable that we should never have heard of any American activity to the extent of winning victories.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman says that the St. Mihiel was our first purely American attack. I would like to ask the gentleman if, on the 18th of July at Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Wood, it was not a distinctly American Army that made the counter advance?

Mr. TILSON. No; not in either case. To the west of Chateau-Thierry on the night of June 5-6—

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I am talking about July 18.

Mr. TILSON. First, however, as to Belleau Wood, the Second Division arrived at Lucy on the night of June 5, found its place in line, and went in. The place was opposite Belleau Wood and the fighting in this wood was done by Americans, but the division was in the French Army.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Under the command of French officers, but it was an American attack.

Mr. TILSON. The attack was really made by the Americans, but under French officers. It was the same way at Soissons, to which the gentleman referred a moment ago. It is generally conceded that the turning battle of the war was southwest of Soissons on July 18. There the attack was made by the First American Division on the left, the Second American Division on the right, with the First Moroccan Division sandwiched in between them, and all under French officers. Gen. Mangin was in command of the Tenth French Army, containing our two divisions.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I was there at the front at that time—at the time the boys made the counterattack when they drove them back on August 4—and I did not see any French soldiers at all. The only French I saw were French generals in command of American soldiers. The American soldiers drove them back in Belleau Wood and Chateau-Thierry, and all through that salient, and the French did not have anything to do with it except to command.

Mr. TILSON. The entire story is told here on this map. I have striven to be accurate and to convey accurate information on the map, so that you can see at a glance every point at which American forces participated. The elimination of the Marne salient was due in large measure to American troops.

Before leaving the Marne salient I wish to call attention to the broad strips with criss-cross markings, indicating gains by

the several American divisions. Southwest of Soissons the first strip represents the advance by the First American Division, the next by the Second American Division, a little farther south the Fourth Division, and here near the southwest corner of the salient I point with pride to the strip—and it is a large one—credited to the Twenty-sixth or Yankee Division. Then, to the east and northeast, are the strips of territory credited to other divisions.

Lest I forget it later on, while the Meuse-Argonne campaign was going on under an American Army, there was also an American division fighting here to the west of the Argonne Forest. You see this narrow strip indicates where it gained through that hard territory. At the same time we had four divisions further north on the line. The New York Division and the Thirtieth Division from Tennessee, South and North Carolina, were at this point on the map with the British, and there were two more divisions sent up to the extreme north, the Ninety-first and the Thirty-seventh.

As I have indicated, the first purely American fight, conducted entirely as an American campaign, was the St. Mihiel salient. There were some French in that, but they were under American command. The American high command had entire charge at the St. Mihiel salient. You will see here that the French troops were placed at the bulge of the salient, and that the Americans were placed at the shoulders of the salient, where the attack was to be made. The attack was made on the night of the 12th of September, by the Twenty-sixth or Yankee Division, and a French division on the west face of the salient, and by a number of other American divisions, beginning with the first division of Regulars, on the southern face of the salient.

Here is a map showing the gains made by different divisions on successive days. As you will observe the Yankee division strip here is quite an extensive one. As my time is very limited, I must hurry on to the battle of which I meant to speak in detail when I began, the great Meuse-Argonne campaign. We have not heard so much about this campaign, simply because it came so shortly before the armistice. Such great things happened so immediately after it that the papers took up the other things and neglected to dilate upon the details of that great campaign. To gain an idea of its magnitude it must be remembered that the casualties in that one single campaign were 120,000 men, and that more than half of all the deaths of Americans in battle during the war were in this campaign. I am speaking of the American activities alone.

We shall lose the relative importance of this great campaign if we do not keep in mind the fact that it is larger than all of the others put together. In fact, it is so large that it is almost impossible for us to visualize it. As indicated on the map, the American sector lay here between the Moselle River and the western edge of the Argonne Forest—that is, including the Argonne Forest, the Aire Valley, and the heights of the Meuse. The ultimate objective was, of course, the Sedan-Mezieres Railroad and the highway through these places. I have it presented here on another map, so that you may see the importance of this railroad and highway. You will see on this map that there is a four-track railroad running through Sedan and Mezieres.

I wish to call your particular attention to the geography and topography of the country just for a moment to show the importance of these great lines of communication. If you will measure from Sedan to the border of Holland, which is here on the map, you will see that it is less than 100 miles as the crow flies, whereas following the western front line to the sea it would be three times that distance. The territory between Sedan and the Holland border west of Aix la Chappelle is occupied by what is called the Ardennes, which is a mountainous country, with sharp ridges and ravines and largely covered with forest. The ridges and ravines run generally north and south, with no railroads across them, and very few highways that run east and west. Those that do so run have to cross sharp hills and valleys at a considerable grade. There is therefore no line of communications capable of supplying an army from Germany except one double-track railroad running through Aix la Chappelle and Liege. From the Holland border to Sedan there is but the one double-track railroad, and it would be well nigh impossible to supply an army the size of that occupying the western front by that one single line. It was therefore necessary to use this great four-tracked trunk line, this great thoroughfare through Sedan.

If this could be broken, the enemy must withdraw from northern France and Belgium. So the objective of this campaign of the Meuse-Argonne was the great railroad and highway at Sedan or some point near there.

The intervening territory lent itself to defense. On the left, included within the American sector, was the great Argonne Forest. In many places it is a jungle of underbrush, steep ravines, and sharp ridges, very difficult to traverse when not in the presence of an enemy. There are numerous very strong positions, especially for machine-gun nests. Then there is the Aire Valley, with lateral ridges running across it, which lent themselves admirably to defense and were utilized for that purpose to the limit by the enemy. Then there were the heights of the Meuse, the hills bordering the left or west bank of the Meuse, extending down by Verdun and northward toward Sedan.

The battle line had been practically stabilized near Avocourt, Vanquois Hill, and a number of other places along the line whose names became familiar during four years, and the whole territory back of it on the German side was filled with prepared defensive positions, while all of the roads and everything else useful were destroyed as the enemy withdrew over it, so that it was almost a trackless waste over which our troops had to advance.

The general attack was begun, as we know, on September 26, and the advance proceeded for a time without much delay, except at one place, in front of Montfaucon, where it required a day or two. It proceeded by means that had been frequently used before, but never quite so successfully as in this offensive. I refer to what is known as a rolling barrage. In the early part of the war when an attack was contemplated, a barrage was planned and laid down from guns in place. Their range could be extended from short range to extreme range of the longest range gun.

When it became necessary to move the barrage farther forward it was generally found very difficult or impossible to do so. The consequence was that there were very few advances longer than the extreme range of a large fieldpiece. When this campaign was planned it was determined that the barrage should be carried along. When the Infantry advanced to the limit of the barrage the guns in the rear were to be moved forward and through the guns nearer the front, so as to take up another position in the front and continue to carry the barrage forward.

I went over the Meuse-Argonne territory. I did not traverse it all, but went diagonally across it with many zigzags, a territory roughly 20 miles by 20 miles—say, 400 square miles. In going over the ground I looked at the effect of the artillery, being very much interested to see the effect of the ammunition. As you all know, I have been considerably interested in ammunition. I did not see any place over which that barrage rolled, as big as this hall, that did not have a shell hole in it.

When the barrage moved it carried with it such destruction and death that it was impossible for any man to put his head above ground to fire upon the attacking troops, and, after all, that is the purpose of artillery fire. It is not necessary to kill the other fellow, but it is imperative to keep him underground and keep his head down so that he can not kill you. The table of the barrage as shown on this chart is a most interesting one. Any Member can examine it who desires to do so. It is all here showing exactly the spots on which the "big fellows," the large shells, should fall, the territory to be covered by the 75's and the 155's, the territory to be covered by the howitzers, and the territory to be covered by the long guns. It is all laid down here—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TILSON. Could I have three or four minutes?

Mr. MAPES. I will yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. STEVENSON. About how many of those guns were used in the barrage to which the gentleman has referred, the rolling barrage, in that particular fight?

Mr. TILSON. I think there were about 3,000 guns used in this particular attack. The gentleman understands that the guns may not all be firing at once, but may be used one after another and brought up one battery through another. The barrage of which I saw the effects was produced by a number of guns much greater than the organization tables call for, because all the artillery that belonged to each division was in line, and in addition all the artillery that belonged to such divisions as had been broken up for replacement of troops, together with all the other artillery that could be had from the French or anybody else, so that the artillery was probably double what any table of organization might call for. After all, the artillery is the man saver—

Mr. STEVENSON. Did not they practically have two lines of artillery?



Mr. TILSON. I do not know in how many lines the guns were placed.

Mr. STEVENSON. So that one line was moving up through another line.

Mr. TILSON. Probably so. I have just said it was probably double the amount of artillery that the organization tables call for. You must keep this in mind.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. They had several lines of artillery, the 77's, the 3-inch, were up within a mile and a half of the front.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman means the 75's. The 77 is a German gun.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Then it run back 8 or 10 miles.

Mr. TILSON. The line occupied by a force may be 10 miles deep. A line may be any number of miles in length and also in depth, because they do not dig one trench and depend upon that, but dig trench after trench and position after position, and all of these are the line. The guns are not arranged on one line with another back of that, but they are placed in such selected artillery positions as can be found, and may be in all sorts of zigzag and echelon positions where they can be advantageously arranged.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will permit, the line of artillery is the amount of the carriage of the shell; that is, the 77's will carry about a mile and a half or 2 miles, and then they run back until the shell will carry 8 or 10 miles.

Mr. TILSON. The 75's will carry a great deal farther than a mile and a half.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. That is the effective distance, I understand, they use them.

Mr. TILSON. They will place one battery of 75's at a mile and a half and use one angle of fire, and another at 3 miles and use another angle of fire. Some of them are moved right up close to the infantry in order to see quickly what is happening.

The amount of artillery used determines very largely how much you can save your infantry. After all, gentlemen, get it clearly in mind, as an artilleryman or a man of any other branch of the service will tell you, that the infantry is the army, that the infantry is the final decisive factor, and that all the others are simply assistants; that the infantry is the army and all the rest are auxiliaries. The Chief of Artillery expressed himself so as we crossed the sea together a short time ago. As my time is going so that I shall not be able to finish, I hope that I may have unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TILSON. The advance of which I have been speaking began near Avocourt and led up to and over Montfaucon. This is a mountain from whose height you can see all over the country. The Crown Prince had his post of command here, which, by the way, is the nearest he got to Verdun. From this height he could look through his periscope from a safe place underground. I saw his sleeping chamber in the basement constructed out of concrete 4 feet thick, where he took unusual precaution to preserve his useless life. This hill being one of the first objectives, one of the soldiers composed a little poem concerning it, entitled "The Road to Montfaucon."

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

Mr. TILSON. Can I have just one minute in order to read the poem?

Mr. MAPES. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. TILSON. In the poem some one is supposed to ask an M. P. the way from Avocourt to Montfaucon.

#### THE ROAD TO MONTFAUCON.

M. P., the road from Avocourt  
That leads to Montfaucon?  
The road, sir, black with mules and carts  
And brown with men a-marching on—  
The Romagne woods that lie beyond  
The ruined heights of Montfaucon.

North over reclaimed no man's land,  
The martyred roadway leads,  
Quick with forward-moving hosts  
And quick with vallant deeds  
Avenging Rheims, Liege, and Lille,  
And outraged gods and creeds.

There lies the road from Avocourt  
That leads to Montfaucon  
Past sniper and machine-gun nests,  
By steel and thermite cleansed. They're gone—  
And there in thund'rous echelon  
The ruined heights of Montfaucon.

[Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I take this opportunity to make reply to some remarks addressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] in the Chamber on Saturday, in which I think he very unwarrantedly and unfairly made an attack on the Attorney General, Mr. Gregory, who vacated that office on the 4th day of March. If you will turn to the RECORD, you will see that while the Committee of the Whole was considering the sundry civil bill, and while it had under consideration at the immediate moment items in the bill with reference to the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] took occasion to make remarks something of this tenor:

I do not want to make a political speech, but I want to say that there are some things that I believe I ought to call to the attention of this House.

And then, further along, he said:

But I want to direct your attention to this fact, that we are reaping the crop the seed of which we have sown. I want to direct your attention to the fact that certain organizations, one of them known as the I. W. W., and other anarchistic societies during the progress of the Great War, now ended, not only threatened to destroy but actually attempted to destroy the food products of this country.

He goes on at great length along that line, and then he says:

Yet I have not heard that any of these people were convicted as traitors to this country, which their acts proved them to be. Is it possible that the millions of dollars that we have given to the Attorney General's department for the prosecution of crime have been expended without results, and that the Department of Justice has winked at these things and allowed them to go on, thereby encouraging this anarchism?

And then he says:

I do not make the charge that there has been any winking at them; but, in my judgment, every one of those men were traitors and should have been lined up before a firing squad next morning and disposed of summarily. But I have heard of no such action being taken.

Further commenting on the Attorney General, he says in conclusion:

Some people are now seeking to throw aspersions upon the labor organizations simply because these anarchists and traitors happened to be members of these unions. It was the duty of the Department of Justice to ascertain who those men were and to weed them out and punish them.

At that point I undertook to get the gentleman to yield, and he declined. He said further:

I sincerely hope and trust that Attorney General Palmer, in whom I have the utmost confidence, will succeed in stamping out this evil from the country. But, oh, how much better it would have been had his predecessor in office succeeded in putting out the fire when it first started. Had he done so, we would not now find ourselves in the condition we are in.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I see that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] is present. I took the liberty to invite him here in view of the fact that I was going to address my remarks largely to his own language. I want to say that the charge the gentleman from Pennsylvania made on last Saturday either arose through the grossest ignorance or it was made for a purely partisan and political purpose, without proper investigation of the facts.

