By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 10061) granting a pension to Mary L. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 10062) granting a pension to Ferdinand Buhler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 10063) granting a pension to William G. Rowland; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of A. Kalajan, of Union Hill, N. J., relating to the barbarian Turks in Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of the Stanislaus County Farm Bureau, representing 1,021 farmers of Stanislaus County, Calif., favoring a tariff on foreign-grown beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of Local Camp No. 321, United Confederate Veterans, of Polk County, Tex., favoring the repayment of the taxes collected on cotton in the South during the Civil War; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASEY: Petition of Paul Rother and 25 other citizens of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., protesting against the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of board of aldermen of the city of Medford, favoring restoration of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEWALT: Petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Piedmont Parlor, No. 120, Native Sons of the Golden West, Oakland, Calif., urging rigorous measures to restrict oriental immigration and settlement; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of J. O. Wells and others, asking that the Coast Guard and Life-Saving Service be retained by and kept under the power and control of and made a part of the United States Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of San Francisco Parlor, No. 49, Native Sons of the Golden West, of San Francisco, Calif., in favor of the continued exclusion of Asiatic immigrants and recommending additional legislation to render our present exclusion laws more effective; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Keith Parlor, No. 137, Native Daughters of the Golden West, of San Francisco, Calif., in favor of the continued exclusion of Asiatic immigrants and recommending additional legislation to render our present exclusion laws more effective; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lompoc Valley Chamber of Commerce and Lompoc Valley Bank, both of Lompoc, Calif., urging tariff on foreign-grown beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, favoring the immediate passage of a bill giving six months' pay to soldiers and sailors who participated in the great world conflict; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion, asking the Judiciary Committee for the immediate favorable report of the bill incorporating the legion organized by the privates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Walla Walla, Wash., various churches, Sunday schools, and others of the same city, urging Congress to pass House bill 8063, a bill to punish violation of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution by American citizens in foreign countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *October 21, 1919.*

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in this sacred moment, a moment that has the sanction of the custom of this Nation and the indorsement of the habit of a praying people, we pause to make mention of Thy name and worship Thee. Thou art the God of all the earth. Thou art our God. We commit our way into Thy hands and pray Thee to guide us to the fulfillment of Thine own purpose in us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Gerry	McKellar	Sherman
Bankhead	Hale	Nelson	Shields
Brandegee	Harding	New	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Harris	Newberry	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Harrison	Norris	Smoot
Colt	Henderson	Nugent	Spencer
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sterling
Curtis	Kellogg	Page	Thomas
Dial	Kenyon	Penrose	Townsend
Dillingham	King	Phelan	Trammell
Edge	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Lenroot	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Lodge	Pomerene	Warren
France	McCormick	Robinson	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Sheppard	

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to announce the absence on official business of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY].

Mr. KING. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] are absent in attendance at a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] are detained on official business. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are detained from the Senate on public business. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is detained from the Senate on account of illness in his family.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 8624) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917, and to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have here a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the Nebraska Legislature, now in session, which I send to the desk and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolution as adopted by the House of Representatives of Nebraska October 17, 1919.

Resolved, That our Senators, Hon. G. M. HITCHCOCK and Hon. G. W. NORRIS, are hereby requested to do all in their power to defeat the league of nations as now pending before the United States Senate.

WILL F. HITCHCOCK,
Chief Clerk.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a resolution of a local labor union at Duquoin, Ill., which I ask may be printed at length in the RECORD but not read. It is a very short resolution.

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

"Whereas our Government, the United States of America, is at war with Germany; and

"Whereas we, the peoples hereof, are fighting for the freedom of the whole world from autocratic tyranny; and

"Whereas the honor and virtue of our mothers and sisters are placed in peril by the barbaric methods of our enemies: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by Local Union No. 510 of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America*, That we, the members thereof, tender our loyal support, both at home and abroad, toward the successful conclusion of the war; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we most emphatically denounce the propaganda of the 'I. W. W.' (Industrial Workers of the World) as

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

being unpatriotic, un-American, and deserving of no place in the free institutions of our country.

"Signed with our official seal this 19th day of November, 1917.

"S. L. VOIGHT, *President.*

[SEAL.] "W. R. WRIGHT, *Secretary.*"

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have a communication in the nature of a petition from citizens of Wayland, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging the ratification of the league of nations covenant. The communication is brief, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, together with the signatures.

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

To the honorable the Senate of the United States:

We, the undersigned men and women, citizens of Wayland, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, respectfully urge upon your honorable body the supreme importance for the United States of America and for the whole world of prompt ratification of the covenant of the league of nations.

It may not be perfect any more than the Constitution of the United States was perfect, but we believe that it will be the beginning of a better era for the world, as the Constitution was for the country. Like that, it can be amended, if necessary; but if rejected now we fear so good an opportunity to preserve peace in the world may not return in our lifetime.

Amy F. Haskins, David G. Haskins, jr., Jacob Reeves, Wm. H. Branigan, Eunice W. Branigan, Samuel Russell, Mary A. Heard, Israel A. Lupien, J. Charles Vincent, Henry J. W. Drew, Nathaniel R. Gerald, Warren L. Bishop, Lester R. Gerald, John B. Wight, Geo. Edward Dwight, Shelley Dwight, Amos I. Hadley, James Bolton, Mary Bolton, James Joseph Bolton, Sadie Bolton.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Alanson, Mich., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHIPPS presented a memorial of the Civic and Commercial Association of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation which confers upon any governmental department or bureau the power to regulate and restrain legitimate business, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Near East Relief, in convention at New York City, N. Y., praying for the extension of aid to American relief workers, American property, and to the stricken people of Armenia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Alderman of Medford, Mass., praying for the restoration of the so-called daylight-saving law to the extent of making it effective and permanent in that portion of the country in the eastern time zone, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 3263) to authorize the construction of flood control and improvement works in Minnesota River and Big Stone Lake, between the States of Minnesota and South Dakota; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3264) granting an increase of pension to Einer Bjarnson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3265) granting an increase of pension to Fred Myers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3266) granting a pension to Allie Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEWBERRY:

A bill (S. 3267) for the relief of the Cornwell Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 3268) for the appointment of Commander Charles W. Moots to the permanent Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 3269) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Crow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 3270) authorizing the superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, to consider, ascertain, adjust, and determine claims for damages occasioned by acts for which said survey is responsible in certain cases; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 3271) granting a pension to Annie F. Rountree (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $496,000 for the purchase of a site and the erection of an archives building in the city of Washington, D. C., intended to be proposed by him to the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—ELIZABETH H. MILLS.

On motion of Mr. PHELAN, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of Senate bill No. 3420, Sixty-fifth Congress, second session, granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Mills, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

CARE OF ARMY TRUCKS.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have a letter in the way of a memorial written by the lieutenant governor of Nebraska, who at the time he wrote the letter was acting governor on account of the absence from the State of the governor, in relation to the automobile trucks that have been purchased by the Government and are permitted to stand out in the weather and be destroyed. I think we have all learned of thousands of such instances scattered around over the country, but I had no idea that there were some of them in my State. I send to the Secretary's desk a newspaper clipping from the Nebraska State Journal of October 18, and ask that the Secretary may read that part of the letter written to Representative REAVIS of the State of Nebraska that is not marked out.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

TRUCKS RUSTING IN RAIN—ACTING GOVERNOR POINTS OUT WHAT HE SAYS IS GOVERNMENT NEGLECT OF PROPERTY.

"DEAR MR. REAVIS: There exists a condition here which I wish to take up with you regarding some automobile trucks in charge of the Government, which are standing unprotected from the elements out on the fair grounds annex north of the city. These trucks are such as can be used by the State in our road-making program, but I am informed by the secretary of the department of public works that he has several times applied to the department at Washington for permission to use these trucks in road work, but can receive no answer to the communications sent.

"I went to the fair grounds this morning and investigated the condition of the trucks, after a man had inquired if it would be possible to purchase one of them for use on his farm. I found the trucks, 12 in number, standing out in a field with absolutely no protection over them. Not even the tops had been raised to protect the cushions on the seats and the engine and other parts, in most instances, rusting.

"I would like to ask if there is any way in which the trucks now standing open to the weather can be secured by the State or be purchased by private individuals, or if there is any system in which letters to the department at Washington having these trucks in charge can receive consideration. There are several mighty good stenographers in Washington from Nebraska whom I am sure would be glad to donate a little overtime service in order that they could see the letters from home receive some consideration, if the department is short of help.

"I would like to ask in conclusion if you know who has the authority to have these trucks looked after, or who can give permission for their use by the State or purchase by private individuals?

"Very sincerely, yours,

"P. A. BARROWS, *Acting Governor.*"

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the reply to the query of this correspondent is very simple. The distribution of trucks has been prohibited by an act of Congress. The last deficiency bill, I think, contained a rider to that effect. We, and nobody else, therefore, are to blame.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator, Has there been any act of Congress to prohibit the department from taking care of automobiles; from taking them out of the weather and putting up their tops?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. The Government officials are compelled to let them stand out in the open unprotected?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Now, let me elaborate——

Mr. NORRIS. I am glad to get that information.

Mr. THOMAS. I have given it to the Senator from Nebraska, but I must explain my answer. That condition is due to the rapid and enforced demobilization of the Army, which, of course, carries with it the discharge of thousands of officers who alone

under our laws can be made responsible for Government property, and who are, therefore, the only persons who can be given custody of it. That is the situation, as represented by officials of the War Department before the Committee on Military Affairs time and again, and it has not been followed by peace legislation to provide for the contingency. That, I think, answers the Senator's question.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will bring in a bill or resolution that will permit the War Department to have the tops of the automobiles raised when the officers go away and abandon them. I might say further to the Senator from Colorado that in other parts of the country I notice the Government is selling automobiles at auction.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; the Government is selling some automobiles.

Mr. NORRIS. Is that being done in defiance of law?

Mr. THOMAS. No; the Senator knows very well that it is being done under the provisions of the law.

So far as raising the tops of machines is concerned in particular places, I do not know. Of course, there may be some local instances of negligence that are absolutely unpardonable, and they ought to be corrected.

Let me say before I take my seat that the Committee on Military Affairs is doing the best it can, and I think the Senate has passed a measure for the relief in that direction, but the other House has not as yet taken action.

INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the statements made by Albert H. Gary and Samuel Gompers appearing in to-day's newspapers be printed in the RECORD. They are short statements, but they present the issues before the industrial conference.

I wish to preface the printing of those statements in the RECORD, if that shall be permitted, by saying that the "collective bargaining" which is in controversy, advocated by Mr. Gompers, is an alias for the "closed shop." There is in it no new question. It is vital; it is not a question of legislation nor of arbitration; it is not a principle that can be compromised. It affects the individual right of an American citizen either to earn a living in a union or out of it; in a "closed shop" or out of it. Those are the underlying principles involved in the pending controversy. For that reason I wish to preserve at length in the RECORD the statements of the two men who voice the conflicting principles.

There being no objection, the statements referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARY'S STATEMENT FOR CAPITAL; GOMPERS DELIVERS LABOR'S REPLY.

JUDGE GARY SAID.

"I desire to make a brief statement in relation to the question under discussion, as well as others submitted to this conference. Further explanation of any vote I may register will probably be unnecessary.

"Like other members of the conference, I recognize that the public interest must always be considered as of the first importance; that all private interest must be subordinated.

"I am heartily in accord with the desire of the President to firmly establish proper and satisfactory relations between all groups of citizens connected with industry, including, of course, what has been designated as capital and labor.

"I believe in conciliation, cooperation, and arbitration whenever practicable without sacrificing principle.

"I am of the fixed opinion that the pending strike against the steel industry of this country should not be arbitrated or compromised, nor any action taken by the conference which bears upon that subject.

"Also, that there should be maintained in actual practice, without interruption, the open shop as I understand it, namely, that every man, whether he does or does not belong to a labor union, shall have the opportunity to engage in any line of legitimate employment on terms and conditions agreed upon between employee and employer.

"I am opposed to a policy or practice which unnecessarily limits production, increases costs, deprives the workman from receiving the highest wage rates resulting from voluntary and reasonable effort, hinders promotion or advancement in accordance with merit, or otherwise interferes with the freedom of individual action.

"As unorganized labor, which embraces the vast majority of working people, has no special representation in this conference, I deem it appropriate to say that all labor should receive due consideration, and that it is the obligation and ought to be the pleasure of employers at all times and in every respect to treat, justly and liberally, all employees, whether unorganized or organized."

SAMUEL GOMPERS'S REPLY.

"If what has occurred in the United States in industrial labor lately has afforded no opportunity for reason, for a new understanding, then there is no reason for a vote in this conference on this question (collective bargaining).

"You can not improve the superstructure safely until you have strengthened the foundation. And the millions of toilers in the United States are the foundation upon whose shoulders rests the entire superstructure of our industrial building.

"The solicitude of the modern employer, who has that understanding of and that great sympathy for the unorganized worker—well, the unorganized workers know where to come when they are in great stress; they know. They know where they can get sympathy; they know where they can get encouragement; they know where their hope lies—and they come to us to be rid of the domination and injustices of arbitrary employers. They come to us and even though we can not help them, by God!—and I say it with all reverence—we will not hurt them."