It can hardly be conceived that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be absolutely ignorant of the workings of a great department of this Government when his duty as a Representative here should be to know something of the functions of the departments of the Government, and yet he stood on the floor of this House on last Saturday, when the gentleman against whom he inveighed is no longer an official of the Government and has not the privilege of this floor to defend or speak for himself, and made, in an insinuating and underhand method, a very severe attack on the former Attorney General of the United States.

I have known Gen. Gregory for the past 20 years. I knew him as a private citizen and as a public official, and I assert that a more faithful or patriotic Attorney General never sat as a member of the Cabinet.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says that he has never heard of any of the people whom he denounced being prosecuted. If he were as diligent in seeking the facts as he is in making unwarranted and ungrounded charges, he could in five minutes have procured the report of the Attorney General of the United States, which is replete with accounts of successful prosecutions of I. W. W.'s and prosecutions for violations of the espionage law, which, by the way, became the law without the vote of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will.

Mr. KREIDER. I wish to direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that I did not say that there were no prosecutions, but that, to my knowledge, there had been no convictions for

offenses that were flagrant in time of war. Did you find there were any of the I. W. W.'s executed, which is the penalty prescribed for traitors in time of war?

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman is dodging the question. He said nobody had been convicted for violating these laws and hindering the Government in time of war. He says now he has heard of nobody being hung. It is not the fault of the Attorney General that the Congress did not provide the death penalty in each case.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman tell what the penalties are for those who were convicted for treason in time of war?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not here to educate the gentleman. The gentleman did make the charge that none of the parties had been convicted. It is not the fault of the Attorney General that Congress did not provide death penalties for all violations. There are degrees in crime and necessarily variations in punishment. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not even vote for the espionage law, but voted, as I recall it now, against it, and I think the RECORD will bear me out.

Now, just for the gentleman's information I want to call his attention to page 48 of the report of the Attorney General for the year ending July 1, 1918, and in the report, beginning on that page, he will find a long list of 34 separate prosecution of cases for violation of the espionage act. Many of these cases involve trial of not only one defendant but a great number of defendants, and in one case of the number, the Haywood prosecution, there were 99 defendants, that were convicted and sentenced to prison. In the case of the prosecution of German plots for violation of law before the war, the record shows there were prosecutions obtained in the Von Rintelen case and others of that character. Under the sabotage law, the report shows, successful prosecutions were made.

Any gentleman who wants to be fair can, by consulting the report of the Attorney General, find that not only one but hundreds of persons who violated legislation passed by the last Congress to aid in the prosecution of the war were prosecuted and a large majority convicted.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania decries anarchy and Bolshevism, while indulging in his intemperate and extravagant statement. I want to say that if there is one thing that brings those evils into being it is for gentlemen in this House, or elsewhere, for that matter, to call the attention of the public to and to make unfounded charges that men who are charged with the responsibility for enforcing the law are not doing their duty. If there is one thing that will encourage Bolshevism, it is the preaching of the false doctrine that those who occupy high place and high responsibility are recreant to their trust and are unfaithful to the public. [Applause.]

And yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in view of this record, to which he has had access all the time, I repeat, either willfully or maliciously for simply a partisan, mean, unworthy purpose, or through the densest ignorance of the activities of his own Government, gets on the floor here and attacks a citizen of this Republic who has striven to discharge his duty. While I hold no brief for the ex-Attorney General, I propose that whenever, either from this side or the other side, he may be unjustly attacked I shall expose the falsity of the charges.

Allow me to call to the attention of the House the following excerpt from the report of the Attorney General for the year 1918 appearing on pages 46 to 56 of the report with reference to some of the cases involving charges of violation of the selective-service act or the espionage act or the sabotage act.

#### SELECTIVE-SERVICE ACT.

Amongst the cases were:

(1) United States v. Louis C. Fraina, Edward R. Cheyney, southern district of New York: Defendant Fraina was a leading publicist of the most radical and revolutionary type of class-war doctrine. He and Cheyney, at a meeting of a "league of conscientious objectors," and in speeches and circulars, advanced the principle of conscientious objection to participation in the war, not on religious grounds, but on the principle that the working classes had no interest in the war, of which they could be only victims. They were convicted of conspiracy to bring about violations of the selective-service act. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(2) The United States v. Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, southern district of New York (245 U. S., 474): The defendants are the well-known anarchist leaders. They were charged with a conspiracy to bring about a failure to register, under the selective-service law, on the part of many persons liable to such registration. They organized a "no conscription league," and in speeches and publications attacked the draft law and urged young men subject to the draft to refuse to register. They were convicted, and the judgment was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

(3) United States v. Hulett M. Wells et al., western district of Washington: The defendants were prominent labor leaders of the radical wing of the labor movement on the Pacific coast. While the selective-service act was pending and before it was passed they prepared a no-conscription circular bitterly attacking the principles of conscription and advocating resistance to any draft law that might be passed. Meetings were arranged for the adoption of the circular and for arrangements to distribute it. Defendants were convicted. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(4) United States v. Edwin Firth et al., southern district of West Virginia: Defendants prepared, published, and distributed a printed circular under the alleged auspices of an alleged "Workmen's Council of Defense," advocating opposition to the enforcement of the selective-service act. They were convicted, and the conviction was affirmed in the circuit court of appeals of the fourth circuit.

(5) United States v. C. E. Ruthenberg, et al., northern district of Ohio (245 U. S., 480): The defendants were socialist political leaders in Cleveland, and before large audiences at public meetings, which included men subject to the draft, they attacked the draft law and urged resistance thereto. It was shown that they succeeded in influencing at least one man against registration. They were indicted under section 332 of the Penal Code for counseling and inducing him to violate the law, were convicted, and the judgment was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

(6) United States v. Will Orear et al., eastern district of Texas: The defendants organized or participated in a movement to offer armed resistance to the enforcement of the selective-service act. They formed a so-called league, which included as members men subject to the draft. Meetings were held, at which plans were laid and members bound themselves to resist the draft to the last ditch. Arms and ammunition were procured and hidden ready for use. Twenty-nine persons were indicted, representing various degrees of criminality and willfulness. Twenty-four were convicted.

(7) United States v. Sam and Lee Edwards, eastern district of Virginia: The defendants, father and son, in their strenuous endeavors to get the son exempted from military service, went so far as to physically assault a member of the local board. They were tried and convicted on the charge of conspiracy to prevent by force and intimidation a Federal officer from performing his official duties. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(8) United States v. Walter M. Reeder et al., western district of Oklahoma: The defendants were organizers of a "Universal Union," a sort of branch I. W. W., formed for the immediate purpose of resisting the draft by force and the ultimate purpose of a forcible revolution with seizure of public utilities and basic industries. Its plan included an elaborate organization modeled on an army. While its plans were large, they were nipped in the bud by arrests, prosecutions, and convictions.

#### ESPIONAGE ACT.

The espionage act contains numerous provisions relating to espionage, exports, protection of harbors and vessels, and many other subjects. The provisions of the act which have given rise to most of the cases, however, are those contained in section 3, Title I, which, for the period from the passage of the act on June 15, 1917, to May 16, 1918, read as follows:

"Whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully make or convey false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies and whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully cause or attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or shall willfully obstruct the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service or of the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both."

On May 16, 1918, there were added, by amendment, numerous provisions against various types of disloyal utterances.

The number of cases brought under the section exceeds the number of those brought under any other of the war laws, except the selective-service act. While the selective-service act may be the more important of these laws, the espionage act has given rise to the most difficult problems, and the cases under it have been especially important. To give a true picture of the work of the department in the administration of this act, the account thereof should contain some reference to the thousands of cases brought to its attention in which prosecution was not instituted, as well as those in which prosecution was begun.

In practically every case under this act the question of free speech or of political or religious liberty was involved, so that, from that point of view, every case was of importance and worthy of specific mention. The following list constitutes, therefore, but a small selection of the important cases, which are enumerated either because of the prominence of the defendant or because the case involved some extensive and dangerous type of propaganda, or because the case arose historically at an important stage of the development of the interpretation of the act. Each of these cases involved a charge of one or more of the three types of offenses specified in the above-quoted language of section 3, and, therefore, for the sake of abbreviation and avoidance of repetition, the particular nature of the charge will not be further mentioned. Some of the cases were for conspiracy to commit one or more of the three classes of offenses.

(1) United States v. Emanuel Baltzer et al., district of South Dakota: Twenty-seven substantial farmers of German extraction formed, after our entrance into the war, a German Socialist society and sent to the governor of South Dakota a so-called petition, in which they objected to the quotas under the draft law assigned to their county, and proceeded further to attack the war as a war instituted by and for the capitalists, and asked the governor to repudiate the war and all war debt. They were convicted. The case is now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. The importance of the case is due particularly to the fact that it was the first notable and prominent case which arose under the espionage act, and the conviction of the defendants was undoubtedly one of the greatest deterrents against the spread of hostile propaganda, and particularly that class of propaganda which advanced and played upon the theme that the war was a capitalists' war, brought by and for the benefit of the big financial interests. The case was also interesting as one involving the right to petition.

(2) United States v. Daniel H. Wallace, southern district of Iowa: This was also a case arising early in the war and given great publicity, and thereby had great influence as a deterrent of dangerous propaganda. The defendant, who claimed to have served in the British Army, delivered just at the time when the recruiting service was most active and the administration of the draft was beginning, a sensational speech containing lurid pictures of the horrors of war, bitter attacks on the Allies, particularly Great Britain, and on our entrance into the war and much praise for Germany. He was the author and distributor of a pamphlet containing the same sort of utterances. He was convicted, and later died in the penitentiary.

(3) United States v. Frederick Kraft, district of New Jersey (249 Fed. Rep., 919): Defendant was a prominent leader of the Socialist Party in New Jersey. His case was one of the early ones in which the attacks upon the war by the antiwar wing of the Socialist Party was involved. The case also presents an early illustration of spoken, as



distinguished from written, propaganda. The defendant, a prominent citizen and editor, made a speech in a public square before a large audience, which included drafted men, attacking the war and conscription. The court held that the necessary criminal intent might be inferred from the occasion, nature of the audience, and other surrounding circumstances bearing upon the natural and probable effects of the utterances. The defendant was convicted, and the conviction has been sustained by the circuit court of appeals.

(4) *United States v. Abraham L. Sugarman*, district of Minnesota (245 Fed. Rep., 604): Defendant, secretary of the Socialist Party in Minnesota, made a speech advising disobedience to the selective-service act. The case is of particular importance by reason of its involving an early discussion and decision upon the scope of the expression "military and naval forces of the United States." The court held it to include at least all those who had registered under the selective-service act. In other cases some courts held that all persons of military age—that is, 18 to 45 years, inclusive—were included, while other courts restricted the phrase to persons who had been actually inducted into the service. The case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(5) *United States v. Clinton H. Pierce et al.*, northern district of New York (245 Fed. Rep., 878): Defendants distributed a leaflet entitled "The Price We Pay." This leaflet purported to be a campaign document for the Socialist Party, and did contain arguments in favor of voting for that party and its candidates. It contained, however, as a part of such argument violent and bitter attacks upon the war and draft law, picturing the war as a capitalists' war, and being of a tenor to convince the workmen that this was not their war and they were not called upon to take any part in it. It dwelt upon and overstated the horrors of war. The importance of the case arises from the fact that it helped to put a stop to preparations for the organization on an enormous scale of a very dangerous piece of antiwar propaganda, and defined the limits of political campaigning in which opposition to the war was used. It also decided that the offense may be shown without proof that any particular individual was so influenced by the propaganda as to refuse or abstain from military service. It also gave a broad interpretation to the word "obstruct" in the statute. The defendants were convicted. The case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(6) *United States v. Vincente Balbas Capo*, district of Porto Rico: Defendant was the editor of a leading anti-American paper in Porto Rico. In this paper he carried articles designed to influence Porto Ricans, particularly those who were not American citizens, against participation in the war. Defendant was convicted. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(7) *United States v. Louise Oliveau*, western district of Washington: Defendant, employed at an I. W. W. hall at Seattle, mailed violent and frank anti-draft literature to Seattle registrants. She was convicted.

(8) *United States v. Charles T. Schenck et al.*, eastern district of Pennsylvania: The charge was based upon the publication and distribution of a circular attacking the selective-service act as unconstitutional and advising disobedience of its provisions. The defendants were convicted and the case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(9) *United States v. Kate Richards O'Hare*, district of North Dakota: Defendant, formerly international secretary of the Socialist Party for the United States and a leading figure in its antiwar wing, had promoted the passage of the antiwar resolution at the St. Louis meeting of the executive committee of the Socialist Party just preceding the passage of the selective-service act. Thereafter she delivered a number of speeches against this act, going so far as to advocate mass opposition to the draft. She was convicted and the judgment has been affirmed by the circuit court of appeals.

(10) *United States v. Perley B. Doe*, district of Colorado: The defendant wrote and circulated a leaflet attempting to belie the officially announced purposes of the war and to justify the acts of Germany which led to the war. His leaflet contained false statements. He was convicted, and after conviction was inducted into the military service, which service he refused to render and is now a military prisoner. His conviction has been affirmed by the circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit.