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, as is well known, the industrial conference in session in Washington is composed of the representatives of three groups—the employers' group, the labor group, and one group which is supposed to represent the general public. I have here an editorial from the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) News, which is entitled "Give farmer square deal." I ask that the editorial may be read, and I trust that it may receive the attention of Mr. Baruch, who is represented as the spokesman of the public group.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. McCORMICK. Would not a "square deal" to the farmers be revolutionary in this epoch?

Mr. STERLING. I hardly think it would.

Mr. SHERMAN. Perhaps the Senator from South Dakota will permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator have the idea that the gentlemen named to represent the public are in fact representing the public?

Mr. STERLING. I am not so sure about that, I will say to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. I want definite information. I have been subject to distressing doubts, and I want to be satisfied.

Mr. STERLING. I think, perhaps, I myself share the doubts expressed by the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the editorial presented by the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"GIVE FARMER SQUARE DEAL.

"Henry Watterson, in his 'Looking Backward' article in the Saturday Evening Post of this week, tells of a debate he once had with William McKinley, in which the subject was which political party was doing the most for the workingman. In his discourse he claimed that it was advisable to discover first who is a workingman in the United States, and he insisted that every person, except the hobo and the 'dude,' the latter term now practically extinct in the vocabulary of Americans, is a workingman. He said the banker, the educator, the merchant, the farmer, the business man, the laborer, all were workingmen together.

"There was much sound sense in the contention of the old Democratic editor, and it applies as well to-day as it did when he had his debate with McKinley, although there is a tendency in some directions to recognize only a member of organized labor as really and truly a laboring man. This tendency is exemplified at the industrial conference at Washington, where of the 45 members 15 are allotted to labor (organized labor), 15 to employers, and 15 to the general public.

"Now, organized labor is but a very small part of the population compared to the farmer, yet of the whole 45 delegates at the conference but 3 are farmers. Farmers, justly, are complaining of this fact, and attribute it, with a considerable show of reason, to the fact that because organized labor has the strike weapon and exercises it, the President, in organizing the conference, gave union labor more consideration than he gave the farmer. There really is no reason in the world why the conference should not have been divided into four groups, with the farmers of the Nation represented by 15 delegates, as well as the labor unions, the employers, and the public. That would have been just, and would have helped the conference materially in arriving at a correct solution of existing problems.

"For the fact can not be gotten away from that the farmer, the first producer of everything the resident of the city eats or wears, was the first sufferer from the high cost of living, and is by way of becoming the first sufferer from the reduced

cost of living, when it comes. For instance, hogs have dropped materially on the live-stock markets within the past few weeks, but town people are paying nearly as much for fresh pork, bacon, and ham as they did before the drop. Corn has slumped on the market, so has barley and other grain. The farmer is the loser. And while farm products are showing a downward tendency, whatever the farmer has to buy persists in advancing. This is shown by the fact that farm hands in some parts of the State are demanding 10 cents a bushel for husking corn, and by the higher price the farmer has to pay for farm machinery, lumber with which he builds his barns, and other material he has to use in his business.

"The industrial conference should have had a larger farmer representation, and it will not accomplish its full purpose if it goes at a solution of the high cost of living, among its other problems, by starting at the farmers' end of the high-cost proposition and seeking to reduce the price of farm products while maintaining war-time profits for manufacturers, organized labor, and other branches of industry."

ADDRESS BY GILBERT H. MONTAGUE.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I should like to request unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD without reading an address by Gilbert H. Montague, a well-known attorney of the New York bar, delivered before the annual convention of the American Manufacturers' Export Association on "Cooperative opportunities for the manufacturer under pending legislation." I may say that just at this time, as all Senators are probably aware, in Atlantic City there is being held a convention attended by representatives of commercial organizations from various countries of the world. The address made in New York is so pertinent to the present situation and to the problems of American export development that I feel it would be of considerable use to have it distributed, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

COOPERATIVE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE MANUFACTURER UNDER PENDING LEGISLATION.

[An address delivered before the annual convention of the American Manufacturers' Export Association, Oct. 17, 1919 by Gilbert H. Montague, of the New York bar.]

"Cooperation has its uses, but it is no substitute for a sales organization or for marketing ability or for the singleness of purpose that is essential to successful sales promotion in foreign countries. Cooperative export corporations and associations organized under the Webb-Pomerene Act have, in a number of instances, been conspicuously successful; but they have succeeded only in so far as they have overcome the inherent disintegrating tendencies of cooperative enterprise, and by insistence upon adequate sales organization and experienced marketing ability have attained an efficiency in sales promotion equal to that of their single-headed competitors.

"The Edge bill, and the various other measures to assist the financing of our export trade, which are now pending in Congress, must be regarded, like the Webb-Pomerene Act, as merely machinery without power. Unless power, adequately supplied and above all wisely directed, be applied to this machinery by those attempting to operate it, the results will be disappointing and even disastrous.

"Whenever an American district has been desolated by fire or flood, rehabilitation, as a matter of course, has come through the assistance of every outside financial and commercial interest that has dealt, or thereafter hopes to deal, with the afflicted community. Outside manufacturing interests immediately and thoroughly canvass the financial, material, and moral resources of their customers and also of those whom they desire hereafter to be their customers in the afflicted region, and within the limits of sound commercial credit, these outside commercial interests, with the assistance of the outside banks that serve them, and of the local banks that serve the customers, grant extensions on old credits and open new ones. Outside financial houses, representing nonresident investors in the outstanding securities of governmental bodies or business enterprises that have been prostrated by the disaster, promptly and carefully investigate underlying conditions in the devastated area, and assist in extending or readjusting the existing indebtedness and in arranging new loans upon security which will appeal to an increased circle of outside investors. So swift and effective are these operations that within a space measured almost by months, new cities arise upon the ruins of the old, having financial, material, and moral resources far greater than the old, and joined to the outside financial and commercial interests that have come to their assistance by sentimental and business ties of the most enduring character.

"The present European problem is unfortunately far more complicated than that of any prostrated American district. Trained financial and banking ability of the highest technical order will be taxed to its utmost to reduce this problem to anything approaching the relative simplicity of the rehabilitation of a devastated American city. But after financiers and bankers have overcome the obstacles presented by differences in nationality, in credit forms, in depreciated currency, in foreign exchange, in balance of trade, and in European fiscal policies, there will still remain for every American manufacturer that heretofore has dealt, or hereafter hopes to deal, with Europe essentially the same work to do, only in thousandfold increased degree, as is required for the rehabilitation of any devastated American community.

"When inquiries come in from abroad for prices and terms, the American manufacturer appealed to must immediately and thoroughly canvass the financial, material, and moral resources of his prospective customers and within the limits of sound commercial credit, and with the assistance of the manufacturer's own banks and of the local banks which serve the customers, decide upon his terms of credit. Necessarily, the initial investigation must be made wholly from the American manufacturer's standpoint. In American territory, the manufacturer himself, through his own organization, conducts the investigation, with such assistance as he requires from his own banks and from local banks in the customer's territory. In the European situation, however, because of the obstacles already mentioned, much greater assistance from the banks is required. The American manufacturer's standpoint, however, must be maintained throughout. And only by cooperation either between the individual American manufacturer and the banks whom he consults, or between American manufacturers associated in groups and served by competent financial and banking assistance specially equipped for this particular service, can this standpoint be preserved.

"For the granting of short credits, for 30, 60, or 90 days, within the limits of sound commercial practice in export trade, there are already existing, or in sight, reasonably adequate facilities. This is particularly the business of the American banks, and is being effectively carried on by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, either directly or through their branches in foreign countries, or by corporations organized under State laws and engaged in international or foreign banking, in which member banks of the Federal Reserve System are authorized to invest not exceeding 10 per cent of their capital and surplus. Several member banks of the Federal Reserve System, during the past 18 months, have organized and invested in corporations of the class last mentioned.

"For the granting of long-time credits, however, running beyond 90 days and sometimes into periods of years, facilities are by no means so adequate; and the need for careful scrutiny of the foreign customer's resources, and for the proper carrying of the credits after they are granted, is far more serious.

"The Belgian Government, let us suppose, needs steel rails for its Government-owned railways, and can pay for them only with Government bonds maturing 10 years hence. The American manufacturer, to whom the Belgian Government appeals, must first investigate the Government's resources, to make sure that the interest upon its bonds will be met when due, and that the principal will be paid upon maturity. Even if the bonds are found to be safe, however, the American manufacturer himself can not carry them until maturity, for in doing so he would be depriving himself for 10 years of working capital which he requires in the conduct of his own business. For the same reason, neither the manufacturer's bank in America nor any bank in Belgium, or anywhere else, can afford to carry these bonds. Unless, therefore, they can, within a reasonably short period, be disposed of for cash by the American manufacturer, he can not afford to accept them, and must decline the Belgian Government's business.

"The problem is very similar to that of an American street railway which needs electrical equipment and can pay for it only with its corporate bonds maturing 10 years hence. For many years various electrical equipment manufacturers have maintained subsidiary companies which, in instances like these, have taken street railway bonds and deposited them, together with other bonds accepted from other customers in purchase of electrical equipment, with a trust company, under a trust agreement to secure an issue of the subsidiaries' own notes, which the subsidiaries have then sold to institutions and individuals for permanent investment. The money which the investing public has thus paid to the subsidiaries in exchange for the latter's notes has, in effect, returned through the subsidiaries to the electrical manufacturers to pay them for the electrical equipment which they have sold to the street railway.

Thus the street railway has bought on long-time credit, but this long-time credit has been carried by the investing public and not by the electrical manufacturers or their banks.

"Instead of themselves organizing subsidiary companies to finance sales to their foreign customers American manufacturers in some instances may best be served by leaving this work to be done by their banks, collectively and cooperatively. One hundred million dollars of purchases by the French Government from American manufacturers during the European war were thus successfully financed, and eventually fully paid for, by a credit operation which has now become history.

"On July 14, 1916, the American Foreign Securities Co. was incorporated in Delaware by a group of American bankers to acquire, by purchase or otherwise, and to hold or dispose of, stock, bonds, or obligations of any foreign or domestic government or corporation. On July 18, 1916, the company entered into a contract with the Government of the French Republic whereby the company made the French Republic a loan of $100,000,000, bearing interest from August 1, 1916, and payable July 31, 1919. Unlike the examples already considered, the company not only took the note of the French Government but also insisted that the French Government deposit collateral with the note. To secure the payment of principal and interest of the loan the French Republic pledged various securities with the company and authorized the company to rehypothecate these securities. The value of these securities was calculated to be $120,000,000, and the French Government agreed to pledge from time to time additional securities so that the calculated value of the collateral should always be 20 per cent in excess of the principal of the loan. The collateral pledged included obligations of the Governments of Argentina, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, Holland, Uruguay, Egypt, Brazil, Spain, Province of Quebec, Suez Canal, and various United States and Canadian corporations. Under its authority to rehypothecate these securities the company deposited $126,526,534 worth of them with the Bankers Trust Co., in New York, as trustee, under a trust agreement to secure $94,500,000 of the company's three-year 5 per cent gold notes, dated August 1, 1916, and payable August 1, 1919, which notes the company publicly offered for general sale in July, 1916, at 98 and interest. Throughout the war these notes maintained a high value and on August 1, 1919, they were paid in full. Meanwhile the company paid dividends averaging more than 8 per cent per annum upon its $10,000,000 of capital stock.

"Instead of individually organizing subsidiary companies like the electrical equipment manufacturers above described, or of leaving this work to be done by their banks upon the analogy of the American Foreign Securities Co. above described, American manufacturers in the same line of business may in some instances best finance their sales to foreign customers by collectively and cooperatively organizing and operating their own investment and financial corporation for that purpose. Such an institution, with a capitalization of upward of $100,000,000, is already under consideration, according to newspaper reports, by a group of American manufacturers of railway equipment, who, it is stated, will themselves take the leadership in the institution and will depend for expert financial and banking assistance and for the marketing of their securities when issued upon their affiliated banking connections and upon security-issuing houses associated with them in the enterprise.

"European bankers, somewhat more than American bankers, have more or less permanently invested their own funds in long-time credits, and have thus assimilated the standpoints of both the manufacturer and the banker which, excepting possibly in the public utility field and the electrical equipment field, and more recently in a few instances in the foreign field, have not often been combined in the United States. Danger is always possible, of course, in any departure from the banker's strict standards of credit. Inertia, however, is no less possible in the inelastic application to long-time credits of standards to which bankers are accustomed in the short-time credits which constitute their business. In the future financing of the American export trade neither the banker's standpoint nor the manufacturer's standpoint can be disregarded. The most fortunate results, it is believed, will be obtained by a policy which fairly reflects both points of view.