(11) *United States v. Floyd Ramp*, district of Oregon: Ramp, an irreconcilable opponent of and agitator against the war, went amongst drafted men who were on their way to the service and by picturing the war as a capitalists' war attempted to move them to insubordination and disloyalty. He was convicted. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(12) *United States v. S. J. Harper*, western district of Louisiana: The defendant was a State senator and prominent politician. He wrote and circulated a pamphlet along the line of the capitalistic nature of the war. He was acquitted.

(13) *United States v. Clarence H. Waldron*, district of Vermont: This was the first important case involving religious antiwar propaganda. Waldron was a minister, who urged upon parishioners of military age the doctrine that participation in the war was contrary to Christianity and that it was their duty as Christians not to render military service. He was convicted and sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. The case was the first important one involving the definition of the scope of the constitutional guaranty of religious liberty and its relation to war and undoubtedly acted as an effective deterrent against a very dangerous type of antiwar propaganda.

(14) *United States v. W. E. Mudd*, western district of Washington: The case is interesting because the utterances of the defendant, an I. W. W. organizer, were directed not against participation in the service of the American armies, but against participation of Canadians in the service of the British Army. Defendant was convicted. Pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(15) *United States v. Rose Pastor Stokes*, western district of Missouri: Defendant was a prominent socialist. She insisted that her views against the war be published in a daily newspaper of large circulation, namely, the *Kansas City Star*. Those views were such as to induce members of the working classes to believe that the war was none of their affair, and that they did not owe loyalty to it. She was convicted and the case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(16) *United States v. Emil Herman*, western district of Washington: The defendant publicly exhibited and displayed where all who passed his place of business could read it, a circular attacking the vocation of a soldier as the lowest and basest of all occupations. This circular was falsely attributed to the famous author Jack London, who not only had not written it but who, before his death, had publicly repudiated it. The defendant was convicted and the case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(17) *United States v. Stephen Binder*, eastern district of New York: The defendant wrote, sent to the printer, and was preparing to circulate a book entitled "Light and Truth," attacking the causes and purposes of the war as stated by the President and Congress, attributing the war to the basest of material motives and justifying Germany. He was convicted and the circulation of the book prevented.

(18) *United States v. Joseph F. Rutherford et al.*, eastern district of New York: This is the best known, most interesting, and most important of the cases involving religious antiwar propaganda. The defendants were the executive leaders of the Russellites, a sect founded by Pastor Russell. Pastor Russell issued a series of books called "Studies of the Scriptures." After his death and after we were in the war the defendants issued a seventh volume of this series, entitled "The Finished Mystery," which, under the guise of being a posthumous work of Pastor Russell, included an attack on the war and an attack on patriotism, which were not written by Pastor Russell and could not have possibly been written by him. They prepared for circulation hundreds of thousands of copies, and would have succeeded but for the promptness of the Government in seizing and suppressing these books. They encouraged and organized on an extensive scale the raising of conscientious objections to the war by men called into the service. They did not restrict this to men who were conscientiously opposed to the war, but sought to create such objection in men who might otherwise be willing to render service to their country. This dangerous propaganda was scotched by the successful prosecution of the leaders before it succeeded in getting much headway. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(19) *United States v. Amos L. Hitchcock*, northern district of Ohio: Defendant was a prominent official of the Socialist Party, representing that party on the board of education of Cleveland. He made frequent speeches calculated to induce the working classes to abstain from participating in the war. He was convicted.

(20) *United States v. Conrad Kornmann*, district of South Dakota: The defendant was the editor of a German-language newspaper at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and president of the South Dakota German-American Alliance. He sent letters and telegrams to officials of that alliance showing, as was charged, a systematic effort to promote a pro-German point of view and pro-German activities amongst the members of the association. He was convicted. The case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(21) *United States v. Jacob Frohwerk and Carl Glessner*, western district of Missouri: The defendants were the authors of articles in a German-language newspaper, the *Missouri Staats Zeitung*, of Kansas City. They did not cease their opposition to the war upon our entrance, but continued the type of articles characteristic of that small portion of the German-American press which remained disloyal for a considerable period after our entrance. These articles attacked the genuineness of the motives of the war as expressed by the President and Congress, played up Germany's military successes and the German point of view, attacked the motives of Great Britain, France, and Italy, and inserted in the paper other articles of a similar strain designed to reduce the war enthusiasm of their readers or to sustain their opposition to the war. The case is an interesting example of those against German-language newspapers. Defendants were convicted. The case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

(22) *United States v. Scott Nearing and the American Socialist Society*, southern district of New York: The defendant Nearing was one of the most active agitators against the war, engaged constantly in making speeches or writing pamphlets. Among these pamphlets was one entitled "The Great Madness," written by Nearing and published by the other defendant, the American Socialist Society. This pamphlet purported to describe the manner in which the big financial interests first conceived the scheme of creating a war which would instill patriotic emotions in the American people and thereby divert attention from the wrongs committed by the capitalists themselves, and then proceed to carry their scheme into effect by bringing on the present war. The indictment has been sustained on demurrer and the case is pending in the trial court.

(23) *United States v. Benedict Prieth et al.*, district of New Jersey (251 Fed. Rep., 946): The defendants were the owners, publishers, editors, and leading writers of a prominent German-language newspaper of Newark, N. J. This was another leading case, involving a series of articles attacking the motives behind the war and suggesting nonparticipation of the German-Americans. The jury disagreed upon the first trial, and the case is still pending in the trial court. The court's opinion in ruling on the demurrer to the indictment contains an illuminating discussion of the scope of the phrase in the statute "enlistment and recruiting service," which has generally been held to include the whole process of raising the Army, whether by recruiting for volunteers or by draft.

(24) *United States v. Eugene V. Debs*, northern district of Ohio: The defendant was a leading member of the antiwar wing of the Socialist Party. The case arose out of a speech of a deeply pacifist nature, calculated to influence his hearers, a large gathering, which included military eligibles, against belief in the war. As charged by the Government in the three counts of the indictment upon which defendant was found guilty, this address was made for the purpose of causing insubordination and disloyalty in the military and naval forces, obstructing the recruiting and enlistment service, and inciting, provoking, and encouraging resistance to the United States. The indictment originally contained 10 counts, 4 of which were nolle, 2 were withdrawn by the court, and on 1, namely, the charge of by word opposing the cause of the United States in the war, the defendant was acquitted.

(25) *United States v. Max Eastman et al.*, southern district of New York: The defendants were the owners, editors, publishers, and contributors of a monthly periodical entitled "The Masses." This paper was not an official Socialist paper and the group of men editing it may be said to belong to the literary, as distinguished from the political, type of Socialist agitators. In the issues of this paper during the first four or five months of the war this magazine, practically from cover to cover, consisted of articles glorifying those who objected to war and resisted military service, and picturing the war as a base conspiracy of the capitalists, and all who participate in the war as nothing better than the abject victims of this conspiracy. The jury disagreed in both the first and second trials.

(26) *United States v. J. A. Peterson*, district of Minnesota: The defendant was a candidate for United States Senator, and in the course of the campaign published an article in a prominent newspaper picturing the war as one in which the lives of young Americans were being sacrificed in order to win territory for the Allies. He was convicted. The case is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.



(27) *United States v. Louis B. Nagler*, western district of Wisconsin: This is interesting as a clear decision showing that attacks upon the Red Cross, Y. M. C. A., and similar quasi governmental or non-governmental agencies engaged in the assistance of the military forces, made with intent to obstruct and impede such assistance to the country's forces, fall within the scope of the espionage act. The defendant was convicted.

(28) *United States v. Jacob O. Bentall*, district of Minnesota: The defendant was a prominent member of the Socialist Party, being at the time its candidate for governor of Minnesota. In his campaign literature he sought to avail himself of and increase the antiwar sentiments of his constituents by playing upon the theme that the war was one brought about and prosecuted by and continued for the exclusive benefit of the large financial groups and interests. He was convicted. The case is pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(29) *United States v. C. E. Schoberg*, eastern district of Kentucky: Defendant in a conversation with a group of men expressed a preference for the German side of the war. He was indicted under the provisions of the amended section 3, Title I, of the act approved May 16, 1918, and the case is one of the early ones involving the interpretation of that provision of the amendment which prohibits, by word or deed, supporting or favoring the cause of Germany or opposing the cause of the United States. This was the first of a series of cases of the same nature, and the court took the occasion to discuss the question of free speech and its constitutional scope, and held that the constitutional right of free speech does not include the right to express disloyal sentiments. Defendant was convicted.

(30) *United States v. Theodore B. Pape*, southern district of Illinois: Defendant, when called upon by a committee soliciting subscriptions to Liberty bonds, had declined to subscribe and explained his action by telling the committee of his opposition to all wars, including this war, and his unwillingness to do anything which would assist or promote the continuance of the war. The court held that these utterances, made under such circumstances, were plainly not intended to influence the hearers against subscriptions on their part to Liberty bonds or other war participation and, therefore, did not fall within the purpose and intent of the espionage act.

(31) *United States v. J. A. Miller*, district of Colorado: This case arose out of the use by defendant of the typical attack on the war as a capitalists' war for the purpose of obstructing the sale of Liberty bonds. The case is not one of exceptional importance, and this reference to it is made solely as an example of a type of cases quite large in number. The defendant was convicted.

(32) *United States v. Joseph V. Stilson, Joseph Sukys, et al.*, eastern district of Pennsylvania: This case grew out of articles in the newspaper *Kova*, the official organ of the Lithuanian Socialist Federation, and circulars belittling patriotism and military service and seeking to arouse political, as distinguished from religious, conscientious objection to service. Defendants were convicted. The case is interesting and important in that it involved an extreme example of the foreign language antiwar propaganda.

(33) *United States v. Victor L. Berger, Adolph Germer, J. Louis Engdahl, William F. Kruse, and Irwin St. John Tucker*, northern district of Illinois: This case is for a conspiracy to violate section 3, Title I, of the espionage act by means of speeches, leaflets, pamphlets, and other literature attacking the war and conscription. Defendants were high officials of the governing committee of the antiwar wing of the Socialist Party and were active in framing and distributing its antiwar literature. Berger is editor of the *Milwaukee Leader*, and has been a Member of Congress. Germer is the secretary of the National Socialist Party. They framed and distributed in enormous quantities the proclamation and war program of the party, frankly urging disobedience of the selective-service act; also "The Price We Pay," mentioned in No. (5) above; also various other pamphlets of the same tenor. The case has not been tried.

(34) *United States v. William D. Haywood et al.*, northern district of Illinois: This is the well-known case, referred to in the previous annual report, against a group of leaders of the Industrial Workers of the World. They were charged with conspiracies to obstruct and defeat the selective-service act, to violate the espionage act, and to obstruct the execution of other statutes relating to the prosecution of the war. One hundred and sixty-six defendants were included in the original indictment, of whom 51 were dismissed before trial and 16 during the trial, leaving 99 defendants, all of whom were found guilty by the jury on all four counts of the indictment. The Government produced a large amount of documentary evidence which had been obtained by search warrant from the general headquarters of the association, including letters written by the defendants, bulletins issued by general headquarters and industrial unions, pamphlets dealing with various phases of the teachings of the organization, their songbooks, newspapers, and foreign-language papers. One hundred and forty-four witnesses were put on the stand by the Government and 184 by the defendants, of which 84 were defendants themselves. Defendants offered a large amount of documentary evidence tending to show that they were not engaged in the conspiracies charged in the indictment, but solely upon the amelioration of labor conditions. For purposes of sentence, the court divided the convicted defendants into four classes, the members of which were sentenced to confinement in the penitentiary for a year and a day, 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years, respectively. An appeal to the circuit court of appeals is in preparation. The conviction of the defendants, after a trial which they themselves admitted to be fair, will, the department feels, have a beneficial effect in checking the unlawful features of the activities of this organization. Similar cases are pending in several other districts.

Title 12 of the espionage act provides that matter which violates any of the provisions of the statute shall be nonmailable. Acting under the provisions of the postal laws and regulations, the Postmaster General withdrew second-class mailing privileges from publications which he considered had violated section 3 of the act. This gave rise to several important suits, in which the owners or publishers of such publications attacked the rulings of the Postmaster General. The cases necessarily involved an interpretation of section 3 of the act. Amongst these cases were the following:

(1) *Masses Publishing Co. v. Thomas G. Patten*, Postmaster of the City of New York, southern district of New York, and circuit court of appeals, second circuit (244 Fed. Rep., 535, 245 Fed. Rep., 102, 246 Fed. Rep., 24): The publishers of a monthly periodical entitled "The Masses" brought a bill to enjoin the postmaster of the city of New York from treating the August, 1917, issue as nonmailable matter. The character of the articles contained in that issue has been described in the reference to the criminal case which arose out of this and other numbers of the periodical (above No. 25). The district court granted a temporary injunction, which was reversed by the circuit court of appeals.

The importance of the case arose not only from the fact that it defined the scope of the discretion of the Post Office Department but also because it was an early and authoritative ruling by an appellate court to the effect that the criminal intent to obstruct the recruiting service or commit other offenses under section 3 may be inferred from the natural and probable effects of the publication and distribution of articles, cartoons, and other published matter.

(2) *Jeffersonian Publishing Co. v. West*, Postmaster, southern district of Georgia (245 Fed. Rep., 585): This was an action for injunction against the second-class mailing privileges from the *Jeffersonian*, a newspaper published by Tom Watson, which had continuously contained articles attacking the war and conscription. The injunction was refused.

(3) *United States of America, ex rel. Milwaukee Social Democrat Publishing Company v. Albert S. Burleson*, Postmaster General, in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia: This was a proceeding in mandamus for a mandatory injunction against the deprivation of second-class mailing privileges in the case of a newspaper, the *Milwaukee Leader*, of Milwaukee, Wis., largely owned and edited by Victor L. Berger, a Socialist leader and politician. It contained continuously articles decrying the war as capitalist, questioning the motives of the war, and stirring up anti-British and many other types of feeling against it. The court refused to issue an order of mandamus.

#### CASES ARISING OUT OF GERMAN PLOTS BEFORE THE WAR.

Some important cases were brought, after our entrance into the war, under section 13 of the Penal Code, arising out of German prewar plots, such as conspiracies to blow up Canadian munition factories and other Canadian war utilities, and such as the conspiracy to stir up sedition in British India. Among these were:

(1) *United States v. Gustav Jacobsen et al.*, northern district of Illinois: Defendants, who were German and Hindoos, were charged with setting on foot, providing and preparing the means for a certain military enterprise to be carried on against the territory and dominion of Great Britain beyond the seas. The enterprise had for its object the inciting of armed rebellion in India and the furnishing of arms, ammunition, money, and military training to Indian subjects for carrying on and supporting the rebellion. The defendants were convicted. Pending in the circuit court of appeals.

(2) *United States v. Albert Kaltschmidt et al.*, eastern district of Michigan: Defendants were charged with a conspiracy to blow up and injure Canadian munition factories, also railroad bridges of the Canadian Pacific Railway Co. used for the transportation of munitions to England and her allies; also similarly the railroad tunnel between Port Huron, Mich., and Sarnia, Canada; also to employ and send into Canada spies to obtain information as to war preparations. Defendants were indicted under section 13 of the Federal Penal Code, and the court held that the above-mentioned acts, which were the object of the conspiracy, would constitute a military enterprise within the meaning of the section. Defendants were also indicted under the Sherman law for conspiracy to interfere with interstate commerce. One case has been tried, resulting in the conviction of five defendants and the acquittal of one. There are other cases still pending.

(3) *United States v. Franz Bopp, E. H. Von Schack, Ram Chandra, Bagwhan Singh et al.*, northern district of California: This is the most important and sensational of the Hindu conspiracy cases. The defendants included Germans, Hindus, and Americans. Out of about 100 originally indicted, 4 plead guilty and 30 were tried, of whom 29 were found guilty and 1 was acquitted. The defendants were indicted under sections 37 and 13 of the Federal Penal Code for a conspiracy to set on foot a military enterprise, namely, a Hindu insurrection in India. They formed elaborate plans for sending arms, ammunition, German officers, and Indian revolutionary leaders from this country to India, many details of which, such as the actual purchasing of two vessels and the loading thereon of a cargo of arms and ammunition, were carried out. All of this conspiracy, shown to have been financed by the German Government at Berlin, was financed by the German Government through the German consular officers at San Francisco. The trial covered many weeks and was marked by many dramatic incidents, the most striking of which was the assassination on the last day of the trial of the defendant Ram Chandra, perhaps the leading Hindu revolutionist operating in the United States, by another Hindu defendant, Ram Singh, who, while firing indiscriminately in the courtroom, was in turn killed by the United States marshal.

(4) *United States v. Franz Von Rintelen et al.*, southern district of New York: There were two indictments for conspiracies to violate sections 298 and 235 of the penal code. Both charges grew out of acts of the defendants arranging for the destruction of the steamship *Kirk Oswald*, then lying in New York Harbor, which vessel was being loaded for a trans-Atlantic trip. The defendants carried upon the boat and placed in the hold thereof bombs or explosive devices, so arranged as to explode and set fire to the vessel while at sea. Their acts resulted in the starting of a fire on the vessel while at sea, which was, however, discovered and extinguished in time to save the vessel. The defendant, Von Rintelen, is the well-known German agent engaged in bombing plots in this country. The defendants were convicted. The case under section 235 is pending in the circuit court of appeals. Indictments arising out of the same attempt to destroy the *Kirk Oswald* are pending in the district of New Jersey and eastern district of New York, which cases include other defendants in addition to those included in the case in the southern district of New York.

#### SABOTAGE LAW.

Amongst the notable cases which have arisen under the so-called sabotage act, being act of April 20, 1918, entitled "An act to punish for the willful injury or destruction of war material, and for other purposes," the following may be mentioned:

(1) *United States v. Homer De Bolt et al.*, southern district of Ohio: Defendants were charged with an attempt to cause to be made in a defective manner steel railway cars, then in process of manufacture for the use of the United States for war purposes, by advising and attempting to influence one of the workmen at the plant to manipulate a lathe on which another workman was operating so that the material passing through the lathe would be injured and rendered defective. The case involved the important question of law whether advice to and attempts to influence a person to cause a defect in war material would constitute, in law, an "attempt to cause" such war material to be made in a defective manner. The defendants had not succeeded in inducing their fellow workmen to follow their advice. The court, in passing upon a motion for a directed verdict, held that advice of this kind and attempt to influence others to commit the offense were sufficient, as a matter of law, to constitute "an attempt to cause" within the meaning of that act. On the trial the defendants were acquitted.



(2) *United States v. Lewis Longwell and Hector Borden*, western district of New York: The defendants, workmen at the Curtiss aeroplane plant, are charged with having concealed cracks in crank casings by hammering or peening so that the defects would not be detected by the Government inspectors. The case is pending.

(3) *United States v. Richard S. Eastman et al.*, western district of New York: This case is against a group of foremen and workmen in the Curtiss plant, based upon an alleged attempt to conceal cracks in the tip of propellers of aeroplanes. Some of the defendants have plead guilty; the case is pending as to the others.

The report of the Attorney General referred to only covered the year ending June 30, 1918, but I have before me a memorandum prepared by the Department of Justice on June 12, 1919, which discloses that since the beginning of the war the Department of Justice investigated 50,000 alien-enemy cases and issued warrants for the arrest of 6,300 alien enemies; that it conducted approximately 300,000 investigations of alleged violations of the military-service act, and by reason of its investigations 50,000 delinquents were apprehended and inducted into the service. By the same memorandum it is made to appear that there have been several hundred prosecutions conducted by the Department of Justice for violation of the espionage act and that in the vast majority of these cases convictions have been had and sentences imposed. In addition to the prosecutions mentioned, the department has conducted approximately 200 investigations with reference to charges of fraudulent practices in the matter of war contracts.

All of these activities have been conducted in addition to the normal duties of the department.

Under all of the circumstances the record of Attorney General Gregory in the conduct of the Department of Justice is one that should command the hearty approval of those who desire to see a fair and thorough administration of this high office, and I very much regret that any Member should feel called upon to misrepresent the work of the department in the manner employed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The only real offense which Attorney General Gregory has committed, according to the political standards of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is that he is a Democrat.

It is a high honor to have a seat in this great body—within these four walls is set one of the greatest forums on earth—but a Member who takes advantage of his place here to make unfair and misleading statements regarding any citizen of the Republic tarnishes his own office and lowers the dignity of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have just finished a great war and finished it after a glorious fashion. History does not contain a brighter page than that which records the achievements of American arms. Our soldiers met and conquered the descendants of the men who had conquered the Caesars. Fresh from the factory, the field, and the farm, hurriedly trained, they destroyed the mightiest military machine of all time. By the millions they poured into France and with all the spirit and zeal of the crusader they carried the starry banner half round the world and brought it back covered all over with glory and radiant with victory. [Applause.]

But to equip, to train, to feed, to pay, to transport, and to supply that Army required the expenditure of immense sums of money. Everything was subordinated to the winning of the war in the shortest possible time. Business was changed, commerce was shifted—the channels of trade were varied—and this entire country from border to border united and finished the supreme task. Much money was spent—some of it was wasted. Things had to be done hurriedly. Weeks could not be taken dickerings and submitting sealed bids. The big purpose was to get things done. The natural and necessary expense was staggering. But the world has been saved, the Kaiser has been defeated, and the debt must be paid. The question is how and when. With the immense wealth and productivity of this country it could be paid in a short period of time. On the other hand, it could be extended over a long period. I am convinced that it ought to be extended over a period of 40 or 50 years. There are many reasons which lead to this conclusion.

The debt is tremendous. The total gross debt, on the basis of the Treasury Daily Statement of May 31, 1919, is \$27,018,346,620.80. The total indebtedness of the United States on March 31, 1917, as appears by the Public Debt Statement of that date, was \$1,282,044,346.28. The difference between these two

items may be taken as the unpaid war indebtedness of the United States, which is \$25,736,302,274.52.

#### PAYMENT SHOULD BE EXTENDED.

This expenditure was made in a great cause, and judged by the aims and purpose as well as by the triumphant results, was fully justified. [Applause.] However, if the war was worth fighting—and no one will deny that it was—the results of the struggle will inure to the benefit of this country for generations to come. This generation has made enormous sacrifices already. The war cost seas of blood, broken hearts, and billions of treasure. The burden of paying the debt should, therefore, be extended over a long period, and thus the burden be lightened. By arranging this debt over a period of 40 or 50 or 60 years on a sinking-fund basis, the amount could be paid without the heavy hand of taxation being laid unduly on any man or set of men or upon any phase of our business life.

By arranging a sinking-fund basis of payment the proportionate part of principal and interest could be equally divided over a period of years, so that the payment for each year could be exactly the same and the taxation for any one year, when distributed over the vast resources of this country, would be negligible. I find that by making the payment annually and by paying \$1,300,981,155 each year, the debt will be entirely paid, principal and interest, in 40 years. It will be paid in 50 years if \$1,198,668,422 is paid each year, and it will be paid in 60 years if \$1,138,198,410 is paid each year.

A great many have advocated the plan of making further great sacrifices and paying off the entire debt within a very few years. There is no doubt that with the practically unlimited resources of this country this could be done, and we could have the satisfaction within a very few years of having all our war debt discharged. However, to do this would break down the business spirit of the Nation, interfere with our commercial opportunities, and lessen the initiative of practically every business and working man in the United States. To do this would require a heavy tax on every line of industry, a tax on every individual income, with a very low basis of exemption, and in many ways would have the effect of destroying the progress and development of this country.

#### DEFINITE POLICY SHOULD BE ANNOUNCED.

In order to have the fullest development of the commercial and agricultural opportunities of this country it is necessary to have the various processes of readjustment and development unhampered in so far as practicable. In order to properly conduct the affairs of the country much money and credit are required. If all the phases of active life are to be heavily taxed, those who have money will be disinclined to put it into any line of business, and as a result commerce will stagnate and hard times will inevitably result.

On the other hand, if a definite policy is adopted, with assurance to all the people of this country that the payment of this debt is to be distributed over a long period of time, it will be easy for men who have ambition or enterprise to embark in any line of business or any line of production that may suit their fancy, with assurance that proper credit can be secured and that the necessary money to protect and maintain the business will be forthcoming. Practically every line of activity in the United States, whether it be farming, manufacturing, organizing, or distributing, for its fullest development requires a line of credit. It is manifestly important that this business be encouraged rather than discouraged.

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

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. What is the gentleman's suggestion as to how that assurance could be given? If by Congress, in what way?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Well, I think Congress could do so by resolution; or, if thought preferable, Congress could do so by adopting a policy in the next tax measure of distributing the burden or by calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for an estimate of the payments necessary on a sinking-fund basis to settle the war debt within a certain period of years. If the Congress of the United States shows a disposition to recognize the fact that every man within the borders of this great country is interested in its progress and development the people will know that fact and will act upon any reasonable assurance.

#### OUR OPPORTUNITIES.

This country has never faced such opportunities for the world's trade as are presented to it to-day. All of its business and commercial opportunities are laid on the sands at our feet. Practically every nation of the world is anxious to have business relationship with this great country. There are business and commercial opportunities in South America that are practically unlimited for the commerce of this country. Those new channels of trade will be rapidly developed.

This country is planning a great merchant marine to carry the products of its fields and factories to other countries. This is a great step forward. What more inspiring sight could be witnessed than a great American merchant marine carrying our products to the ports of the world? What could contribute more to its success than the lifting, in so far as may be, the burdens on products to be carried?

America has had an unusual history. The United States has had 100 years of the richest experience that was ever crowded into a single century. Heretofore she has been more or less sufficient unto herself, but she has developed to that point of production and distribution which require that she have other markets for her vast production. Otherwise her products will stagnate on her hands and prices will get so low as to discourage her people and cause untold losses. If we are not to have cheap cotton, cheap wheat, and other products in proportion, together with low wages for the workers of the country, we must take advantage of the markets of the world. Nothing can do more to materialize the dream of men of vision in this country than the removal of unnecessary burdens. The genius of American organization and the efforts of the American producers made the winning of the war possible. Wherever the results of their efforts were placed alongside those of any other country their surpassing excellence were made manifest.

I have no patience with the demagogue who would destroy the business interests or the productive life of this country. You can not destroy the business life without destroying the market for all of our products and without causing intense suffering and entailing a loss on every man. You can not disassociate poor business and poor prices. Every man in the United States who toils for a living is interested in a steady business development of the country. If it fails he suffers. He is, therefore, vitally interested. More and more it is getting to be the spirit of the American people that every man should do some useful work. Gradually the idea is gaining force that voluntary idleness is unpardonable. Nothing will add more to the growth of this trend of thought and attitude than an enlarged opportunity for every man of ambition and energy.

#### REGULATION NECESSARY.

I do not advocate and I do not argue that business should be turned loose without restraint. Proper regulation is as vitally necessary as organized government itself. Hence, rules of control and supervision are absolutely essential; and so long as the people retain control of their Government this supervision can be arranged.