"How successful may be investment in financial institutions which have attained this golden mean appears from the history of some of the English, Scotch, and Swiss 'investment trust companies.' These are institutions for the acquisition, disposition, and rehypothecation of securities particularly in foreign trade and are operated substantially upon the plan of the electrical equipment subsidiaries above described, and began to be formed in Great Britain during the third quarter of the last century. Like our own American savings banks and insurance companies, these investment trust companies have pursued the policy of selecting their securities in various lines of trade and from all parts of the world. The Investment Trust Corporation (Ltd.), of London, for example, in its statement of 1917, shows 315 kinds of investments; the Second Edinburgh Investment Trust (Ltd.), of Edinburgh, Scotland, for the same year, showed 235, and the Metropolitan Trust Co., of London, showed 220. These investments included foreign government issues, municipal loans, mortgage bonds, preferred and common shares in railroads, public utilities, banking, commercial, and industrial corporations. The Investment Trust Co. (Ltd.), of London, is capitalized for $10,000,000, and has outstanding $10,000,000 in 4 per cent bonds, and during the 10 years expiring in 1917 paid dividends averaging about 12 per cent per annum upon its common stock. The Second Edinburgh Investment Trust (Ltd.), of Edinburgh, Scotland, is capitalized for $2,250,000, and has outstanding $1,950,000 in 4 per cent bonds and during the nine years expiring 1916 paid dividends averaging 12 per cent per annum upon its common stock. The Metropolitan Trust Co. (Ltd.), of London, is capitalized for $4,000,000, in 4 per cent bonds, and during the 10 years expiring 1918 paid an average of 12 per cent per annum upon its common stock. The Bank for Electrical Securities, of Zurich, Switzerland, which specializes in the securities of public utility companies, and the Franco-Swiss Co., of Geneva, Switzerland, which specializes in city and railroad bonds, have had almost as great a development.

"Heretofore no Federal law has provided for the organization of such investment and financial institutions as these, nor were member banks of the Federal Reserve System authorized to invest in them.

"To correct the first of these deficiencies, the Edge bill (which passed the Senate September 9, 1919, and is now pending in the House of Representatives) provides in effect that corporations for the granting of long-time investment credits as well as short-time commercial credits may be organized under the Federal reserve act, though not themselves entitled to membership in the Federal Reserve System, which shall be capitalized at $2,000,000 or over, of which capital at least one-fourth must be paid in before commencing business, which corporations may then engage in international or foreign banking 'or other financial operations' with power to invest not exceeding 15 per cent of their capital (subject to the approval of the Federal Reserve Board) in other corporations similarly organized, or in foreign corporations, provided such corporations transact only purely incidental business in the United States.

"The importance of the Edge bill to the export trade of the United States is emphasized by the Federal Reserve Board in a letter urging the passage of the bill which it officially addressed to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency last July:

"The credit situation in Europe at the present time is such that in order to maintain a stable market for our exports it will be necessary not merely to grant short-time commercial credits * * * but also long-term investment credits. * * * To this end Senate bill 2472 (the Edge bill) provides for the organization of corporations which shall be permitted to engage both in the business of international or foreign commercial banking and in other financial operations as distinguished from commercial banking, such as shall be necessary to assist in the development and maintenance of the commerce of the United States. * * *

"The Federal Reserve Board earnestly indorses the proposed bill and suggests that its enactment is even more essential at this time than when its adoption was first recommended by the board. The board knows no one way in which the present European credit situation may be more effectively dealt with than by the incorporation of institutions of the kinds provided for in this bill, and anything that betters that situation assists not merely in the gigantic task of reconstruction in Europe, but also in providing a market for our own exports and in developing our foreign commerce in a most effective and satisfactory way.

"To correct the second deficiency, the McLean bill (which passed Congress Sept. 5, 1919) provides that until January 1, 1921, any member bank of the Federal Reserve System may invest not exceeding 5 per cent of its capital and surplus in any corporation or corporations of the class provided in the Edge bill, so long as the financial interest of such member bank in such corporation and in the establishment of branches in foreign countries does not exceed a total of 10 per cent of its capital and surplus.

"The Edge bill specially provides in effect that shares of corporations organized under it shall be owned, in the majority at least, by citizens of the United States and by corporations organized under State or Federal laws, or firms or corporations controlled by citizens of the United States, whether engaged in domestic competition or not. While the Edge bill forbids corporations organized under it to become members of the Federal Reserve System, nevertheless it specially provides that such corporations may constitute member banks of the Federal Reserve System as their agents, and specially permits such member banks of the Federal Reserve System, subject only to regu-

lations of the Federal Reserve Board, to place their facilities at the disposal of corporations organized under the Edge bill.

"The practical benefits which manufacturers throughout the United States, particularly manufacturers cooperating under the Webb Act, will derive from the Edge bill are explained by Senator EDGE in a recent statement, as follows:

"The procedure under the prospective laws is simplicity itself; it is merely the application to international trade of the accepted method by which John Doe sells his business to penniless Richard Roe and yet obtains actual cash payment in the transaction. The American exporter or manufacturer may sell his goods to an impoverished foreign purchaser—a foreign Government or a private concern. One of the proposed corporations then may accept collateral from the purchaser, acceptable to the Federal Reserve Board, and against this issue debentures to sell to investors, and the money so received will be paid to the American seller. Through the powers granted to these proposed corporations they may accept even mortgages on the plants or other real property of the purchasers—'to borrow and to lend money on real or personal property,' so reads the bill. Thus a foreign concern in need of raw materials may obtain it by giving a mortgage on its plants and eventually by turning this raw material into finished product will be able to redeem its collateral and to put aside a little profit besides.

"Of special value will this be to corporations or combinations organized under the Webb Act. For instance, a group of shoe men who have combined to sell their shoes abroad may combine to finance their own commercial operations with which they will be intimately familiar. So also with manufacturers and exporters in every other line, even agriculture, they will be able to keep all the reins in their own hands.

"From the foregoing it appears that the Edge bill, in brief, facilitates further investment by member banks of the Federal Reserve System in corporations organized for financing long-time credits in foreign trade, and adds the official encouragement of the Federal Government to a class of investment and financial institutions which have already abundantly justified such encouragement by successful operation in a number of pioneer instances in several European countries and in the United States under various State laws. Neither the Edge bill nor any institutions organized under it is other than a piece of quite familiar machinery. Wisely directed, with correct application of power, its results will be permanently beneficial to American export trade. It requires, however, the same thorough investigation of foreign customers to whom credit is granted and the same careful building up of good will among American investors to whom its securities must be sold that is required in the successful operation of any other investment and financial institution. To accomplish this cooperation is necessary; in some instances cooperation among American manufacturers in the same line of business, but in all instances cooperation between American manufacturers and the best financial and banking intelligence which they can consult. For the points of view of the manufacturer, the bank, the security-issuing house, and the investing public, together with the point of view of America's future position in the export trade of the world, must all be reflected in the conduct of the institutions to be organized under the Edge bill."

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD without reading an article on the United States and the Shantung question by Mr. Thomas F. Millard, which has just reached me. It has been so helpful to me that I should be glad to have other Senators see it.

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

THE UNITED STATES AND THE SHANTUNG QUESTION.

(By Thomas F. Millard, Oct. 17, 1919.)

"Efforts to rectify the so-called Shantung provisions of the treaty adopted at Paris have two major considerations and objects:

"(a) Protection of the interests of the United States.

"(b) Protection of China.

"In dealing with the question it is presumed that the American Senate gives primary place to the first (a) object, with a sincere desire also to secure the second object.

"No statements or arguments have been brought into the discussion by prominent Americans indicating that any branch of the American Government has thought of abandoning the traditional American policy toward China, as embodied in the Hay doctrine of the commercial open door for all nations and the preservation of the territorial integrity and administrative autonomy of China. The argument is about means to preserve that doctrine and policy in relation to the treaty and covenant adopted by the Paris conference. It is evident that a majority of the Senate and of the American people regard the treaty provisions concerning Shantung as unsatisfactory and as subversive of both of the above-named objects. Two methods of correcting the treaty and covenant are proposed, by amendment and by reservations.

"A distinction can be made between these methods, viz, amendment of the treaty and covenant attempt to reverse certain things that were done by the Paris conference; reservations attempt to deprive those acts of the conference of binding force upon the United States. Amendments attempt to react upon the past; reservations look more to the future. Both methods may have the same ultimate results. From the standpoint of the interest of America in the Shantung question they seem as well safeguarded either way.

THE INTEREST OF CHINA.

"There is no doubt that it would have been more satisfactory to China had the Paris conference adopted provisions regarding Shantung by which Germany's position and rights and property there were ceded to China instead of to Japan, especially if Japan had signed a treaty containing those provisions; and even if Japan had not signed such a treaty a powerful international force would have been formally aligned against her. It may be pointed out, however, that even if the treaty had awarded the German rights and position in Shantung to China, Japan still would have been actually in possession of those rights, and the task of enforcing the treaty would have remained a delicate and difficult one; in short, the problem of getting Japan out of Shantung and other parts of China would have been a very embarrassing question for the powers.

"In that connection, the matter of the so-called 'secret' agreements has an important bearing. These were private engagements made in February and March, 1917, whereby the British, French, Russian, and Italian Governments agreed, in substance, to support Japan at the peace conference in her claim to inherit the German rights and position in Shantung. An examination of the texts of those diplomatic engagements indicates that the four Governments mentioned did not commit themselves in those private agreements to support Japan beyond the peace conference. Therefore by supporting Japan at the conference those Governments fulfilled the letter of their engagements and the secret Shantung agreements were terminated by being paid in full. If, however, it was proposed to amend the treaty by reversing its articles relating to Shantung, and such an amendment was referred back to the conference, the secret Shantung agreements would be revived in their binding force on the British, French, and Italian Governments, and those Governments almost certainly would feel compelled to again support Japan's position. In these circumstances there is little prospect that the consent of the principal powers to a change in the Shantung clauses could be obtained.

"On the other hand, the position of the United States on the question can be made clear by an explicit reservation, leaving the American Government free hereafter to pursue its traditional policy toward China. By not reviving the secret agreements and leaving them extinguished by being satisfied the British and French Governments also are left free regarding a future policy toward China, provided those Governments have not already made or do not hereafter make other engagements with Japan binding their actions.

"From these circumstances it appears that any advantages that might be gained by attempting to amend the Shantung clauses of the treaty might be offset by reviving the secret Shantung agreements, thereby circumscribing the policies now and perhaps hereafter of the British, French, and Italian Governments.

"The acceptance of an amendment on Shantung by the conference at one time would probably have induced the Chinese Government to sign the treaty with Germany, but it hardly would have that result now, because the Chinese Government already has declared peace with Germany by resolution and will arrange the details by negotiation. By signing the treaty with Austria, China has become eligible for membership of a league of nations should one result from the Paris conference.

"China's interest is apt to be served now and hereafter by measures that will determine or influence the alignment of the principal powers on the broad issues of the Hay doctrine and on moves to induce Japan to restore Shantung and Manchuria and to abandon her policy of aggression in China.

HOW TO PRESERVE THE HAY DOCTRINE.

"China can be saved by saving the Hay doctrine and by converting its basic principles into international practice. On this purpose American diplomatic policy should be concentrated. These conditions are essential to the success of such a policy:

"(a) An alignment of Great Britain with the United States on this question, and if possible also of the other principal nations in Europe, especially France.

"(b) Knowledge by the American Government of all diplomatic agreements and understandings, private or open, between Great Britain and those other powers in Europe relating to China and Asia, and of those powers with Japan.

"(c) Prevention by the American Government, if possible, of any further agreements between those powers, or between any of those powers and Japan, or between any of those powers and China, which are antagonistic to or subversive of the prin-

ciples of the Hay doctrine, and the abrogation of existing agreements of that character.

"(d) A declaration by the American Government that it regards the political development of China and of eastern Asia on democratic lines, and free of the interference and oppression of the imperialistic policies of any nations, to be of fundamental importance to the United States and to American institutions.

"(e) A refusal by the United States to allow its capital wealth and other resources to be used either directly or indirectly through other nations to obstruct or impede the fruition of the American policy in eastern Asia, and the withholding of American financial and other assistance to nations that either directly or indirectly oppose or try to subvert the Hay doctrine.

"(f) The creation of the necessary facilities and agencies for extending and securing the American position in eastern Asia.

"(g) Establish a definite entente or alliance with Great Britain and France by which those powers will aid America in sustaining and putting into practice the Hay doctrine in China.

"It, of course, is true that the treatment of some of these matters lies outside of the prerogatives of the Senate in dealing with the present treaty and covenant, but it is in the power of the Senate to lay the foundations for them in its action relating to the treaty and covenant.

AN ANGLO-FRENCH-AMERICAN ENTENTE OR ALLIANCE.

"Interwoven with the treaty and covenant adopted at Paris, and as a supplement to them, the President has laid before the Senate for its consent a treaty whereby the United States engages, under certain conditions (of an 'unprovoked' attack on France by Germany), to come to the assistance of France with military and other forces. By reason of the fact that at the same time a similar treaty was arranged between France and Great Britain, the two treaties constitute, in effect, a tripartite defensive alliance.

"This proposed alliance is designed to secure to France safeguards not believed to be assured by the league of nations. Its territorial application is confined to Europe and to a single specified contingency. By becoming a party to it, the United States will be committed to obligations which entail great responsibility and expense and which involve this Nation in the whole corpus of European international politics. While the language of the proposed alliance treaty makes the condition of American participation an unprovoked attack by Germany upon France, the nature and causes of such provocation manifestly are not and plainly can not be confined strictly to issues that may arise directly between Germany and France. The treaties adopted at Paris reshape the political map of Europe and create conditions and relations which plant possible causes for provocations between Germany and France in every boundary and question arising in Europe, and even outside of Europe. If the United States enters upon this proposed alliance, every friction of nations in Europe or of European nations anywhere in the world will carry the possibility of eventually bringing this alliance into effect.