By lightening the burden of taxation the exemption can be raised from its now unreasonably low basis, and many disagreeable taxes on the necessities of life can be removed, and the taxes so levied and arranged as to be an appreciable burden on no one and at the same time pay off the debt within a reasonable period. How anyone can have a valid objection to such a system it is impossible to conceive.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Has the gentleman, in estimating the amount of the war debt and in estimating the time necessary to pay it and the tax collections necessary to raise it, taken into account the fact that several billions—I forget how many—of this war debt are owing to us by the allied nations to whom we have advanced it, and that that will come back to us without taxation? Or was the gentleman's estimate of \$25,000,000,000 as though we had no credit?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have made the estimate of \$25,736,000,000 to cover the total indebtedness. While it is true that the other nations owe us money and will ultimately repay it, I do not believe they will be able to repay us the principal, at any rate, for a long period of time; and I doubt whether it would be wise for us to endeavor to collect too rapidly from those nations, because that would make it necessary for them to ship gold into this country, and we would have an oversupply and they would have an undersupply of gold. The readjustment must be gradual.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. For information, then, does the \$25,000,000,000 and some odd hundreds of millions include the money that we advanced to foreign nations?

Mr. JONES of Texas. That includes the money that we advanced to foreign nations.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. So that really our indebtedness is not so great?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Our indebtedness is not quite that much, but I was making an estimate to take care of all our obligations. When they repay us, well and good. People have no objection to their taxes being reduced at any particular time.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. What is the amount of our loans to foreign governments?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The total outstanding loans amount to \$9,380,219,124.27, divided as follows:

Belgium	\$341,500,000.00
Cuba	10,000,000.00
Czecho-Slovaks	50,000,000.00
France	2,802,447,800.00
Great Britain	4,318,000,000.00
Greece	43,412,966.00
Italy	1,581,500,000.00
Liberia	5,000,000.00
Roumania	25,000,000.00
Russia	187,729,750.00
Serbia	27,268,608.27

9,380,219,124.27

Mr. HARDY of Texas. So that our debt would then be between \$16,000,000,000 and \$17,000,000,000?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes. Assuming that all of those obligations will be duly repaid, our total outstanding war indebtedness would be reduced to \$16,346,083,150.25.

Calculating interest at 4 per cent per annum on a sinking-fund basis, this sum could be repaid in 40 years by the payment of \$842,059,000 per annum. The amount would be paid in 50 years by the payment of \$775,837,166 per annum, and the total principal and interest could be paid in 60 years by the payment of \$736,097,999 per annum. I have made these calculations in round numbers, but they are within a few dollars in each instance of being correct. The figures as to indebtedness and loans are entirely accurate.

#### EXTENSION WILL NOT CAUSE INFLATION.

It is true that a large bond issue for money borrowed and spent in the country making the issue has a tendency toward inflation of prices and encourages speculation unless there is a corresponding tax levy. However, this danger does not obtain where the issue is simply to pay off or to take up and extend an existing indebtedness. The inflation and speculation in the one instance is caused by the superabundance of money which the presence of borrowed money occasions. Of course the issue which simply takes care of an indebtedness already existing does not increase the immediate supply of money. It is similar to the action of an individual in extending a note.

The converse of the proposition is true, to wit: A heavy levy of taxes where there is no bond issue and no occasion for an increase in the supply of ready money tends to business depression, and consequently to bring about stagnation of trade and commerce. The application of this principle, therefore, would further argue the advantage of the distribution of our obligation over an extended period.

It is all important that prompt action be taken in this matter. The nation, just at this critical period in the world's history, which gets the first start will have the distinct advantage in opportunity for the new business. The man who is on the ground first gets what is sometimes termed the "bulge," and it is difficult to dislodge him. Trade goes in channels or grooves in national as well as individual business. Hence, prompt assurance to the citizenship of this country is necessary if full advantage is to be taken of our opportunities.

#### NEED OF ECONOMY.

Another matter that is closely linked with the distribution of these taxes is the issue of public expenditures. During the war great expenditures were absolutely necessary, but in the future I expect to vote to reduce the expenses of government in every way possible. In many instances appropriations can be reduced, and in some cases entirely eliminated. Since the signing of the armistice I have voted against a great many of the appropriation items simply because I recognize the necessity of rigid economy. The people have a right to expect these appropriations to be "cut to the limit," and I for one expect to continue to vote with this end in view. Such a policy will further lighten the burdens which this as well as every other nation which engaged in the war must carry.

#### CONCLUSION.

It is a pleasure to know that the world is turning in heart and in spirit from the arts of war to the arts of peace. It is to be hoped that the people of the earth have grown sick and tired of war to such an extent as to turn with a sense of relief to the implements of friendly rivalry; from the processes of destruction to the processes of construction; from the grasping at each other's throats in deadly combat to the contests which make for happiness and prosperity rather than suffering and despair. This country has grown in a few short years from simplicity and honor to the proud heritage of freedom and power. Just now she is given the chance to reap the harvest which her institutions, her organized form of government, and



the industry of her people entitle her. How happy will be her people if she makes the most of these opportunities. How foolish we will be if by tearing at each other's throats in class rivalry we attempt a foolish policy of strangling business and fritter away the opportunities which great events have placed in our path.

I believe in the United States Government, her history, her institutions, and her people. Knowing the glory of her past, I have implicit faith in her future. Never defeated in a contest of arms, I hope she may never be defeated in the more glorious contests of peace. We have as a heritage the finest form of government that was ever fashioned by human intelligence on this or any other continent, polished albeit and made more perfect by the growth and experience of a just, fair-minded, and generous people. Added to this we have the greatest resources any nation has ever possessed. We have mastered the machinery of production as no other nation has ever mastered it. It is equally important to master the machinery of distribution.

I know not whether triumph or despair awaits us in the infinite sea of the future; I know not what inventions or discoveries the genius of man may conceive. The beginnings of a wonderful garment have been woven in the loom of our country's past. I know not in what form it may be finished; but I do know that if our people are given the unhindered opportunity to which their institutions, their sacrifices, and their industry entitle them the Nation's future will be triumphantly secure. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, incorporated by act of Congress, approved March 16, 1896, is hereby authorized and empowered on the petition of the vestry of any parish or separate congregation to give the same right to women to vote and hold office as is now conferred upon men by existing law.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "convention" in line 3 be made to begin with a capital letter.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection that correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This legislation was recommended by the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington at its last annual convention.

It appears that the right to vote in the parishes of the Episcopal Church in this city is confined to men, and that this right was limited and defined by a statute passed by Congress in 1874.

The women of the Protestant Episcopal Churches of the District petitioned the last annual convention for the right to hold office and to vote the same as men, and the convention acted upon that petition and recommended this legislation. The legislation does not give the right absolutely to the women of the churches to vote, but authorizes the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington to grant the women of any parish that right upon the petition of the vestry of the parish; or upon the petition of the vestry of any separate congregation the women in that congregation may be authorized to vote and to hold office by the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

This Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington is a corporation created by an act of Congress approved March 16, 1896, and it has jurisdiction and supervision to a large extent of the church in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FOCHT. I am highly in accord with the proposition contained in this bill; but I should like to inquire whether the chairman of the committee does not think that the suffrage movement is a little late in arriving among the Protestant Episcopal brethren in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MAPES. Well, it is coming along now.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if there should be any qualifying words with reference to the right to vote and hold office, and if it should be to hold office and vote in the parish? Or is that implied?

Mr. MAPES. I think that it is implied. I called that matter to the attention of the committee of the church who called upon me in reference to this bill. That committee had one lawyer upon it, and this bill was drafted and recommended by the convention; and the committee thought the bill as it is covered the situation all right.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I notice that the bill gives—

The same right to women to vote and hold office as is now conferred upon men by existing law.

Does that sufficiently define it?

Mr. MAPES. The bill itself, of course, pertains entirely to the church organization.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Do I understand the gentleman from Michigan to say that the words "existing law" refer to the act of March 28, 1874? It is stated in the report that—

In this diocese the right to vote in parish meeting and to serve on vestries is determined by the Maryland Vestry Act of 1798 and by the act of the Legislative Assembly of the District of Columbia of June 26, 1873, approved by Congress March 28, 1874.

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. It further says:

To remove the disabilities of women, therefore, requires an act of Congress, so far as the parishes in the District of Columbia are concerned, and an act of the General Assembly of Maryland, so far as those parishes in Maryland are concerned, which have not already secured remedial legislation.

Mr. MAPES. The act of 1874, approving the act of the Territorial assembly, is the existing law.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the gentleman think that act should be referred to, rather than the words "existing law"?

Mr. MAPES. That was my impression at first, and I asked the church committee about that. The explanation given to me was that it is the intention of the church not to give the women the right to vote absolutely, but the idea is to authorize the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church to give the women the right to vote upon the petition of the vestries of the different churches.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. BEE. This matter, as I understand it, is a matter of internal organization of the church.

Mr. MASON. Entirely.

Mr. BEE. It is not a matter that affects the body politic of the United States, but only the internal regulation of the church?

Mr. MAPES. That is it. But a statute was passed which confined the right to vote in the church to men.

Mr. BEE. I understand that is the rule in the Episcopal Church.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. I take it the rules of the church prescribe the qualifications that the men must possess to have the right to vote.

Mr. MAPES. I think the Maryland statute confines it to men 21 years of age who hold pews in the church, or are regular attendants of the church in case the pews are free.

Mr. KEARNS. Does this put the women on the same footing as men?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Do the women have to be of age and own a pew?

Mr. MAPES. They will have to meet the same qualifications as the men.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, there is a little matter I desire to call the attention of the committee to, and I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for three minutes.

Mr. MAPES. General debate was limited before we went into committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 16 minutes of general debate remaining.

Mr. MAPES. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, on May 30 and at subsequent times the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] made a number of charges reflecting not only on the efficiency but in terms charging maladministration against the United States Employment Bureau. When a Government executive official is attacked here he can not have an opportunity to defend himself on the floor. I hold in my hand a memorandum furnished by Mr. Densmore setting out his answer to and refutation of the charges made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

In view of the serious nature of the charges and the widespread publicity given them by publication in the Record and the newspapers, I think it is a matter of justice and right that this memorandum constituting the reply of that bureau should be published in the Record. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by publishing the communication indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter is as follows:

JUNE 18, 1919.

Memoandum: In re facts in connection with certain charges made by Congressman BLANTON with reference to the administration of the United States Employment Service.

(1) In reply to the charge that the United States Employment Service will only furnish information as to opportunities for employment to persons who are members of labor unions there is submitted an excerpt from an address of the Secretary of Labor made before representatives of 33 governors, of employers, employees, and United States Employment Service officials:

"Since we have been engaged in a Federal way in the placing of workers in the different lines of industry we have met with some criticism that I feel I ought to bring to your attention and to make some statements concerning them. And one of the criticisms that we have met with is that our Employment Service, the Federal Employment Service, is a union-labor employment service and gives preference to the placement of union labor. That statement is made incidentally in connection with the allegation that the Department of Labor, of which the Employment Service is a part, is a union-labor department, giving preference to union labor. Of course, any employment service that is a union-labor employment service, and that gives special preference to union labor as against nonunion labor, would not meet the employment situation of the United States.

"There are those engaged in industry who are trade-unionists. There are those engaged in industry who are nonunionists. I make no hesitancy in saying that I am a trade-unionist myself. I believe in trade-unionism; I also belong to a church. I belong to some fraternal societies. It doesn't follow that because I belong to a church or belong to a fraternal society that when I became an executive of the Government I would immediately set the machinery of the Government in motion to set up my church as the established church or to exclude all other fraternal organizations from the United States except those that I happen to be a member of. It is not a function of any branch of the Government to promote trade-unions. It is not a function of any branch of Government to promote corporations, but it would be folly to say that because it is not a function of the Government to promote corporations therefore the Government must not deal with corporations, and it is just as much folly to say that because it is not a function of government to promote trade-unions that therefore government must not deal with trade-unions. Those who are members of corporations, those who are members of copartnerships, those who are individualists in business, those who are trade-unionists and nonunionists are all citizens of the United States, and as a governmental agency, the Department of Labor and the Employment Service can deal with all of them. We are authorized by our organic act to promote the welfare of labor and to advance its opportunities for profitable employment. No distinction is made as between the union and the nonunion worker in the organic law, and no distinction has been made by the Department of Labor or by its Employment Service in the handling of labor affairs or in the placement of workers, except those distinctions that employers and employees have themselves, by their mutual contracts, made absolutely necessary. The one great example that has been used by our critics in connection with the allegation that we are a union-labor department and a union-labor service is that when the demand for ship workers and shipbuilders came from Seattle our employees in the interior of the country said to those who were applicants for employment that 'it is not advisable to go to Seattle unless you are either a union man or willing to join the union,' and we are held up as a trade-union department because we made that statement. After the criticism began we continued to make it. We are making it now. We will continue to make it while the conditions remain the same, and the conditions were these: That the employers and the employees in the shipbuilding industry in Seattle had come to an agreement that all people employed in those yards should be members of their respective unions. In other words, they had a closed-shop agreement, and if we had, at our instance, caused any man to leave the interior of the country and go to Seattle who was neither a trade-unionist nor willing to become a member of the Union, only to find when he reached there that he couldn't secure the employment that we had said was available, then we would have been justly subject to criticism and ought to have been denounced from one end of the country to the other.

"Now, on the Atlantic coast the situation was entirely different. The employers and the employees had no closed-shop agreement, and we placed more workers in the shipbuilding yards of the eastern coast by far than we placed at Seattle, and we placed them there without any reference to whether they were unionists or nonunionists. The question was never asked; it was not a condition of employment, and so they were sent to our shipyards on the eastern coast without any intimation that they would be unable to find employment if they were not trade-unionists or unwilling to become such. That has been our attitude.

"I may go further and say this: That if there was a call for nonunionists coming to the department, we would endeavor to supply the non-unionists, if they were available, and the only distinction we would make would be in the event of there being an industrial dispute. If there was an industrial dispute in existence we would not be the agency through which labor could be furnished to that industrial dispute. We take this ground with respect to industrial disputes:

"That there is a sufficient supply of labor there if a strike is going on. The labor is competent to perform the work that is required and has been evidenced by the fact that it has been doing it, and to send workers from some other community, however near or far, into a community where there is already a sufficient supply of labor of the necessary skill is simply to create a complication, a surplus of labor, one of the things that is to be avoided, and where a labor dispute is on it is not a question for our Employment Service to deal with; it is not a matter for it to handle. It is a question for our conciliation service to deal with, and when the conciliation service has successfully handled the problem, then you have the workers there, ready to go on with the work. That has been our attitude with regard to industrial disputes.

"I have referred to this criticism because undoubtedly you will find it more or less from time to time in your local communities, and I wanted to make clear to you at least what my attitude is on the matter, at least the manner in which we have been endeavoring to handle the problem from a national standpoint."

This statement of the Secretary very accurately outlines the policy of the United States Employment Service with respect to its attitude toward union and nonunion labor. Any violation of this policy by subordinates is immediately remedied when brought to the attention of the administrative officials.

(2) In reply to the charge that the United States Employment Service, through its Director General, J. B. Densmore, interfered with the

activities of the San Francisco Mooney case, the following is a statement from Mr. Densmore, giving briefly the facts in the case:

"Since 1913 I have been Solicitor of the Department of Justice for the Department of Labor, appointed as such by the President. I resigned this position in January, 1918, at the request of the Secretary of Labor, to take up the work of establishing and directing the United States Employment Service.

"During the year 1917, as solicitor for the department, I was sent by the Secretary of Labor to San Francisco to make an investigation of alleged graft and corruption in the Chinese Immigration Service in connection with the fraudulent admission of Chinese laborers in this country. I had a few trained investigators of the Government service with me, and at the conclusion of the investigation we had turned up and dismissed some 23 employees of the Immigration Service who were involved in accepting money from Chinese and others for the illegal admission of alien Chinese and for the delivery and destruction of certain records of the Government pertaining to Chinese. These frauds also involved several lawyers in San Francisco who were working with these dishonest Government employees.

"I was instructed by the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General to present the whole matter to the Federal grand jury with the United States attorney, which I did, with the result that about 22 of the grafters were indicted. The grand jury investigation was finished and the indictments returned about November, 1917, at which time I returned to Washington, as there was no possibility of trying the cases in the near future. As several of the defendants had made complete confessions upon their arrest and were Government witnesses, I felt that it was necessary to leave one of the department's special inspectors to protect them from corruption by the more influential defendants and also as a matter of protection to the Government's cases, as an attempt had been made to corruptly influence the action of the Federal grand jury while considering the cases we had before it. With this in mind, one of the inspectors who had worked on the whole investigation was left in San Francisco, together with one other who lived there, and together they assisted the United States attorney in gathering additional evidence to be used in the trials."

"It was during the time these inspectors remained in San Francisco that they discovered an opportunity to present further evidence to the Secretary of Labor on the subject of the fairness of the trial of Thomas J. Mooney by the State's attorney for San Francisco, which subject had been gone into by the commission appointed by the President, of which the Secretary of Labor was chairman. They were authorized to do so in connection with their other work.

"In the meantime when I returned to Washington, in November, 1917, I was, as before mentioned, asked to take charge of the establishment and direction of the United States Employment Service, and I resigned as solicitor to do so. This new work engaged all my time, and it was not until the middle of October, 1918, that I found myself able to leave this work even for a few weeks to go to San Francisco and assist the district attorney in the prosecution of the cases. I was then Director General of the United States Employment Service, but I went to San Francisco at that time solely for the purpose of assisting in the Government's prosecution of the people indicted as a result of my investigation as solicitor, and not at all for the purposes, as universally charged, 'to investigate the Mooney case.' Such investigation as was made was carried on by the two inspectors of the department who remained in San Francisco, and no person connected with the United States Employment Service had anything to do with it.

"The investigation was practically finished when I arrived in San Francisco last October to assist the United States attorney in the trials, and the report of the investigators was transmitted by me to the Secretary of Labor. Unfortunately some of this report fell into the hands of the publisher of a local paper, who published it without any authority whatever."

(3) In reply to the charge that there were 513 high-priced officials connected with the administrative offices of Washington, the facts are briefly these:

Owing to the failure of the passage of the third deficiency appropriation bill in the last Congress, which carried an item in the sum of \$1,800,000 for the continuance of the United States Employment Service until June 30, 1919, it became necessary on March 22, 1919, to reduce the operating expenses of the service approximately 80 per cent. At that time there were approximately 500 employees connected with the administrative offices, at an average salary of \$132 per month per employee. Between March 22 and April 1 this number was reduced to approximately 100, which number included watchmen, charwomen, and laborers. In addition to reducing the number of employees connected with the administrative offices the salaries were also reduced. The Director General on April 1 reduced his own salary \$1,000 per annum. A reduction of \$500 per annum was made in the salaries of the heads of the several divisions, and corresponding reductions were made in the compensation of the other higher-salaried employees. Of the 100 employees retained 30 were reduced in salary.

(4) In reply to the charge that a large amount of money was expended by employees making useless trips, particularly Mr. Luther C. Steward, Harry L. Parks, and the three employees who were sent to France, and that the official stations of employees were made at different places from that where they were working, for the purpose of increasing salaries, the facts are these: In not a single instance was an employee's official station changed for the purpose of granting per diem or for the sole purpose of granting a per diem, thereby augmenting his salary. Since all employees were paid from a lump-sum appropriation a subterfuge of this character was not necessary, even if desired, to increase salaries.

Mr. Luther C. Steward prior to July 1, 1918, was connected with the field force of the Employment Service official station at Kansas City, Mo. In July he was called to Washington for the purpose of assisting in reorganizing the administrative offices. In August he was placed temporarily in charge of the control division of the administrative offices, and later made director of the control division, at which time his official station was changed from Kansas City to Washington, D. C.

Mr. Harry L. Parks entered the Employment Service in September, 1918, from California, as assistant director of the personnel division with official station at Washington. Records of this office show that in November, 1918, he made one trip to Baltimore for one day, and November 26 he visited Ohio and Chicago, Ill., returning December 1. In February he made two trips to Philadelphia and returned, spending three days on each occasion in Philadelphia. In March he was detailed to Philadelphia to take charge of the organization in Pennsylvania. He made one trip to Washington. In April he made one trip to Washington. In May his official station was changed from Washington to Philadelphia.

(5) On March 1 three employees of this service were sent to France under the following circumstances: Under date of January 27 the



United States Employment Service received a communication from Mr. John M. Dunn, colonel, General Staff, acting director of military intelligence, inclosing a copy of memorandum prepared by Capt. A. V. Dalrymple, of the Military Intelligence Division, on the subject of returning soldiers and sailors. This memorandum set forth that while in Europe Capt. Dalrymple found that there was considerable unrest among the soldiers because of unsettled conditions and a keen interest being manifested on the part of the soldiers, especially as the time approached for them to return home, to know what their prospects were in regard to future employment. It was suggested in this memorandum that the Department of Labor place officers in France whose duty it would be to furnish outgoing ships carrying troops with proper blank forms, the same as provided in military cantonments in the United States, to put the returned soldiers in touch with the facilities of the United States Employment Service for finding employment on their return to civilian life. This matter was taken up informally with Maj. Gen. Jervey, of the General Staff, who gave informal but enthusiastic approval to the suggestion and stated that he would recommend it if it should be handed to him formally. Accordingly, the matter was taken up by the Secretary of Labor with the Secretary of War, and in February the Secretary of War approved the proposed plan and issued a memorandum to the Adjutant General directing him to issue instructions by courier cable to the commanding general of the American Expeditionary Forces. In accordance with this arrangement with the War Department, 2,000,000 pamphlets describing the operations of the United States Employment Service and 2,000,000 applications for employment cards were shipped to the designated military officers in France. The carding system established abroad was instituted at the request of the War Department and has received its hearty cooperation and approval. Application cards from the soldiers abroad are received by the United States Employment Service at the average of more than 3,000 per day stating that they need assistance. The expense of sending three representatives to France cost approximately \$4,000.

(6) In reply to the charge that Miss Jeanette V. Densmore took a pleasure trip from New York City to Atlantic City on July 4, 1918, at the expense of the Government, the facts are these: Miss Densmore, for 16 years a civil-service employee, was appointed to a position in the Immigration Bureau, Department of Labor, and then transferred to the United States Employment Service before a director general was appointed. For a week or two prior to July 1, 1918, many girls in New York City had just finished their year's schooling and had been applying for opportunities for work in the hotels and boarding houses at Atlantic City, N. J. The officer in charge of the work for the State of New York directed Miss Densmore to proceed to Atlantic City for the purpose of conferring with Col. Lewis T. Bryant, commissioner of labor for the State of New Jersey and Federal director of the United States Employment Service for that State, who resided in Atlantic City, and to make a personal inquiry into the opportunities that might be available in the numerous hotels and boarding houses of Atlantic City for New York girls who desired work of that character, as well as to ascertain conditions under which the girls would be required to perform their duties. The records of this office show that Miss Densmore left New York City on July 4, 1918, at 3.30 p. m. and arrived at Atlantic City at 6.30 p. m. that day, that she remained in Atlantic City for two days, July 5 and 6, and left there on July 7 at 9.15 a. m. for New York City, arriving at the latter place at 12.15 p. m. The record further discloses that in proceeding from New York to Atlantic City Miss Densmore used Government transportation request No. L 51736, the amount of which was \$1.25, and that in returning she used Government transportation request L 51737, the amount of which was likewise \$1.25, these items representing single fares between the points indicated. She paid cash fare for a seat in a Pullman car amounting to 98 cents each way. The total charge against the Government for the entire trip was \$13.46. Two girls did accompany Miss Densmore from New York to Atlantic City, but they did not travel on Government transportation nor did they represent any claims to the Government for reimbursement of traveling expenses.

In substantiation of the foregoing facts there is attached as a part of this report the signed statement (1) of Col. L. T. Bryant, Federal director of the United States Employment Service for New Jersey, certifying that Miss Densmore conferred with him at Atlantic City on official business of the United States Employment Service on that date; (2) an affidavit of Mrs. Nina B. Riddell to the effect that she personally purchased with cash two tickets used by the two girls who went from New York to Atlantic City with Miss Densmore.

(7) Mr. C. H. Burroughs, a former employee of this service, who apparently is furnishing Congressman BLANTON with alleged facts concerning the unnecessary traveling of certain employees of the service, was a clerk in charge of administering and auditing what is commonly known as the revolving fund—a fund of \$250,000 to be used in the advancing of transportation to wage earners from the place of recruitment to war projects. He had nothing whatever to do with the auditing of any travel vouchers except the expense vouchers of scouts accompanying the shipments of labor. He was not chief of the auditing section or of any other section. Any information that he may have, accurate or inaccurate, in connection with travel vouchers other than above stated, did not come into his possession legitimately, and if it was furnished by others it was for sinister purposes. He did resign voluntarily, but only after he had been required to make a report as to the condition of the work of which he was in charge and which he admits was in a deplorable condition, and it was fully known by him that the officials of the service were cognizant of his failure to perform the work for which he was employed. In other words, his statements are those of a disgruntled employee.

## EXHIBIT 1.

[Letterhead of the United States Department of Labor—United States Employment Service.]

TRENTON, N. J., June 17, 1919.

MRS. MARGARETTA NEALE,  
United States Employment Service, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NEALE: I wish to advise you that I recall having had a conference with Miss Densmore regarding cooperative service for hotel help between New York and Atlantic City soon after the Atlantic City office was opened. The office opened about the 15th of June, 1918, and was in operation during the 3d, 4th, and 5th of July. It was open during practically all of the 4th of July on account of work which had to be performed.

Yours, respectfully,

(Signed) LEWIS T. BRYANT,  
Federal Director of Employment for New Jersey.

## EXHIBIT 2.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ss:

Mrs. NANA B. RIDDELL, of Chevy Chase, Md., being duly sworn, deposes and says:

That my attention has been called to the remarks of Congressman THOMAS L. BLANTON, and reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 5 and June 14, 1919, in relation to a trip made by Miss Jeanette V. Densmore on July 4, 1918; that to my own knowledge the statements made by Mr. BLANTON therein to the effect that Miss Densmore received transportation and Pullman reservations for three persons on July 4, 1918, from New York City to Atlantic City, N. J., is untrue and misleading; that I was present at the Pennsylvania station in New York City on July 4, 1918, when Miss Densmore presented a Government transportation request for one ticket for herself from New York City to Atlantic City, N. J., and that to my knowledge she did not receive other transportation at that time on that date; that I know the two persons who accompanied Miss Densmore on that trip, inasmuch as one is my own daughter and the other a girl friend; that out of my own pocket I paid for the transportation and Pullman accommodations of my daughter and her friend for that trip; that I have not received nor sought to receive any refund of the amount paid out by me for that purpose at that time; that neither of the two persons who accompanied Miss Densmore at that time were employees of the Government; that I personally saw Miss Densmore and the two other persons depart on the train from New York; that these two persons did not return to New York with Miss Densmore; and that I myself paid out of my own funds for their return transportation from Atlantic City to New York City.