"In the terms of the proposed alliance the United States assumes heavy obligations in the interest of France; or, to broaden the application to its real content, to sustain a certain balance of power in Europe by backing up France.

"But the alliance as written contains no compensation for the United States. It provides for no defense or support of American territory or interests anywhere by France and Great Britain.

"In connection with the Far Eastern policy of the United States a clause in this proposed Anglo-French-American alliance treaty by which the French and British Governments again express adherence to and engage under certain conditions to aid America in defending or enforcing the Hay doctrine would clarify the attitudes of those powers vis-à-vis this question and aid greatly in establishing the future tranquillity of China and in averting a rupture of the peace about the Shantung and Manchuria questions. Such a clause will protect the interests and rights of China and safeguard the American policy toward China, as well as can be done now by diplomatic provision."

ESTATE OF THOMAS H. HALL.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent of the Senate for a little indulgence with reference to a bill on the calendar. It will not take five minutes to act on it, I am sure. It is a bill which once has been passed by the Senate; it has twice been favorably reported in the House and favorably reported in the Senate, and unless it is passed now it will be too late to give the relief intended. It is a very small item, only involving $544.73, which, of course, is a bagatelle so far as the Government is concerned, but it is of great importance to the widow of Mr. Hall, who is being sued for that amount under conditions which make it improper that she should be called upon to pay it. I repeat, the Senate has passed the bill once before, and, as I have said, unless it is passed now and goes to the House it will be too late to afford the relief, because the suit is now pending in the Federal court which it is intended to relieve. I am sure we can dispose of it in two minutes, and I therefore ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2716) to relieve the estate of Thomas H. Hall, deceased, late postmaster at Panacea, Fla., and the bondsmen of said Thomas H. Hall, of the payment of money alleged to have been misappropriated by a clerk in said office.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the bill read.

Mr. WARREN. I withhold objection until the bill has been read.

Mr. FLETCHER. A report has been filed with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the estate of Thomas H. Hall, deceased, late postmaster at Panacea, Fla., and the bondsmen of the said Thomas H. Hall as such postmaster, be, and they are hereby, relieved of the payment of $544.73, together with the amount of the costs which may have accrued on account of the United States bringing an action to enforce the payment of said sum, the said sum being the amount of cash and funds held by the Post Office Department to be due from said Hall's estate to the United States for money misappropriated to his own use by a clerk in said office while the proffered resignation of said Hall was pending in the Post Office Department and while the said clerk was acting postmaster with the consent and acquiescence of the United States.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the whole case.

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

There being on objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

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

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WARREN. Is morning business closed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9205, being the first deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9205) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendment.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read in full for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I understand the Senator does not want to ask that the reading be dispensed with at some period during the progress of the bill.

Mr. WARREN. The bill will be read entirely as we go along.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the formal reading of the bill will be dispensed with, and the bill will be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

BUREAU OF EFFICIENCY.

With a view to facilitating the Bureau of Efficiency's investigation of duplication of work in the several executive departments and independent establishments as now authorized by law, it is hereby directed that before any Government department or independent establishment shall undertake any new activity, inquiry, or investigation, it shall inform the Bureau of Efficiency of (1) the character and scope of the activity, inquiry, or investigation, (2) the probable number of persons to be employed, the probable salaries to be paid, and the probale total cost of the activity, inquiry, or investigation, and (3) the appropriations out of which expenditures are to be made.

The Bureau of Efficiency is directed to investigate the methods of business of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and to report to the Congress at the beginning of the next regular session, with such recommendations as it may deem proper to make. If only a partial report can be made at that time, a complete report shall be made as soon thereafter as practicable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

For temporary employees for the Civil Service Commission, $50,000: *Provided*, That not more than two persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,400 per annum and no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the appropriation made for the Civil Service Commission—as I recall, it was a very generous and a very liberal one—proved inadequate; and, if so, why? Has the Civil Service Commission been adding to its personnel or force without any authority of Congress?

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is alluding to this appropriation of $50,000 put in by the House?

Mr. KING. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is not a committee amendment.

Mr. KING. I am aware of that.

Mr. WARREN. It is not a committee amendment, and it is hardly in order to take it up now.

Mr. KING. I was merely inquiring so as to save recurring to it. If the Senator prefers, however, I will defer my inquiry.

Mr. WARREN. It is a deficiency, and it was stated originally by the commission that unless the appropriations were made larger there probably would be a deficiency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC INFORMATION.

For expenses of auditing and closing the accounts of the Committee on Public Information, to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury, $32,000. All unexpended balances of appropriations for the Committee on Public Information, together with all proceeds from the sale of material and receipts from the activities of said committee, shall immediately be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts upon the passage of this act: *Provided*, That that part of the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919 which provides "that all moneys received through the motion-picture activities of the committee shall be paid into the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation and be available for the said activities" is hereby repealed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations explain this item?

Mr. WARREN. It is for the purpose of closing up the expense accounts and effects of what remains of the Creel Bureau of so-called Public Information.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "District of Columbia," on page 3, after line 15, to insert:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

SEWERS.

The unexpended balances of appropriations contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1919 for main and pipe sewers and receiving basins, for suburban sewers, and for assessment and permit work, sewers, amounting in all to approximately $120,000, are hereby reappropriated and continued available during the fiscal year 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 24, to insert:

Upper Potomac interceptor: For additional amount required for continuing the construction of the upper Potomac interceptor between Twenty-seventh and K Streets and the Chain Bridge, $19,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 2, to insert:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Community forums and civic centers: Not to exceed 50 per cent of the appropriation of $25,000 for the fiscal year 1920 for expenses of the community forums and civic centers in the public schools of the District of Columbia may be expended for payment of secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, when the last appropriation bill was under consideration there was considerable debate over the appropriation for the civic forums; and, as I recall, the appropriation, though it was very liberal, was cut down from what some had desired. Is it the plan now to augment that appropriation?

Mr. WARREN. Not at all. If the Senator will read the amendment, it adds nothing to the former appropriation. It simply allows 50 per cent instead of 25 per cent to go for clerks and other employees, instead of going for rental and janitors, as they do not need the 75 per cent as it stood for the payment of janitors, rent, and expenses of that kind.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment, if it is in order. I move to strike out "50," in line 5, page 4, before the words "per cent," and insert "33⅓."

The reason why I propose that is this: The present law authorizes but 25 per cent of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1920 for expenses of the community forums and civic centers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to be expended for payment of secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks. Instead of using 25 per cent for these purposes, as Congress intended, and as has been the case in the past, they now want to take 50 per cent of the amount of the appropriation, in order that they may employ more secretaries, more teachers, more organizers, and more clerks. That is the effect of this amendment as reported. Perhaps it would be the part of wisdom to give them a little more than 25 per cent, but I can not see why we should give them 50 per cent for these specific purposes, although I know the object of it. The object of it is that the next time they ask for an appropriation it will be more than the present $25,000. I think that if we take one-third of the whole amount of the appropriation for the purpose of paying the secretaries, teachers, organizers, and clerks that is sufficient. Therefore I offer that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 4 in the committee amendment, on line 5, it is proposed to strike out "50," before the words "per cent," and to insert in lieu thereof "33⅓."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I hope that motion will not prevail, and that the matter may be allowed to go as it stands to the committee of conference.

The allusion to what has been done in the past can apply only to two appropriations, because it is a new matter; and the determination of the committee, if I may judge by expressions when we were considering this item, was that this probably would be the last appropriation. They asked for $65,000 for this purpose, if I remember correctly—either sixty or sixty-five thousand dollars—and we gave them $25,000, and we restricted the matter of teachers, and so forth, to 25 per cent. It would have been a matter of using the money for purposes that might not be necessary if it were left as it is, because the quarters can be provided without payment. It is a matter of evening meetings, and so forth, in the schoolhouses. The payment of janitors for attention, of course, has to go on, but the whole object of this is to impart knowledge to the young. In order to impart that knowledge, teachers are required; and, of course, the organizers and clerks come along, so that I think the committee in voting on this believed that it should go to conference as it stands.

I therefore hope the amendment to the amendment may not prevail.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just one more word.

I wish that I had the list of the activities that this community forum and civic center has mapped out. It goes into every conceivable activity of life, including the teaching of French, the teaching of the violin, the teaching of cooking, the teaching of a hundred different things, as enumerated in the list that they themselves have furnished members of the committee. I left the list over at my office, or I would put it in the RECORD in full. Allow me to say now that if the program is carried out the appropriation in years to come will not be $25,000, but it will be nearer $250,000, and we will not have a few teachers and organizers and clerks and secretaries, but we will have a horde of them in the District of Columbia, and we will be asked to furnish a building for them to occupy if the program as submitted is carried out.

I am perfectly willing that the Government shall pay the salaries of the necessary clerks and a limited number of teachers that are required in the District of Columbia for carrying on meetings to be held under the auspices of the community forums and civic centers, but I do not want established in the District of Columbia again a complete organization for instruction of every sort and every kind. As I say, my amendment would give them more than 25 per cent to pay for the secretaries, organizers, and clerks. I am perfectly willing that a third of the amount shall be devoted to that purpose; but, in my opinion, that is all that it should be, and I hope the amendment to the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator certainly knows that the Committee on Appropriations would not assent to any such appropriation as he states—$250,000. There is not the slightest intention nor the slightest hint from any quarter that the committee would do that. The committee amendment, of course, carries no additional appropriation. It really provides, in my judgment, for the reasonable expenditure of the present appropriation.

I have here a great amount of matter on this subject from the board of education, letters from the several members of the District government, a letter from Miss Margaret Wilson, and many others. I think as little as we can do in the case of the amount already appropriated—and which, as I said, is likely to be the last—is to let it be used in the direction of doing some good, rather than to tie it up so that it must be used in a direction where it would be of no particular account.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Why did the former Congress, in making this appropriation, limit the expenditure for this purpose to 25 per cent of the amount unless they intended that that was all that should be utilized for clerical and other services of that kind? Why should the committee now, in a deficiency bill, change the original purpose of the appropriation and divert the appropriation from the channel in which it was to be expended to some other? If the former Congress appropriated $25,000 and limited the amount to be expended for employees to 25 per cent, what right have we now to change that?

Mr. WARREN. We placed the percentage as low as we did because we believed at the time that they would have to pay more for rental, and so forth. But those matters have been so arranged that they have continued in the same rooms, and other help has been contributed. This is to make the money go further and do more good.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will permit me, if we save some part of the amount which it was contemplated would be spent for rental, why may it not be covered back into the Treasury? Certainly it would be refreshing to find one appropriation not fully exhausted.

Mr. WARREN. It is very refreshing if the Senator thinks that any part of that will go back into the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, when the first appropriation was asked for community forums and civic centers the amount asked for was $10,000, as I remember, and the committee was told that at no time would it ever amount to more than $10,000. We have it up to $25,000 now, and there was $65,000 asked for. Have we forgotten that when we established the Children's Bureau it was stated upon the floor of the Senate, not only by one Senator but by a number, that at no time in the history of this country would it require more than $25,000? To-day we appropriate around one-quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. President, we were told that if this community forum and civic center was established all that the Government of the United States would be asked to pay would be the actual expenses attendant upon it, and that public-spirited citizens would give their time freely for the purpose of directing its activities.

I suppose that many Senators were visited by the lady in charge of this work last year, and they will remember that she wanted the use of the grounds in front of the Capitol to give a pageant, and one of the reasons why she said she wanted to give it was that all the money that was appropriated had not been expended, and unless they gave the pageant the money would go back into the Treasury of the United States. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] suggests to me that that is a good reason for it. I know it is a reason that is followed by most of the departments of the Government.

I want the public-spirited citizens who wanted this forum and civic center created in the beginning to continue in the work they were so anxious to undertake and not throw this burden back upon the Congress of the United States. As far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to pay all of the expenses attached to it, and I am perfectly willing to pay the clerks who labor all the time to keep the accounts, but as far as anything else is concerned, Mr. President, if we undertake to carry out the program that is mapped out, I have not any doubt as to what the result will be in the end.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I notice that in one portion of the pending bill there is an appropriation for the International Industrial Congress, and in connection with that appropriation I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate what I believe to be one of the most important problems before the country to-day, the proposed bituminous-coal strike which menaces the country.

Mr. President, three weeks ago, on October 1, I made some remarks in the Senate regarding the threatened strike of the bituminous-coal miners. This was in connection with an informal report I made at the time concerning the work of a subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committee, of which I am chairman, which has been investigating the coal situation.

In view of the desperate situation which menaces us, I deem it my duty to make some further remarks at this time, in order that the country may be advised, through this body, what the outlook now is and what a serious state of affairs is threatened on and after November 1.

An industrial calamity seems to be imminent in the United States. The stage has been deliberately set for this disastrous event by 400,000 men, over one-third of whom are foreign born, who can not speak the English language, and who have no acquaintance or sympathy with our institutions.