(Signed) NANA B. RIDDELL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of June, 1919.

[SEAL.]

CHAS. CLAMBORN,

Notary Public.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield me three minutes?

Mr. MAPES. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this Congress I presented a petition containing some 75,000 names—people of my State—praying for the return of the troops from Russia. That petition is addressed also to the President of the United States. It has been presented to the Congress by presenting it here. I now ask unanimous consent that that petition may be presented to the White House at an early day, that it may be delivered to the President of the United States. That is only fair. It is a carefully prepared petition and contains the signatures of 75,000 people.

We get conflicting statements every day about the return of the boys from Russia. As near as I can get to the facts, the 5,000 American boys sent to Russia have practically been ordered back, except the Engineers and those who have been buried there. I do not know that any arrangement has been made for the return of their bodies.

In the city of Chicago, which is a part of my district, there are 600 women who have sons or husbands in Russia. I received this morning something like 12 letters, and I receive them almost every morning, asking when our troops are to be returned from Siberia. Ten thousand of them were sent to Vladivostok. At the right time and place I propose to discuss in this body the question as to the President's right to send them there. The American people do not believe we had any right to send them there. Those who write to me and those with whom I talk claim that we had no right to send them there. The President for six months refused to send American troops to fight in Russia because we had not declared war on Russia, and the President was of the opinion that the lawmaking power, known as the Congress of the United States, was the only power that could declare war. In response to this call which comes to me almost daily and hourly I intend to keep this matter fresh in the minds of the people. I consider it one of the great blunders of the war that we should have sent 15,000 men to subdue 180,000,000 people and take part in a political fight in Russia between the Czar and those who follow him and the Bolsheviks, in neither of which parties have we any interest. We have already taken quite a number of lives out of my district, and I have this right to have this petition presented to the President.

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the petition be withdrawn from the House and presented to the President by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that the documents to which the gentleman refers are in the possession of the House. We are now in the Committee of the Whole, and the Chair thinks the request is hardly in order in the committee.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill H. R. 5032, with the amendments, to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass, together with the other bills which have been temporarily laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TREADWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bills H. R. 5032, 1199, 1713, and 3624, reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bills as amended do pass.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendments and the bills to final passage.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment, until I can get unanimous consent in respect to this petition. It will not take a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves the previous question on the bills and amendments to final passage.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that in the House we can pass all of these bills in a bunch in that way.

The SPEAKER. They certainly could not all be passed in that way—in a bunch, as the gentleman says—but the Chair is disposed to think that the previous question can be ordered on all of them at one time. The question is on ordering the previous question on the bills and amendments to final passage. The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the petition heretofore filed by me in regard to the return of American troops from Siberia be forwarded by the Clerk of the House to the President of the United States. The petition is addressed to the Congress and to the President.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the memorial and petition which were forwarded to him and by him filed with the Clerk of the House be forwarded by the Clerk of the House to the President of the United States. Is there objection?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire where these petitions come from?

Mr. MASON. They came from my district and came from the gentleman's district.

Mr. WHEELER. Any other county in the State except Cook County?

Mr. MASON. I do not know just what districts they came from, but they came from my district, about 75,000, and there are about 600 in my city alone.

Mr. WHEELER. Do I understand the gentleman to say that 600 out of 75,000 come from Cook County?

Mr. MASON. I do not know how many come from Cook County. There are some from Kane County, and I presume some from the gentleman's district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, just a moment. It is simply to present a petition. The gentleman surely does not want to deny the right of petition to these people.

The SPEAKER. Objection has been made, and the Clerk will report the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3624) incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the petition to which I have referred—

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman has a right to interrupt the vote in that manner.

The SPEAKER. He can not do so except by unanimous consent, and the gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. MASON. Then I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Obviously there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. This is an automatic call, and the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 281, nays 0, answered "present" 0, not voting 149, as follows:

## YEAS—281.

Ackerman	Aswell	Bland, Mo.	Briggs
Alexander	Babka	Bland, Va.	Brinson
Almon	Bankhead	Blanton	Brooks, Ill.
Anderson	Barbour	Boies	Brooks, Pa.
Andrews, Md.	Barkley	Booher	Browning
Andrews, Nebr.	Bee	Bowers	Brumbaugh
Anthony	Begg	Box	Burke
Ashbrook	Benham	Brand	Butler

Byrnes, S. C.	Greene, Vt.	Madden	Sims
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hadley	Magee	Sinnott
Caldwell	Hardy, Colo.	Maher	Sisson
Campbell, Kans.	Harrison	Mapes	Small
Campbell, Pa.	Hastings	Martin	Smith, Idaho
Cannon	Hawley	Mason	Smith, Mich.
Caraway	Hayden	Mays	Smithwick
Carter	Hays	Miller	Snell
Chindblom	Hernandez	Monahan, Wis.	Stedman
Christopherson	Hersey	Mondell	Steele
Clark, Mo.	Hickey	Montague	Stephens, Ohio
Classon	Hicks	Moon	Stevenson
Cleary	Hill	Moore, Ohio	Stiness
Cole	Hoch	Moore, Pa.	Strong, Kans.
Collier	Holland	Moore, Ind.	Strong, Pa.
Connally	Houghton	Morgan	Summers, Wash.
Copley	Howard	Mott	Sweet
Costello	Huddleston	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Crago	Hudspeth	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Crisp	Hull, Iowa	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Crowther	Hull, Tenn.	Newton, Mo.	Temple
Cullen	Hutchinson	Nicholls, S. C.	Thomas
Currie, Mich.	Igoe	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson, Ohio
Curry, Calif.	Ireland	Nolan	Thompson, Okla.
Dale	Jacoway	O'Connell	Tillman
Dallinger	James	O'Connor	Tilson
Darrow	Johnson, Ky.	Ogden	Timberlake
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Miss.	Oldfield	Tincher
Denison	Jones, Pa.	Oliver	Towner
Dent	Jones, Tex.	Overtstreet	Treadway
Dickinson, Mo.	Juul	Park	Upshaw
Dickinson, Iowa	Kearns	Parker	Valle
Dominick	Kelly, Pa.	Parrish	Vare
Dowell	Kendall	Pell	Venable
Drane	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	Vestal
Dunbar	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Vinson
Dunn	Kincheloe	Quin	Voigt
Dupré	Kinkaid	Radcliffe	Volstead
Echols	Kitchin	Rainey, H. T.	Walsh
Edmonds	Klecza	Rainey, J. W.	Walters
Ellsworth	Kraus	Raker	Wason
Elston	Kreider	Ramsey	Watkins
Esch	LaGuardia	Ramseyer	Watson, Pa.
Evans, Nebr.	Lampert	Randall, Wis.	Webster
Evans, Nev.	Lanham	Rayburn	Welty
Fess	Lankford	Reber	Whaley
Fields	Lazaro	Reed, W. Va.	Wheeler
Fisher	Lee, Ga.	Rhodes	White, Me.
Focht	Lehlbach	Ricketts	Wilson, La.
Foster	Little	Riddick	Wilson, Pa.
French	Loneragan	Robinson, N. C.	Wingo
Fuller, Mass.	Luce	Robison, Ky.	Winslow
Gallivan	Lufkin	Rogers	Wood, Ind.
Gandy	Luhling	Romjue	Woods, Va.
Gard	McAndrews	Rose	Woodyard
Garner	McDuffie	Rouse	Wright
Godwin, N. C.	McFadden	Rowe	Yates
Good	McKeown	Sanders, Ind.	Young, N. Dak.
Goodwin, Ark.	McKinley	Schall	Young, Tex.
Goodykoontz	McLane	Scott	Zihlman
Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sears	
Green, Iowa	McPherson	Sells	
Greene, Mass.	MacCrate	Shreve	

## NOT VOTING—149.

Ayres	Fitzgerald	Larsen	Reavis
Bacharach	Flood	Layton	Reed, N. Y.
Baer	Fordney	Lea, Calif.	Riordan
Bell	Frear	Leshner	Rodenberg
Benson	Freeman	Lever	Rowan
Black	Fuller, Ill.	Linthicum	Rubey
Blackmon	Gallagher	Longworth	Rucker
Bland, Ind.	Ganly	McArthur	Sabath
Britten	Garland	McClintic	Sanders, La.
Browne	Garrett	McCulloch	Sanders, N. Y.
Buchanan	Glynn	McGlennon	Sanford
Burdick	Goldfogle	McKenzie	Saunders, Va.
Burroughs	Goodall	McKiniry	Scully
Candler	Gould	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sherwood
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	MacGregor	Siegel
Carew	Griest	Major	Sinclair
Carrs	Griffin	Mann	Slemp
Casey	Hamill	Mansfield	Smith, Ill.
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton	Mead	Smith, N. Y.
Coady	Hardy, Tex.	Merritt	Snyder
Cooper	Haskell	Michener	Steagall
Cramton	Haugen	Minahan, N. J.	Steenerson
Davey	Heflin	Mooney	Stephens, Miss.
Davis, Minn.	Hersman	Moore, Va.	Sullivan
Dempsey	Hulings	Morin	Summers, Tex.
Dewalt	Humphreys	Murphy	Tinkham
Donovan	Husted	Neely	Ward
Doolling	Jefferis	Nelson, Wis.	Watson, Va.
Doremus	Johnson, S. Dak.	Olney	Weaver
Doughton	Johnson, Wash.	Osborne	Webb
Dyer	Johnston, N. Y.	Padgett	Welling
Eagan	Kahn	Paige	White, Kans.
Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Phelan	Williams
Elliott	Kettner	Porter	Wilson, Ill.
Emerson	Kiess	Pou	Wise
Evans, Mont.	King	Purnell	
Fairfield	Knutson	Ragsdale	
Ferris	Langley	Randall, Calif.	

So the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.

Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.

Mr. PURNELL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. KING with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. MCGLENNON.

Mr. BURROUGHS with Mr. GALLAGHER.



Mr. BAER with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. GRIEST with Mr. WISE.  
 Mr. COOPER with Mr. CARSS.  
 Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. GALLAGHER.  
 Mr. OSBORNE with Mr. HAYDEN.  
 Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. AYRES.  
 Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. BENSON.  
 Mr. WHITE of Kansas with Mr. BLACK.  
 Mr. WARD with Mr. CANDLER.  
 Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. CANTRELL.  
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. CAREW.  
 Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. CLARK of Florida.  
 Mr. SLEMP with Mr. COADY.  
 Mr. SINCLAIR with Mr. DEWALT.  
 Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. DONOVAN.  
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. DOOLING.  
 Mr. SANDERS of New York with Mr. DOREMUS.  
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. DOUGHTON.  
 Mr. REED of New York with Mr. EAGAN.  
 Mr. REAVIS with Mr. EAGLE.  
 Mr. PAIGE with Mr. EVANS of Montana.  
 Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. FERRIS.  
 Mr. MURPHY with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.  
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. FLOOD.  
 Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. GARRETT.  
 Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. GRIFFIN.  
 Mr. HASKELL with Mr. RUBEY.  
 Mr. LAYTON with Mr. HARDY of Texas.  
 Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. HEFLIN.  
 Mr. KIESS with Mr. HERSMAN.  
 Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. HUMPHREYS.  
 Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. LARSEN.  
 Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. LEA of California.  
 Mr. JEFFERIS with Mr. LESHNER.  
 Mr. HUSTED with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.  
 Mr. HULINGS with Mr. LINTHICUM.  
 Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. LEVER.  
 Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. MCKINIRY.  
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. MAJOR.  
 Mr. GOODALL with Mr. MANSFIELD.  
 Mr. GLYNN with Mr. MEAD.  
 Mr. GARLAND with Mr. MINAHAN.  
 Mr. FULLER of Illinois with Mr. MOONEY of Ohio.  
 Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. FREEAR with Mr. OLNEY.  
 Mr. FAIRFIELD with Mr. PADGETT.  
 Mr. EMERSON with Mr. PHELAN.  
 Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. POU.  
 Mr. DYER with Mr. RAGSDALE.  
 Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. RIORDAN.  
 Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. BUCHANAN.  
 Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. ROWAN.  
 Mr. BROWNE with Mr. RUCKER.  
 Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.  
 Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.  
 Mr. BAER with Mr. SCULLY.  
 Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. SMITH of New York.  
 Mr. BURDICK with Mr. STEAGALL.  
 Mr. MICHENER with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.  
 Mr. MEKRITT with Mr. SULLIVAN.  
 Mr. MACGREGOR with Mr. SUMNERS of Texas.  
 Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan with Mr. WATSON of Virginia.  
 Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. WEBER.  
 Mr. McARTHUR with Mr. WEBB.  
 Mr. MURPHY with Mr. WELLING.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill, H. R. 1713.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. There are amendments, and the question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 1199.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1199) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 5032.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5032) to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. PHELAN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, for three days, on account of death in his family.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Record my remarks on the subject of the passage of the joint resolution thanking the soldiers and sailors who took part in the war.

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

#### TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. I presented a petition some days since to the House, which was addressed to the Congress and to the President, praying that our troops be withdrawn from Russia. A few moments since I asked unanimous consent that that petition might be sent by the Clerk to the President, as it was addressed to him as well as to Congress. I wish to ask the Chair the parliamentary procedure to get a vote so that the right of petition may not be denied these people.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry. Of course, the gentleman made a proper motion. He asked unanimous consent, which was refused. The only way the Chair knows—

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, then I desire to move that that petition—

The SPEAKER. It is not in order. A motion to adjourn is pending.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, can not the gentleman take that down to the White House himself?