On September 23, 1919, the United Mine Workers of America, in convention assembled at Cleveland, Ohio, adopted a proposed wage scale, whose terms were embraced in a notable document of 13 sections. These were all set forth in my former remarks upon this subject. I shall now mention 2 only of the 13 demands.

First. A 60 per cent increase in wages.

Second. Establishment of a six-hour day and a five-day working week.

Through a committee these demands were presented to a like committee representing the bituminous coal operators of the central competitive district. This conference of the operators' and miners' representatives took place in Buffalo. Subsequent meetings have been held in Philadelphia.

At these conferences the representatives of the United Mine Workers of America have presented the ironclad demands of their convention. They have admitted that they were without power to change the terms proposed or in any sense to play the rôle of negotiators. They were, in effect, messengers only, to convey certain demands, and in default of an acceptance of the same the inevitable result would be that set forth in the twelfth of the 13 "points," to wit:

> We recommend that in event a satisfactory wage agreement is not secured for the central competitive field before November 1, 1919, to replace the one now in effect, that the international officials be authorized to and are hereby instructed to call a general strike of all bituminous miners and mine workers throughout the United States, the same to become effective November 1, 1919.

In passing let me call attention to one remarkable phase of this controversy. The bituminous field of the United States is divided into four districts. The central competitive district comprises Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and western Pennsylvania. The demand of the United Mine Workers has been presented only to the operators in that district. Nevertheless, in the event of the latter declining to accede to the demands of the miners a strike is to take place in all four districts, in spite of the fact that the operators in the other three districts have never had any demands or grievances presented to them.

I wish again to invite attention to the fact that the miners' representatives have presented certain drastic terms, which they apparently are without authority to alter or deviate from, while the representatives of the operators are vested with plenary power.

The United Mine Workers of America as an organization have achieved their present position in the world of labor through "collective bargaining." But where is there even a trace of "collective bargaining" in the proposal they have placed before the bituminous operators?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would explain whether this demand for a 60 per cent increase, a six-hour day, and a five-day week applies only to that division where the complaint arises or does it apply to all the other three?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It applies as well to the other three. The demand is made for the entire field by the president of the United Mine Workers of America representing the entire group.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand the Senator, there has been no demand with reference to wages or conditions in any of these groups except the one in which the demand has actually been presented and to which he is referring.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is all.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I did not quite hear the question of the Senator from Nebraska, but I understand if the strike should become effective it would spread throughout the United States, either directly or indirectly, through sympathetic striking or independent action upon the part of other organizations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The contracts made between the miners and the operators relate to the several competitive fields. The demands are made by the president of the miners' union, controlling through the various locals all the competitive fields, and those demands, I understand, are made for all the fields in the United States.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. This will result, will it not, directly in the cessation of mining in all the bituminous coal fields of the United States?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. They will be entirely, absolutely, closed down except where there are nonunion mines, and those comprise about 25 per cent, I believe, of the entire production, which amounts to some 550,000,000 tons per year. I intend to point that out a little later in the course of my remarks.

The miners have come and have laid down their demands—their rigid, hard, and fast demands—and have said, "Here is what we demand; take it or leave it. Pay us a billion dollars a year more, trust in our ability to produce in a 30-hour week enough coal to keep your industries going and you from freezing, or we will close up the Nation as tight as a drum November 1."

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator speaks of a 30-hour week. The prevailing week has been how many hours?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Forty-eight.

Mr. KING. Forty-four hours in some places.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; 44 in some places. Is that collective bargaining? To my mind the operators were right in refusing to grant these inordinate demands. What right have the coal producers of the country to saddle every man, woman, and child in the United States with a staggering tribute tax, such as the miners propose, and in addition gamble on the miners' ability to produce, in 30 hours a week, coal enough to keep American industries going and American houses from freezing?

Now, let us go back a little. Under the Lever Act of August 10, 1917, the United States Fuel Administration was organized. This act contained the following clause, being section 24:

> That the provisions of this act shall cease to be in effect when the existing state of war between the United States and Germany shall have terminated, and the fact and date of such termination shall be ascertained and proclaimed by the President; but the termination of this act shall not affect any act done, or any right or obligation accruing or accrued or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil case before the said termination pursuant to this act; but all rights and liabilities under this act arising before its termination shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as if the act had not terminated. Any offense committed and all penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred prior to such termination may be prosecuted or punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if this act had not been terminated.

Both the letter and spirit of this act are very clear.

After the passage of the Lever Act and the creation of the United States Fuel Administration, acting under the inspiration of Dr. Garfield, an agreement was entered into between the bituminous-coal operators and their employees whereby the scale contract of April 1, 1916, was modified and extended "during the continuance of the war, and not to exceed two years from April 1, 1918."

I may point out that this was the second increase of wages granted under the Fuel Administration. The increase for the first six months previously amounted to approximately 15 per cent, I understand. Then when six months had gone by, during the continuation of the war, they came again, and, through the instigation of Dr. Garfield, the coal miners and coal operators got together and made a new wage scale. I have that wage scale here, but I will not read it. That increase amounted to approximately 30 per cent, and the miners agreed to operate the mines not less than two years beyond April 1, 1918, or during the continuance of the war.

Mr. THOMAS. That arrangement constitutes, does it not, what is generally known as collective bargaining?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I so understand.

Mr. THOMAS. Of what avail is collective bargaining if one party to the bargain may abandon it or repudiate it at pleasure?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Of no avail, I will say to the Senator from Colorado.

This language in the agreement should be carefully noted—"during the continuance of the war." The Department of Justice and the various Federal courts have repeatedly held that the war is not over, and will not be until the fact is duly proclaimed by the President, following a formal ratification of the treaty of peace. This has been universally held. The Lever Act, from which I have quoted, clearly sets forth this fact and this view of the law. Therefore the scale agreement referred to is in full force and will be until April 1, 1920, unless the President shall declare the state of war at an end following the ratification of the treaty of peace.

Now, this contract, entered into during the solemn days of actual hostilities, is to be tossed into the discard and treated, in true Kaiserian fashion, as a scrap of paper, unless the demands of the miners shall be acceded to.

The two chief demands, which I have already referred to, a 60 per cent increase in wages and the establishment of a six-hour work day and a five-day working week, together with certain auxiliary demands, would involve an increase of from $2 to $2.50 in the cost of each ton of bituminous coal delivered to the consumer. This would aggregate fully a billion dollars in the country as a whole.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What are the wages at present, if I may inquire?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Generally speaking, I understand they average from $1,200 to $1,500 per year for each miner. I think that is the average. I have the scale of wages here. It is approximately $1 an hour.

Mr. POINDEXTER. At present?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes. That statement was made to me last night by the president of one of the operating companies.

I hold in my hand a carefully prepared table, which I shall ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with my remarks. Based upon the figures of the United States Geological Survey of the bituminous coal consumption during 1917, I am able to show to what extent the people of the several States, the consumers of bituminous coal, will be penalized if the demands of the miners are granted. This is the annual cost to the public of the wage demands of the United Mine Workers of America in bituminous coal only, using the 1917 consumption figures and estimating the increased cost of production at $2 per ton.

I should like to call attention of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce [Mr. CUMMINS], handling the very important railroad legislation, to the fact that the estimate of the Geological Survey of the increased cost to the railroads of the country on account of this demand of the United Mine Workers of America is $300,000,000 per annum.

I ask that the table to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

Annual cost to the public of United Mine Workers of America wage demand, bituminous coal only, using 1917 consumption figures and estimating increased cost of production at $2 per ton.

State.	Used at mines for steam and heat.	Used in manufacture of beehive coke.	Used in manufacture of by-product coke.	Used in manufacture of coal gas.	Used by electrical utilities.	Used for domestic purposes.	Used for industrial purposes.	Total coal consumed.
Alabama	$1,283,466	$7,317,196	$7,960,486	$181,772	$599,932	$1,302,000	$4,262,980	$22,907,832
Arizona					5,270	130,000	88,730	224,000
Arkansas	150,134			2,660	216,232	600,000	829,910	1,798,936
California	480			560		700,000	1,070,348	1,781,388
Colorado	608,984	3,569,262		244,988	1,030,486	2,900,000	6,406,358	14,760,078
Delaware				2,018	285,084	40,000	905,234	1,232,336
District of Columbia				14,386	316,820	500,000	902,794	1,734,000
Florida				66,334	65,606	180,000	294,060	606,000
Georgia	14,400	145,378		157,754	390,776	1,742,000	2,782,038	5,232,346
Idaho				16,342	3,242	600,000	623,352	1,242,936
Illinois	4,478,500		6,467,338	551,194	8,465,114	19,442,000	46,122,770	85,796,916
Indiana	1,285,102		9,635,884	336,676	4,177,956	7,000,000	18,682,678	41,118,296
Iowa	452,783			124,534	2,047,002	5,824,000	10,443,798	18,892,122
Kansas	370,928			9,456	852,086	3,600,000	2,689,178	7,521,648
Kentucky	1,279,954	1,199,252	1,484,324	29,518	1,173,172	3,728,000	3,932,686	12,826,906
Louisiana				6,460	321,326	740,000	2,577,110	3,644,896
Maryland	117,820		1,466,368	21,952	723,492	704,000	5,570,404	8,604,036
Michigan	95,930		2,440,060	1,475,748	2,963,708	5,948,000	16,877,076	29,800,522
Minnesota			1,353,762	199,918	1,478,966	5,274,000	4,765,760	13,072,406
Mississippi				21,814	567,670	600,000	1,512,516	2,706,000
Missouri	303,562		703,510	1,129,728	2,043,578	6,000,000	13,842,808	24,023,186

Annual cost to the public of United Mine Workers of America wage demand, bituminous coal only, using 1917 consumption figures and estimating increased cost of production at $2 per ton—Continued.

State.	Used at mines for steam and heat.	Used in manufacture of beehive coke.	Used in manufacture of by-product coke.	Used in manufacture of coal gas.	Used by electrical utilities.	Used for domestic purposes.	Used for industrial purposes.	Total coal consumed.
Montana	$335,408			$24,074	$212,668	$1,770,000	$1,791,670	$4,133,820
Nebraska				2,178	1,022,728	2,850,000	3,048,778	6,923,684
Nevada					4,050	200,000	519,950	724,000
New England			$1,477,746	1,786,976	5,781,466	3,310,000	24,052,586	36,408,774
New Jersey			1,243,398	251,460	2,200,896	180,000	9,839,262	13,715,016
New Mexico	72,898	$1,872,822		3,606	86,906	350,000	505,762	2,891,994
New York			2,802,916	1,279,764	6,282,622	2,484,000	25,539,030	38,388,332
North Carolina				95,166	408,032	1,640,000	2,052,802	4,196,000
North Dakota	68,154			35,224	430,282	1,310,000	1,183,316	3,026,976
Ohio	1,522,064	449,904	10,282,092	61,330	7,213,786	9,800,000	46,689,936	76,019,112
Oklahoma	378,380			1,900	217,990	1,550,000	1,497,756	3,646,026
Oregon	11,008			7,922		450,000	747,626	1,216,556
Pennsylvania	6,999,454	73,189,126	11,432,442	521,486	4,972,572	3,672,000	60,440,140	161,227,220
South Carolina				11,860	354,276	960,000	1,026,864	2,356,000
South Dakota				4,680	371,224	1,140,000	658,102	2,174,006
Tennessee	329,396	1,391,682	127,586	142,256	805,650	2,422,000	3,745,466	8,564,036
Texas	98,710			30,136	829,790	1,300,000	2,730,498	4,989,134
Utah	172,256	1,340,984		70,662	19,150	1,630,000	1,193,892	4,426,944
Virginia	290,462	4,187,886		223,068	1,195,124	1,812,000	5,237,496	12,946,036
Washington	332,798	321,100	90,050	174,560	273,504	1,300,000	810,720	3,302,742
West Virginia	2,370,400	9,508,632	1,455,556	4,488	990,266	950,000	6,246,004	21,525,346
Wisconsin			2,588,000	573,794	1,644,738	5,064,000	7,253,004	17,123,536
Wyoming	540,882			5,982	340,206	500,000	120,720	1,507,790
Alaska							107,910	107,910
Miscellaneous—smithing							510,000	510,000
Total	24,234,318	104,493,224	63,011,518	9,919,394	63,385,444	114,208,000	352,731,878	731,983,776
Railroad fuel (in round figures)								300,000,000
Grand total	24,234,318	104,493,224	63,011,518	9,919,394	63,385,444	114,208,000	352,731,878	1,031,983,776

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, do the Senators from Alabama know that the people of their State would be taxed $22,000,000 to meet these demands? Do the Senators from Michigan comprehend that if the increase asked for were granted their constituents would have an enlargement of their coal bills to the extent of $29,000,000?

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator's estimate include anything more than the actual increase in cost of production added to this wage scale, or does it also include an added profit which the operator would probably add to the price to the consumer?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It does not include an added profit. It is based entirely upon the present cost of production under the present scale and the proposed advance in wages.

Mr. McCORMICK. What about reduction in hours and its influence?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is taken into account. It also includes the increased cost by reason of the reduced production on account of a six-hour day.