Mr. MASON. There is nobody at the White House to receive it but the janitor. [Laughter.]

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

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

S. 552. An act to reimburse W. B. Graham, late postmaster at Ely, Nev., for money expended for clerical assistance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 1711. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.;

H. R. 530. An act for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Madawaska, Me., and Edmundston, Province of New Brunswick, Canada;

H. R. 242. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conynham, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the township of Salem, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 240. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conynham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.; and

H. R. 241. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the city of Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to the borough of West Pittston, county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 25, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### 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. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6376) to amend section 2 of the act approved September 8, 1916, relating to pensions, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 56), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KIESS, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5418) increasing the pay of printers and pressmen in the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 57), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Water Power, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3184) to create a Federal power commission and to define its powers and duties, to provide for the improvement of navigation, for the development of water power, for the use of lands of the United States in relation thereto, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 61), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 409) to consent to the proposed compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and New York for the construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a tunnel or tunnels under the Hudson River between the cities of Jersey City and New York, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 62), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the House resolution (H. J. Res. 120) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point Tao Hung Chang and Zeng Tze Wong, citizens of China, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 63), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CALDWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3143) to provide for further educational facilities by authorizing the Secretary of War to sell at reduced rates certain machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade, technical, and public schools and universities, and other recognized educational institutions, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 64), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 6542) to repeal the act of Congress approved February 1, 1905, and to transfer national forests from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6543) to provide for the survey of a national highway connecting certain national monuments in the States of Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6544) for the protection of the water supply of the town of Sunnyside, Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6545) to protect the Government of the United States of America, its national emblem, its securities and obligations, and its military and naval forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 6546) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Anthony, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6547) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Dodge City, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6548) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lyons, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 6549) to pension the survivors of certain Indian wars and disturbances in Utah Territory from 1849 to 1869, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6550) to prevent the withdrawal of mineral lands of the United States from entry and occupancy under the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6551) to establish a branch of the Interior Department in the Western States, and to transfer to such branch certain bureaus and offices of the Interior Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 6552) to create a department of Federal highways, to establish a national highway system, to promote efficient and economical highway transportation, and to amend an act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. EVANS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 6553) to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce, passed February 4, 1887, and subsequent amendments thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6554) to amend section 48 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 6555) to prevent breaches of the public peace in the District of Columbia by picketing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 6556) to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau of citizenship and Americanization for the Americanization of naturalized citizens; amend section 4 of the act approved June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6557) to provide for the deportation of certain aliens from the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 6558) providing for the survey of a canal from Cumberland Sound, Ga., to the Gulf of Mexico, and terminals; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 6559) to amend section 900 of an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 6560) providing for the survey of a canal from Ocmulgee River, Ga., to Apalachicola River, Fla., and terminals; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 6561) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Addison, county of Lenawee, Mich., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6562) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Park Falls, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 6563) to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, and to repeal all acts and parts of acts amendatory thereto, and to provide for the disposition of all property acquired under and by virtue of the same; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANKFORD: A bill (H. R. 6564) for the erection of a public building at Hazlehurst, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6565) for the erection of a public building at Adel, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.



Also, a bill (H. R. 6566) for the erection of a public building at Baxley, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6567) for the erection of a public building at Ocilla, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6568) for the erection of a public building at Blackshear, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6569) for the erection of a public building at Jesup, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6570) for the erection of a public building at Nashville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARDY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6571) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Mexia, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6572) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Teague, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6573) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Greensburg, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or field-piece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6574) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Vandergrift, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or field-piece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6575) to provide for the construction of a public building at Spartanburg, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6576) for the payment of claims for loss of private property on account of the loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops during the labor strikes in the State of Colorado in 1914; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 6577) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1911; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 6578) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Waynesburg, Green County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6579) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Berlin, Somerset County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6580) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Connellsville, Fayette County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6581) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Somerset, Somerset County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6582) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Meyersdale, Somerset County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6583) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Perryopolis, Fayette County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6584) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Windber, Somerset County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6585) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Addison, Somerset County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6586) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Brownsville, Fayette County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6587) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Uniontown, Fayette County, Pa., one captured German cannon or field gun and carriage for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 6588) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6589) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept in behalf of the United States certain lands within the Siuslaw National Forest, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MACCRATE: A bill (H. R. 6590) regulating the hours of labor at navy yards; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 133) authorizing session clerks to certain committees; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SNELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 135) authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling upon the Government officials to display the United States flag on all Government buildings and the people to display the flag at their homes on the third Sunday of June, which shall hereafter be known as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. REBER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) extending to members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards the thanks of Congress for their services rendered in the administration of the selective-service law; also authorizing the President to appoint by brevet commissions the members of such local and district boards; also authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause to be struck and presented to each of such officials in the name of Congress an appropriate medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE: Memorial of the Legislature of Pennsylvania urging appropriation for continuance of Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CRAGO: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania favoring an appropriation by Congress for Frankford Arsenal sufficient to employ 2,400 men; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CULLEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York favoring introduction of a measure which will accord citizens who desire to own a home the same inducements now afforded to farmers by Federal statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HULINGS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, with relation to the Frankford Arsenal; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, approving legislation which provides for the deportation of aliens whose presence in this country is a source of danger to the lives and property of its inhabitants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, approving legislation which provides for the deportation of aliens whose presence in this country is a source of danger to the lives and property of its inhabitants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, approving legislation which provides for the deportation of aliens whose presence in this country is a source of danger to the lives and property of its inhabitants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6591) granting a pension to Edith Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6592) granting a pension to Catherine D. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6593) granting a pension to Mary J. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6594) granting a pension to Sabina A. Wade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6595) for the relief of Blanch Winters; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BEITTEN: A bill (H. R. 6596) for the relief of Bertiel Nielson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 6597) granting a pension to Harrison Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 6598) granting a pension to Cynthia Ann Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6599) granting an increase of pension to Martin B. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6600) granting a pension to Frances Tucker Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6601) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hollister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6602) granting a pension to Louise Wamsley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6603) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Brewer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6604) for the relief of Alfred Cluff and others; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6605) granting a pension to Herbert E. Van Horn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 6606) for the relief of Kathryn Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 6607) granting a pension to John E. Tingley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6608) granting a pension to Alfred M. Graham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6609) granting a pension to Floyd B. Daugherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 6610) granting a pension to Thomas Mahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 6611) granting an increase of pension to Adam Goodlive; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6612) granting an increase of pension to Spencer S. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6613) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert Geslin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6614) granting a pension to Annie Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6615) granting a pension to John Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6616) granting a pension to James R. Garrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6617) granting a pension to Jesse Gibson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6618) granting a pension to John Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6619) granting an increase of pension to R. J. Stanberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6620) granting an increase of pension to Dudley R. Sloan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 6621) granting an increase of pension to Raymond E. Daniels; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 6622) granting an increase of pension to Anna Christophersen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 6623) granting a pension to Harriet L. Cobb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6624) granting a pension to Viola Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6625) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6626) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Gibbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 6627) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Parkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 6628) granting a pension to Eliza K. Leman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6629) granting a pension to Peter F. Wesner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 6630) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Rilea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 6631) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Huntley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6632) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6633) granting an increase of pension to William L. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6634) granting an increase of pension to R. Franklin Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6635) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Sidlinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6636) granting a pension to Reuben Marks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 6637) granting a pension to Allen R. Vickers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Congregational Church Men's Bible Class, Williamsburg, Mass., favoring a league of nations, and asking that the United States Senate, without delay, ratify the treaty of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of Local No. 295, Detroit Postal Clerks' Association, asking relief for the inefficiency in the Detroit post office due to the inadequate wage allowed postal workers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring Senate bill 1029, for the reappropriation of surplus fund in payment for a proposed memorial archway to the entrance of Vicksburg Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also (by request), petition of City Council of Worcester, Mass., requesting that steps be taken to procure an investigation of the wholesale and retail price of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, asking for repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, for the distribution of stored foodstuffs to reduce high cost of living; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of members of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Dundee, Ill., protesting against any modification of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of residents of Bensenville, Ill., urging repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Aurora, Ill., urging repeal of tax on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of registrars and other volunteers who conducted the registration draft on June 5, 1917, Brooklyn, N. Y., asking that some appropriate recognition be granted to all who served in this work in any part of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of California Bean Growers' Association, to permit collective marketing through nonprofit cooperative associations of farm products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of five representative department stores of Sacramento, Calif., in favor of the repeal of the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Memphis, Tenn., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Gallipolis, Ohio, protesting against and asking for repeal of section 904 of 1918 Federal income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Cook County (Ill.) Real Estate Board, favoring an appropriation of \$1,500,000 for a harbor at Great Lakes Naval Station; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Illinois Valley Manufacturers' Club, opposing any appropriation for continuing the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of 100 citizens of Mazon, Ill., for repeal of tax on soda water, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of H. O. Bursum and Juan J. Gurule, committee on resolutions, asking for an appropriation to be used in behalf of drainage for the benefit of several Indian pueblos; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Protest of a resident of Smithville Flats, N. Y., against the appropriation of public money for the redemption of swamps, deserts, or cut-over lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of Charles Warren and others, customers of Schilleci Bros., Bessemer, Ala., for repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of R. H. Thompson and others, of Little Rock, Ark., asking for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Foster Drug Co. and others, of Little Rock, Ark., favoring the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution: of Methodist Episcopal Church of Woonsocket, R. I., and Newman Congregational Church, East Providence, both in the State of Rhode Island, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition and for the passage of enforcement codes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of mass meeting of citizens of Turtle Creek, East Pittsburgh, and Wilmerding, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring freedom for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburgh, Pa., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIESS: Petition of sundry citizens of Muncy, Pa., asking immediate repeal of tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Resolution of board of aldermen of the city of New York, urging adoption by the Congress of the United States of resolution providing for recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Petition of Local 33, National Amalgamation of Textile Operatives of Salem, Mass., in favor of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Local 797, Painters and Paper Hangers Union, Manchester, Mass., in favor of a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of board of aldermen of the city of New York, urging a resolution providing for the recognition of the Republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of 200 citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., urging repeal of section 630 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin: Petitions of the Madison Tea Co. against the present interpretation by the Treasury Department of section 902 of the revenue act of 1918; the Madison (Wis.) theatrical managers, protesting against the continuation of the present admission tax on theater tickets; and Harley C. Lawrence and 11 other citizens of Ferryville, Wis., asking for the repeal of the taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the citizens of Belmont, Wis., against the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Rhineland, protesting against taxes on candy, ice cream, and soda-fountain foods and drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of F. G. Tassotti and others, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the Jugo-Slav; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Resolutions by the City Federation of Women's Clubs, San Francisco, Calif., in support of a bill to amend the naturalization act of 1906, urging free distribution of a textbook issued by the Bureau of Naturalization to every foreign-born student in public schools throughout the United States; and approving the work of the Bureau of Naturalization concerning educational matters within the States; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RIDDICK: Resolution passed by Stationary Engineers' Union, Butte, Mont., urging that Congress make appropriation for the continuance of the working conditions service, United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petitions of citizens of Baylor, Glentana, and Avondale, all in the State of Montana, protesting against repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Harold R. Young, secretary public affairs of National Retail Dry Goods Association, and many hundred citizens of New York, requesting the repeal of section 904 of the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of board of aldermen of the city of New York, providing for recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petitions of Gates Lodge, No. 565, International Order of Good Templars, of Gates, Monroe County, and of Monroe District Lodge, No. 24, all of Gates, Monroe County, N. Y., for the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHALL: Resolution of Minneapolis Branch, No. 9, of the National Letter Carriers' Association, praying for congressional relief; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition of Mrs. S. A. Manning, of Garfield; Dan G. Regan, of Oakesdale; William L. Pence, of Farmington; and others, in the State of Washington, asking repeal of tax on necessities, medicines, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Buckeye Extract Co., of Olympia, Wash., protesting against passage of either House bill 3458 or 3461; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Seattle, appealing for protection of the American magnesite industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of the First Methodist Church of Yakima, Wash., against the repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Miss Grace Bell and 27 teachers of the Irving School, Spokane, Wash., favoring the enactment into law of House bill 7, the educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of Tennessee Manganese Co., by D. C. Campbell, president, relating to manganese industry of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania for the repeal of tax on soda water and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of M. Sludzinski, commissioner for an investigation of the high cost of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, asking repeal of tax on soda water and soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of citizens of Huntington, W. Va., etc., favoring the repeal of present tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of Sullivan County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, by its president, Mrs. Alma F. A. Brown, Cornish, N. H., for the enforcement of the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Northern Star Lodge, International Order of Good Templars, Littleton, N. H., by C. W. Bedell, chief templar, and Melvina J. Page, secretary, asking the full enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the North Haverhill Woman's Christian Temperance Union, North Haverhill, N. H., by its secretary, Mrs. Ina B. Miller, for the enforcement of the prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, June 25, 1919.

(Legislative day of Monday, June 23, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

EDUCATION OF NATIVES OF ALASKA (S. DOC. NO. 43).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations in the sum of \$50,000 required by the Bureau of Education for education, etc., of the natives of Alaska, fiscal year 1920, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1199. An act to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1713. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3624. An act incorporating patrol drivers into the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 5032. An act to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 240. An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River from the township of Conyngham, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Shickshinny, county of Luzerne, Pa.;