Are the Senators from Missouri aware that the citizens of their State would be mulcted to the extent of $24,000,000 in the event that the mine workers have their way? Do the Senators from New England realize that their States would be called upon to pay $36,000,000 to the mine workers' union? Do the Senators from Ohio comprehend that the share their State would pay would be $76,000,000? Are the Senators from Illinois aware that the United Mine Workers are demanding an annual toll of $85,000,000 from the people of their State? And the Senators from Pennsylvania, are they cognizant of the fact that that Commonwealth will be called upon to contribute $161,000,000 to the same organization? My own State is much smaller than those cited and the extent to which my constituents would be mulcted would be considerably less, yet they would be called upon to contribute $13,700,000 to the coffers of the bituminous miners.

Are the people of the United States prepared to go down into their pockets and pay out $1,000,000,000 a year in order that the United Mine Workers may have a 60 per cent raise in pay, work six hours a day, and that for only five days a week?

Are the people of the United States prepared to place any industry on a six-hour basis? In response to an insistent demand of labor agitators an eight-hour day has been legalized. What more do labor organizations want? If any such concession be made to the miners, how long would it be before like demands would be made by representatives of other trades, and what would the final harvest be?

All thinking men, all economists, all students of trade and sociological conditions as well, are demanding the highest degree of productivity at this time. The Great War withdrew twenty-five or thirty millions of men—probably more—from the ordinary fields of production, industrial and agricultural, and the world, economically, is all awry and normal conditions will not prevail for many years. It may take a decade or even a generation to get back to healthy, rational conditions in our domestic economy.

Yet here we have nearly 400,000 men insisting that over two days shall be dropped from the industrial calendar each week, while idleness shall take the place of activity and inertness the place of production.

We all recall the great coal strike of 1902. Prior to that the miners worked 19 hours. Indeed, at one time they had a 12-hour day. The celebrated conciliation and arbitration board, presided over by Judge George Gray, of Delaware, reached the conclusion that the miners' day should be reduced to nine hours, that being deemed a reasonable and proper working-day period. That was promptly acquiesced in at that time. Next came the demand for an eight-hour day, which was granted through congressional enactment.

And now comes this final demand for a six-hour day. Where will it stop? Production would in due course of time entirely end, the wheels of production would cease to revolve, and we would have chaos and disaster throughout the land.

A demand for a 6-hour day—for a 30-hour week—involves a 37 per cent cut in present working time. To my mind this means a 37 per cent cut in bituminous-coal production. And that in turn means but one thing, a coal supply so insufficient to meet the country's needs that the closed factories, the idle mills, the crippled industries, the unheated homes of our people, would bring about a shortage infinitely worse than that of the winter of 1917–18.

It is out of the question for the miners' terms to be granted. The demanded decrease in working hours would result in industrial disaster. The demanded increase in wages would impose a financial burden upon the consumer that he can not afford to bear.

What is the alternative which the American mine workers present to the people of the United States through the operators? The country is to be plunged into industrial chaos two weeks hence. Not a pound of coal will be supplied thereafter. Our factories and mills will be closed. Our public utilities, our railroads, will cease to function. The homes of those compelled by reason of locality to use soft coal will be deprived of all fuel. Pneumonia and other diseases will become widespread. Hunger and suffering of all kinds will prevail in many communities. Industrial America will be brought to a standstill, and paralysis will take the place of activity at a time when the highest degree of productivity should prevail.

And who are the men who have precipitated this state of affairs? Are they American citizens? To a very large extent they are not. A vast majority were born on foreign soil, and, as I have said, do not speak our language and have nothing in common with the dyed-in-the-wool American. Some of them have been naturalized, but between one-third and one-half of the entire number are still aliens and utterly lacking in all the elements which go to make up the patriotic American citizen.

Is the United States ready to be dictated to by these men?

I have in my hand a letter written to me by the vice president of the National Coal Association. I asked him to give me the

percentage of aliens employed in the mines, and he writes me as follows:

NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., October 15, 1919.

Hon. JOSEPH S. FRELINGHUYSEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Referring to our conversation this morning, I take pleasure in placing before you below the result of a canvass of the nationality of the employees in bituminous coal industry made by the National Coal Association in July, 1918. This canvass covered approximately 2,000 operating companies in practically every producing field in the country, and in our judgment is representative of conditions prevailing in the industry to-day.

The canvass showed:

Nationality.	Total employees.	Percentages.
Americans	283,340	63.40
Foreign born	163,516	36.60
Total	446,856	100.00

Foreign-born employees, by nationalities.

Nationality:	Number.
Austria-Hungarians, including Slovaks, Ruthenians, Magyars, and Hortats (Croats)	59,271
Bulgarians	545
Chinese	59
Danes	67
Dutch	105
Finns	1,060
French	4,478
German	5,548
Greek	3,088
Italian	44,869
Japanese	412
Lithuanians	3,767
Mexicans	820
Montenegrins	590
Polish	16,801
Portuguese	25
Roumanians	740
Russians	9,944
Servians	1,282
Spanish	850
Syrians	131
Swedish	1,167
Turks	200
Miscellaneous	7,697
Total	163,516

Very truly, yours,

J. D. F. MORROW,
Vice President.

The time has come to put an end to this situation.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I desire to ask how many employees are there working in the mines?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Four hundred and forty-six thousand eight hundred and fifty-six.

Mr. WATSON. That number includes both Americans and aliens?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Both Americans and aliens.

Mr. WATSON. Does it include both anthracite and bituminous coal miners?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No; the number has reference simply to bituminous coal miners. There are about 185,000 anthracite coal miners, I think.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I inquire what area the number of 446,000 referred to by the Senator from New Jersey covers?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That covers all of the bituminous coal mines located both in the East and the West.

Mr. WARREN. Then it covers altogether both the East and West?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; the entire area.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me to have read, if it will not interrupt his remarks, two telegrams which I have just received, coming from the largest coal corporations in Wyoming, which are mining vast quantities of bituminous coal?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the Secretary read the telegrams that I send to the desk.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

KIRBY, WYO., *October 20, 1919.*

Senator FRANCIS E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.:

Wyoming coal operators have had no voice in wage controversy with miners. Please use your influence with Secretary of Labor Wilson so that negotiations will not be settled or adjourned without we are represented. As matter now stands, the negotiations have all been with eastern coal producers, and the western operators are being forced into a position without representation.

NORTHERN WYOMING COAL OPERATORS' ASSOCIATION,
C. A. BARNARD, *Secretary.*

CHEYENNE, WYO., *October 20, 1919.*

Senator F. E. WARREN,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

Please, if possible, see Secretary of Labor Wilson and advise him that southern Wyoming coal operators do not feel there is any justice in any settlement made in the East with coal miners to which we are made a party without representation. We stand ready to meet representatives of the miners from our district in conference to negotiate a wage scale at any time. Do not want to be tied or bound by any agreement made in the central competitive field.

P. J. QUEALY.
W. D. BRENNAN.

Mr. WARREN. I simply wish to say that information comes to me, not only from these dispatches but from other sources, that there is no controversy in the mines of Wyoming; and the miners there seem to have been excluded from participation in the conference in connection with the proposition made by certain representatives of labor in the eastern section of the country.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I understood the list read by the Senator included the number of foreigners employed in this industry. Were they all unnaturalized?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; the number indicated were unnaturalized aliens.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if the threatened coal strike embraces also the anthracite fields or only the bituminous fields?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It does not embrace the anthracite fields. The anthracite miners and operators have settled their differences and their contract continues until the 31st of March, 1920.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have received quite a number of telegrams of similar import to those placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and coming from operators in my State. There has been since the troubles of 1914 no difficulty in the mines of Colorado, but they are involved in the present situation, and, whatever the result may be, they will be affected by the conditions that will prevail after the 1st of November, notwithstanding their nonparticipation either in the so-called demands of the miners or in the proposals of compromise.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, that is one of the difficulties in the situation. The president of the union can order this strike and will order it in the fields where there are no differences between the operators and the employees.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for just a moment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator has given the number of aliens who are now engaged in this industry. Can the Senator state what the relative proportion between Americans and foreigners was at the time of the strike of 1902 and whether there has been any considerable change in the relative proportions from that time until this?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have the Gray report in my desk, but I have not read that portion of it, and I do not know. I know that the present radical influence which is being exerted in the union mine workers' organization comes principally from the foreign element.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. One moment, until I finish. I understand that the older mining men, the men with families and children, who have been employed in the mines for many years, are not the trouble makers; that they stay at home and are law-abiding citizens. When the local unions have their meetings the men that come are the foreign element, who are very radical and very pronounced in their demands. The old, conservative miner is retiring and naturally stays away from the meetings. That is what happened in the convention at Cleveland. I understand the radicals controlled it and presented these demands, which were in the nature of an ultimatum. I understand that there is to be no referendum, and although Secretary Wilson informed the Senate committee that there could be a referendum, I understand there is not and will not and can not be a referendum to the miners. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was impressed by what other Senators from coal-mining States have said, and also by what the Senator from New Jersey has said, that the difficulty comes only from one district. Now, the Senator is assuming all the time—and he may, of course, be right—that when the strike is called all the other districts in which there has been no dispute in regard to wages or any other question will strike the same as the miners in the district where the dispute has arisen.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly; the order has gone out to strike.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think that the miners in other sections and States where there is no dispute will obey the order to strike?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. There is no question about it. If the Senator from New Jersey will permit me, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. operates the largest steel mill west of the Mississippi River. They had no difficulty whatever with their men and conferences were granted as rapidly as they were asked. Not a single grievance was presented that was not met and considered. Notwithstanding that fact, when the call for the steel strike was issued, 6,500 men walked out; they are out yet; and, for the first time in 30 years, those great mills are absolutely silent, although the employees have no grievance and no difficulty whatever.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator thinks, of course, from that that the same condition will be brought about in the event the coal strike takes place?

Mr. THOMAS. There is no question about it, in my judgment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. In Illinois there are approximately 100,000 bituminous-coal miners, and my information from that area is that practically all of them will go out on strike. When they will return, or how long they will stay out, no one can tell.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, my judgment is that the same thing may happen in Wyoming, because it has twice before happened. In one instance there was hardly a man employed by a concern numbering its employees by the hundreds, and in another case by the thousands, that did not go out. It amounts to this, that when an order goes out from labor headquarters to strike, the members of the union who refuse to obey the order are punished, being liable to a fine and, of course, to expulsion from their union.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

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

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think another thing that ought to be understood by the public, if the Senator from New Jersey has not already made it clear, is that this coal strike was practically ordered before any attempt had been made to harmonize any existing difficulties between employers and employees. No demands had been made and no call for a conference had been asked. They met in convention, directed their representatives to make certain demands, and if those demands were denied to strike. That is the situation—a most unusual condition—and I think the country ought to understand it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I regret that I was not able to hear the first part of the speech of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], but I think every Senator is impressed with the importance of this subject. The remarks which have just been made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] made me feel that, perhaps, I ought to call attention to this situation: I have been told, and I believe reliably, that when the delegates met in convention in Cleveland these demands were presented to the convention, a resolution was passed instructing their committee to present them, and they were directed to report back to the convention. Ordinarily in disputes between operators and miners, a referendum may be had at which the miners are privileged to cast a secret vote, but under the plan which was adopted by the delegates in this case the miners themselves will have no privilege of voting upon these demands. I have been informed that in my own State of Ohio there are 45,000 miners, and that if they were granted the privilege of a referendum vote these demands would be overwhelmingly defeated. I am constrained to believe—and I base this belief upon information which I think is reliable—that this is not a miners' strike, but is a strike by the officers and delegates of the miners.

This situation is so serious that it seems to me if there is any way by which the Congress of the United States can reasonably prevent the calamities which will befall the country in the event the strike takes place, Congress ought to act. In my own State alone, with a population of over 6,000,000 of people, where we have an abundant coal supply, though much of the coal which is used in our industries comes from Pennsylvania and West Virginia and Kentucky and Tennessee, it is appalling to think that 6,000,000 of people must be compelled to freeze, the wheels of industry stop, and transportation cease because these demands are made by the officers and the delegates to a convention, and the miners themselves have no opportunity to register their voice. That is the situation as I see it.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from Ohio has very well expressed the alarming condition and the attendant circumstances. He says that if Congress can do anything to prevent that situation, Congress ought to act. What has the Senator in mind as preventive legislation?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have nothing in mind. I am not a member of the subcommittee that has been studying this situation; but I have this in mind which the press and public men generally can do, and that is to call the attention of every man, woman, and child in the country to the peculiar situation, and I think we are safe in saying that this strike as ordered has not been authorized by the miners themselves, or if authorized they would not ratify the action of their delegates if they had an opportunity to vote upon it.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Ohio what his opinion would be of a proposition of this sort: Could or could not Congress constitutionally make it a criminal offense to promote a strike that would interfere with commodities that pass through the channels of interstate commerce without first having a referendum to the men who are actually interested?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator is a better constitutional lawyer than I am. I can see serious difficulties, as I think. I am disposed to think, since the Senator has suggested the question, that while we are legally at war there is perhaps some provision among the provisions of the fuel legislation which we passed a couple of years ago which might authorize the Federal Government for the time being to take control of the situation. I do not know. I have not studied that question sufficiently to say.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me to ask the Senator from Ohio a question?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am perfectly willing to yield.

Mr. POMERENE. I apologize to the Senator for taking so much of his time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not want to interrupt this discussion, because this is the most important matter that this Congress can have before it, next to the treaty of peace; but I do want to finish pretty soon. I yield, however. I know how valuable this discussion is, and I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I simply wanted to make this inquiry, and I hope this observation may be noted.

We have here in this appropriation bill the following item:

Enforcement of antitrust laws: For the enforcement of antitrust laws, $200,000.

As it came from the House, the item excludes from the operation of the antitrust laws labor unions and farmers. So far as the farmers are concerned, I do not understand that they ask for it; but I want to ask the Senator from Ohio, if he may be permitted to answer me "yes" or "no," whether he does not think that the present threat and the present situation as described by the Senator from New Jersey amount to a trust, a conspiracy in restraint of trade, and so forth? Shall we go on in every appropriation bill appropriating money for carrying out the trust laws and excepting certain classes of people, or shall we repeal the trust laws?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, we have section 6 of the Clayton bill confronting us, and I never have made it a practice to give an offhand opinion on a legal problem. I do not think it avails very much; but I shall hope that out of this discussion will grow a solution of a very serious situation. I can not understand what humanitarian principles prompt a few men to say in the great Republic of the United States: "We have got you by the throat. We are going to make your wives and babies freeze unless you surrender." I do not believe in that kind of autocracy, and the country will not tolerate it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the impending strike was considered by the subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Committee investigating the production of coal. We held several meetings to decide whether or not we should call Mr. Lewis, the president of the bituminous mine workers, whether anything could be offered to the controversy in that way. The demands are so drastic, so impossible, that all we could do would be to point out to the president of this union

that it was his duty to keep the contract. However, we asked the Secretary of Labor to come to a conference of the committee, and he came. I think I am at liberty to state that he also agreed with us that there was a legal and binding contract, and that the demands were impossible. He stated to us that he intended, through certain powers of mediation which he has, to call before him the mine operators—and I understand that that includes all of them—and Mr. Lewis, and attempt to adjust the differences.

That meeting was convened at 11 o'clock this morning, and from information which I had previous to its assembling I very much despair that out of the conference will come any agreement. The mine operators are perfectly willing, upon recognition of this contract, to negotiate a new wage scale, but they are unwilling to grant a six-hour day or a five-day week or a 60 per cent advance. In a proper discussion of the differences in regard to the wage scale they are perfectly willing to enter into the question of the increased cost of living as compared with the increased wages paid their miners; and I understand that the Secretary of Labor has admitted that in the last wage scale granted by Dr. Garfield, which he now states is sufficient, and also states that that contract is binding to April 1, 1920, the Secretary of Labor admits that the wages had advanced beyond the increased cost of living.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I think the statement just made is subject to this qualification, that this wage scale shall continue until April 1, 1920, unless peace is sooner declared.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; during the continuance of the war. I have already mentioned that in my previous remarks.

Mr. President, I have here the invitation to Mr. Thomas T. Brewster, chairman of the coal operators, from the Secretary of Labor, asking him to meet with Mr. Lewis in order to see if these differences can not be composed. I will ask that it be printed in the RECORD, and not read.

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

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, October 17, 1919.

Mr. THOMAS T. BREWSTER,
Chairman Coal Operators of the Central Competitive Coal Field, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The impending labor dispute and possible strike in the bituminous coal fields of the United States is of vital importance to all of the people. As the executive officer of the Government intrusted with the function of mediation in such disputes, I feel that nothing should be left undone that may give hope of an amicable adjustment of the differences existing between the operators and miners. I realize the difficulties to be overcome and give full weight to the statement of the coal operators that certain assurances relative to carrying out of existing contracts, the rescinding of the strike order, and the withdrawal of a demand for a shorter workday must be given by the representatives of the miners before negotiations can be renewed, and the statement of the miners that there must be a disposition to really negotiate on the part of the operators before it would be worth while for them to go into conference. I am sure, however, that there can be no objection on the part of either side to meet with the Secretary of Labor for the purpose of discussing with him all of the matters involved in the dispute.

I would therefore invite, through you, the full scale committee of the coal operators of the central competitive coal field to meet with me at my office in Washington at 11 a. m., Tuesday, October 21, 1919, for this purpose. I am sending a similar invitation to the full scale committee of the miners through their acting president, Mr. John L. Lewis.

Trusting that you may find it possible to comply with this request, I am,

Respectfully, yours (Signed) W. B. WILSON,
Secretary of Labor.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I also have the reply of Mr. Brewster to the Secretary of Labor. I ask that the reply be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 17, 1919.*

Hon. W. B. WILSON,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As chairman of the coal operators of the central competitive field, I am instructed to make the following reply to your suggestions that negotiations between the miners and operators be resumed. The coal operators assure you that they are willing to comply with your request, but the resumption of such negotiations should be predicated upon the following:

First. The miners must indicate their willingness to carry out the existing contract, which contract H. A. Garfield, United States Fuel Administrator attests is still in effect, to its legal termination.

Second. To do so the present strike order, effective November 1, must be rescinded and work must be continued pending negotiations.

Third. In order to produce sufficient coal for the needs of the public at the lowest possible cost, we refuse to negotiate any reduction in the hours of labor below the present standard, eight hours per day, six days per week.

As pertinent to the questions involved, the operators deem it advisable to say that the coal operators of the central competitive field have adhered to the principles and practices of collective bargaining for 33 years with the largest body of organized labor in the United States, and it is our opinion that our scale negotiations have broken down and that our contract has been abrogated by the miners' union in their call for a strike November 1, because the present system of collective bargaining does not fix equal responsibility under the law upon the employer and the labor union.

Our experience teaches us that no set of employers should agree to a system of collective bargaining which does not make both parties to the contract equally liable and responsible for the observance of the terms of such contract.

Respectfully, THOS. T. BREWSTER, *Chairman.*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, one of the claims of the president of the miners' union is that the war is practically over, that the mine operators have made extortionate profits, and he points to the statement of the Federal Trade Commission, based on costs for 1917–18, and states that the mine operators have been making 60 cents margin per ton profit. That is correct as far as it goes, but it does not take into account certain items which largely reduce the net to the operators. In Federal Trade Commission report, Bulletin No. 1, speaking of this margin, it is said:

This margin must not be confused with what is often called profit. Selling expense, interest, income, and excess-profits taxes, as well as other items, must be deducted from it before the net profit available for dividends or surplus can be determined. The margin necessary to a profitable operation varies greatly from operator to operator and from field to field. One operator may have a heavy investment in mining machinery and thus show a relatively low labor cost, while another operator may have a small investment but a high labor cost. In the case of the first operator the margin obtained should be larger in order to give an equal rate of remuneration on the larger amount of invested capital.

I understand that reference has been made to the western Pennsylvania field, and that the profits of the operators there were approximated to net about 10 to 15 cents per ton.

Speaking again of these demands, unless this intolerable condition can be rectified; unless some means can be found to prevent the imposition of such unthinkable demands and penalties; unless collective bargaining can be continued in an orderly manner and with due regard to the public welfare and comfort, a new remedy must be applied—the remedy of making labor amenable to the same extent as capital to the laws of the United States, hedged around by the same restrictions and subject to the same penalties.

I do not think the American people are opposed to trade-unions or to any kind of organization of workmen whose object is the betterment of their conditions.

The principle of collective bargaining is proper enough in the abstract, and also proper enough in the concrete, when applied to the employer and his employees. There should be no objection to the demand of the latter that they as a body, or through a committee, be called into consultation and conference regarding the question of wages and kindred matters.

But American employers should not be placed in subjection to any outside organization whose officers and dominating spirits are not identified with or in the service of the particular business concern in question. That is not democracy.

Allied to this is the open-shop proposition. While no employer should attempt to prevent his employees from joining any sort of an organization they please, they should never agree to close their shops to nonunion men. That, also, would be a repudiation of the essential principles of democracy.

In this connection, while speaking of the open shop, I take pleasure in quoting a very distinguished authority, none other than President Wilson, before his elevation to the White House, but then an eminent educator and historian.

Writing January 12, 1909, in reply to an invitation to speak at a banquet of antistrike and antiboycott advocates, he said:

I am a fierce partisan of the open shop and of everything that might be possible for me to contribute to the clarification of thinking and the formation of right purposes in matters of this kind.

That was a fine presentation of a fundamental proposition. Upon such a question the truly patriotic American can afford to be a "fierce partisan."

In collective bargaining it is pertinent to ask, Of what avail is a bargain if it is not enforceable at law? Of what avail is an agreement with men who break agreements? In the case of the printers' strike in New York strong local unions defied their officers. So, too, the boatmen tied up the whole food supply of New York in violation of their agreements. I read Mr. Gompers's letter, denouncing the breaking of contracts, addressed to the leader of the labor organization directly involved:

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Your telegram, in which you state members of your organization are on strike against an award of the National Adjustment Commission, received. The executive council in session in Washington considered this telegram and decided:

That it is not in the province of the executive council to inject itself into a strictly trade struggle between factions in a national or international union. The dispute should be solved by those who have the power to enforce its rules and decisions.

SACREDNESS OF CONTRACTS.

But on the question of adherence to contracts the American Federation of Labor has taken strong grounds. In 1904 the convention declared unanimously: "We wish in the strongest language possible to express our regret that any organization of workmen should fail to rigidly adhere to a contract entered into with employers of its members, and we believe it essential to urge upon trade-unionism the absolute necessity of holding contracts between them and their employers inviolate."

If the longshoremen agreed to abide by the award they have been striking in violation of one of the fundamental principles of the American Federation of Labor. The agreement to abide by the award was a sacred contract to accept it.

We therefore hope that, through laws of your international union, you will successfully induce the strikers to return to work, not only for their own honor and best interests but in the interest of the trade-union movement.

By order executive council, American Federation of Labor.

SAMUEL GOMPERS, *President.*

Note what Mr. Gompers says. He condemns in the severest terms the breaking of contracts and upholds the sacredness of contracts. Every right-minded American must be in accord with him in that proposition, but in the first part of his letter he states that the executive council decided—

That it is not in the province of the executive council to inject itself into a strictly trade struggle between factions in a national or international union. The dispute should be solved by those who have the power to enforce its rules and decisions.

A battle over fundamental principles of right and wrong, between agreement keepers and contract breakers, Mr. Gompers denominates a "struggle between factions," and he confesses himself and his organization powerless to right the existing wrong or to compel the recalcitrant strikers to keep their contracts.

This is the issue that we must face. We are forced to insist that collective bargaining shall be coupled with collective responsibility, legal and moral, and that when employers make a contract with their employees the powers of government shall be put behind that agreement with the same force and effect as it is put behind any agreement that is entered into for lawful purposes.

I noticed in the Washington Post this short article on collective bargaining:

COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT NOT BINDING, HAT MAKERS SAY.

NEW YORK, *October 18.*

A statement asserting that "collective agreements are nonoperative" was issued to-day by the Ladies' Hat Manufacturers Association in view of reports that the main question before the industrial conference at Washington is the collective agreement.

The statement asserted that for four years agreements which the association had made with the Cap and Hat Makers' Union of North America had been broken at will by their employees, and that the union leaders who signed the agreements asserted they had no control over the workers. A general strike is now in progress in the industry.

One of our ablest newspapers of the country, editorially speaking, the Philadelphia North American, in a recent issue said:

Three years ago a severe blow was adminstered to the principle of arbitration and also to the doctrine of the predominating rights of the public in industrial controversies. In the late summer of 1916, when the Nation was in the ominous shadow of approaching war, the four great railroad brotherhoods presented drastic demands and announced that they would be enforced, if necessary, by a Nation-wide strike. President Wilson, concerned for his campaign for reelection, intervened in the name of the public. But when the brotherhoods refused to withdraw their ultimatum he yielded and forced through Congress a bill embodying their demands, without any effective inquiry into the facts. The railway workers, as one of their leaders candidly avowed, had employed an adaptation of the ruthless methods of the cave men, and their victory over the Government was hailed by them as a justification for their policy.

I seriously object to the United States Government being forced into partnership with any class of our citizens. If we expect to survive and continue our career as the greatest Republic on the earth, we must adhere to the doctrine that all class alliances shall be prohibited; that this shall be a Government of the whole people, and not one in which any section or faction or industry or class shall exercise a dominating influence.

What was the situation when we entered the arena of war? Why were the railroads taken over by the Government? Because they had broken down? Nothing of the sort. Look back over the newspapers of the day and you will recall the threat of a Nation-wide strike by the trainmen—a threat which, if it had been carried into effect, would have paralyzed all our transportation facilities, plunged us into chaos, and made it utterly impossible to carry out any of our war plans.

When the railroads were taken over what was the first step? Rates were raised a billion dollars. What was the second step? Wages were raised a billion dollars. And who paid the bill? The question answers itself—the people, of course.

The demand of the trainmen was followed by that of the ship workers. Ten thousand struck in one yard. Fifteen thousand in another followed suit. With the Allies in dire peril and entirely dependent upon the speed with which we would come to their rescue, and all this contingent upon the vastly increased output in our shipping facilities, these men went on strike, thus imperiling the cause of democracy and civilization in its battle with the barbarous war lord and his diabolical henchmen.

Not until their demands were granted was work resumed in the shipyards and the work of tonnage production continued.

And thus it went on, one trade or industry after another making its demands for greatly increased pay and shorter hours, with never a thought of the consequences to this country or to the world at large and never an atom of sympathy with the splendid efforts of our soldiers in France to defeat the machinations of the despicable Huns.

What is the industrial and economic situation in America to-day? We have a state of semiparalysis in the steel industry, through the action chiefly of a lot of foreigners who saw fit to strike, although they already were receiving very high wages. Only a few days ago in Pittsburgh, if the newspapers give us correct information, certain of the malcontents themselves testified before Senator KENYON's committee that from 50 to 75 per cent of the strikers were foreign born.

We have the strike of the longshoremen, which has held up practically all our shipping and brought almost to a standstill trade with foreign ports, involving an incredibly large pecuniary loss, not to mention a tremendous food loss in New York City. At the same time we had the strike of the pressmen already referred to, the result being, likewise, a serious financial loss in many quarters.

And so it goes. Where will the striking frenzy stop? What will the harvest be? Unless a halt is called we shall reach a state of anarchy infinitely worse than the autocracy which the German Junkers sought to impose upon the world, and for the defeat of which America entered the war.

I am not an alarmist. I have an abiding faith in the American people. But I try to be a student of history, and especially of current history. Furthermore, I am not blind. There is abroad in the world a spirit of evil—Bolshevism—which is the twin brother of autocracy, in that both are enemies of pure democracy. And this spirit is more deeply seated in America than most of us are aware.

Autocracy simply meant the assumption of large powers by an individual or a clique, with the welfare of the masses a subordinate consideration. That stifled democracy. Nevertheless, autocracy, for selfish reasons, perhaps, was oftentimes paternalistic to a degree that the interests of the populace were largely conserved and promoted.

Bolshevism, like autocracy, is the antithesis of democracy. Bolshevism, as practiced in Russia, is confined to the proletariat, only a minority of the population, but embracing the rolling-stone elements, the irresponsible citizens. These oppose not only the old, exceedingly small monarchic group, but that great mass of citizens known as the bourgeoise, embracing millions of the middle class—merchants, farmers, home owners, and well-to-do mechanics. These, according to the tenets of the Bolshevists, must be excluded from all participation in government, being deprived even of the right of suffrage.

This is class government, and not democracy. This tendency toward Bolshevism in some form, either closely following the original Russian model or developing milder symptoms, is found in every nation of the earth, and this evil force is a far greater menace to the perpetuity of democratic institutions than the average citizen imagines. It is rampant in Germany. It is powerful in France. It is untiringly at work in Italy. Its activity in Great Britain is pronounced.

He who thinks we do not face this great menace at our very doors is not a truly wide-awake American. He is a sleeping sentinel at the post of duty.

The danger in America to which I refer does not come, in the main, from the un-American elements in our population who have planned and executed bomb explosions and similar manifestations of the anarchists. That element is, unfortunately, too large, and has been given entirely too much latitude in the past. But these men can be located by the authorities and placed where they shall be harmless.

But there is a determined movement throughout the land to assume control of all the functions of government in behalf of a class. They would make this a class government committed to the enactment of class legislation.

But I protest against any class organization in America being taken into official partnership with the Government of the United States, such as has prevailed for the last few years in Washington, and especially since our entrance into the war. We have come to the parting of the ways.

To Americans as a whole let me say: Abhor and resent class organization which seeks to control government in the interest of that class. In self-defense you may be compelled to organize to protect yourselves from a state of affairs which means vas-

salage for you and all those not subservient to the leaders of the movement to which I refer.

The people of Great Britain have just faced a grueling experience of a like character, and they have come off victors in the struggle which ensued. The very foundations of society, of government, were threatened. Only by a hair's breadth was a revolution averted.

The railway men made demands which could not be recognized. As in the case of the threatened coal strike, the conflict in England was started precipitately and in violation of an agreement. One authority described it as "wanton war on society" and "an effort to starve the country into submission," "an unparalleled attempt to blackmail the nation."

Another authority said, "Whatever is done for the railway men must come out of the pockets of the people. Everyone should be paid a fair rate, but you can not continually pay men for what they do not do. In the present case they are demanding to be masters and to determine the fate not only of the Government but of the whole community."

Speaking last February, when the miners of Great Britain threatened to strike, Lloyd-George denounced in Parliament "demands which are put forward not to obtain fair conditions, but to overthrow the existing order, to destroy the Government," and declared that "the nation must fight Prussianism in the industrial world exactly as we fought it on the continent of Europe."

Speaking two or three weeks ago at the reception to Field Marshal Allenby, at the Mansion House, the British premier employed almost the same language when referring to the strike of the railway men. He said:

> Prussianism in the industrial and economic world must not prevail. Great Britain has once more rendered a deep and lasting service to real freedom by defeating an effort to hold up the community and strangle it into submission. The nation means to be strong, firm, and just, but always master.

We can not afford to temporize or compromise with the forces of evil which are threatening to undermine the foundations of society and destroy the fundamental methods of our Government. We can not afford to submit to any partnership with a class. We must not allow any element or organization to assume any of the functions of government or to dictate to either Congress or the Executive.

There has been entirely too much of this in the past. Public men have shivered and shaken in their boots when agitators have issued their orders, and, in innumerable instances, have ignored their own sense of duty because of a fear of consequences. The time has now come for every red-blooded American to stand up and be counted.

So far as concerns this threatened strike of the bituminous coal miners, there is only one way to avert it. It can not be done by Executive decree nor can any action of Congress prevent the consummation of the conspiracy.

Public opinion, however, may bring the leaders of the movement to their senses and thus the calamity may be averted. To this end it is hoped that the patriotic newspapers of the country will at once speak, and in no uncertain terms. To a large extent the matter is in their hands. Already many of them have denounced the proposed strike. The press should not wait until the strike is upon us and the disaster at our gates before speaking.

Recently, following the inexcusable strike of the Boston police force, the papers of that city, almost without exception, denounced the action of the strikers in unmeasured terms. On this point the Springfield Union said editorially:

> Our only criticism of these sound observations is that something in similar vein was not said when the policemen were most in need of advice and when Commissioner Curtis should have received the uncompromising support of public opinion. It was too long left to the Transcript alone to express with courage and clear understanding the honest thought of Boston and to uphold the correct public policy for which the police commission was contending.

Concerning this whole question the Philadelphia North American, which has always been a friend of organized labor and a champion of Mr. Gompers, has recently said editorially:

> There is a perceptible and growing public antagonism to organized labor. The condition is known in every newspaper office in the country, but the aggressive and dictatorial attitude of union labor, upon which most newspapers must depend, has made publishers cautious in discussing labor problems. At the present time, however, when conflicts in industry are multiplying, the newspaper which resorts to silence or evasion fails in its duty to the public and does a distinct disservice to labor itself.

These are brave words and as true as they are brave.

It is a satisfaction to note that many other leading newspapers of the United States are denouncing in vigorous terms the attempts of certain unions to sandbag the country. The New York World has recently published several powerful editorials which contain words of warning to misguided labor leaders. In its issue of October 9 it said:

> Before organized labor can hope to make further progress anywhere it must put its own house in order. The whole structure of collective bargaining rests upon the principle of collective responsibility and collective good faith. Once these are destroyed nothing remains.

While taking a firm stand itself editorially upon this supreme question, the World justly calls upon Government officials to be equally positive and determined in upholding popular rights and in demanding a proper consideration of the public welfare at the hands of labor leaders.

The World quotes from the speech of Secretary Wilson in opening the sessions of the industrial congress, who said:

> We have found ways of regulating all the other relations of mankind. Surely human intelligence can devise some more acceptable method of adjusting the relationship between employer and employee.

And adds:

> It might, but it does not, and it never will until the Government, under the pressure of public sentiment, takes the initiative and asserts some of the power that is inherent in it.

The press of the country should make it clear to these misguided men of the United Mine Workers that the people of America will never permit this burden to be saddled upon them, and that they will never submit to any such demands as they have made—demands which threaten the very foundations of our democratic institutions. This country is not ready to be dictated to by a horde of aliens in no sense Americanized nor in sympathy with our democratic institutions.

In this whole labor controversy one fact should be clearly borne in mind. We are not chiefly concerned regarding the interests of capitalists, the employers, the operators. Nor are we giving undue consideration to the welfare of the individual worker, the miner, or other laborer who is disposed to strike. But we are greatly interested in the material welfare of the vast body of our people, the middlemen, so to speak, the consumers—in other words, the men who "pay the freight"—upon whom falls the great burden resulting from the continual increase in wages. These men know perfectly well that this increase must be made up by an increase in commodity prices, and that it is the individual consumer who foots the bill in the final analysis. These men, nine-tenths of our population—one hundred millions—are disgusted, are incensed with the whole proposition, and are determined that the arbitrary demands imposing an unjust and intolerable burden on them shall not succeed.

A bit of verse in a local paper, the Washington Evening Star, properly diagnoses the situation, as follows:

THE PUBLIC.

Says capital to labor,
"We will talk it over, neighbor,
And the public shall admire the wisdom deep."
Says labor, "I am willing,
For my mind I have been filling
With some information far too good to keep."

They argued and expounded,
And each topic they surrounded
With a vast and indefatigable din.
Here and there they grabbed a missile
Silencing the factory whistle,
And the public murmured, "Where do I come in?"

Then the discord rising thickly
Turning the harmony right quickly
As the two exclaimed in a convincing way,
"Don't feel nervous or dejected,
You shall never be neglected—
You shall be the audience who has to pay."

The New York World phrases the same idea in stern prose, when it declares, editorially:

> There are three parties to every strike, not two. The third party is the general public, whose rights and whose welfare are trampled under foot, which pays the ultimate cost of the conflict, and in addition is saddled with the expense of maintaining some semblance of law and order between the belligerents.

That is the situation in a nutshell. The great third party is the chief sufferer in these strikes.

The total cost of the British railway strikes is estimated at a quarter of a billion dollars. What an enormous loss these misguided men have inflicted upon their country, already suffering from underproduction and a stupendous war debt! They should profit in a single instance, at least, from the policy of their late German antagonists, who are now organizing and putting into force a 10-hour day program, in order to force production to a maximum limit, and thus hasten the day of liberation from the burdens and penalties resulting from war conditions.

We are threatened with an experience in this country similar to that of England. If all the strikes which scheming malcontents, largely of alien origin, are now hatching in the United States shall materialize, the loss in production and otherwise is likely to amount to billions of dollars. This, in view of the burdens we are already carrying, is piling Pelion upon Ossa to an unendurable degree. Those guilty of this dastardly act

are in no sense patriotic American citizens, nor should they be treated as such. Whatever they may be nominally, they are in spirit outlanders and enemies of democracy, and are deserving the contempt of all true patriots.

Throughout this whole controversy one compelling question looms up, overshadowing all others. Lloyd-George set it forth in the splendid words which I have already quoted, and which I shall quote again, paraphrased to fit the occasion:

Prussianism in the industrial and economic world must not prevail. The United States will render a deep and lasting service to real freedom by defeating any effort to hold up the community and strangle it into submission. The Nation means to be strong, firm, and just, but always master.

I call upon all patriotic Americans, in public life and out, to adhere to that principle with the utmost rigidity, and not seek to enter into any "entangling alliances" with forces whose primary concern is not the public welfare, forces seeking to advance causes antagonistic to the well-being of the people as a whole.

That citizen who seeks to advance the interests of himself and associates at the expense of the general public is not a patriotic citizen, or one to whom any considerable deference should be paid in the adjustment of economic or other problems. Sovietism means class rule. We can not permit that in America and still preserve our democratic institutions.

Labor unionism should be upheld for one primary principle, to obtain and maintain justice for the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow; but when the power of organization is employed to impose injustice against all other classes of society, the law of the land should be invoked to prevent the abuse of such power, or laws enacted that will do this.

When labor defies law and order through the power of its union it is sounding its own death knell and digging its own grave.

There are thousands of law-abiding citizens members of these unions, men of family, self-respecting citizens, who are satisfied with existing conditions, who do not desire to strike, but wish to continue at work. The terrorism spread by the radicals and lawless in these unions creates fear for the safety of their homes, their wives, and their children, and, indeed, for their own lives.

Is it not the Government's duty to throw around such in this land the strong protecting arm of the law, so that the liberty we all boast of may continue to exist?

The best thought of this Nation should always be expended in the interest of the man who works with his hands. He is the bone and sinew of the land. Otherwise the history of labor, indeed, would be the history of slavery. But in this land of opportunity labor has risen to a higher degree than in any other, but if, through improper influence and disloyal leadership, the labor group attempt to place its fetters upon an unoffending public, it must be dealt with accordingly.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 4, after line 9, to insert:

COURTHOUSE.

For the care and protection of the courthouse of the District of Columbia, under the direction of the United States marshal of the District of Columbia, namely: Ten charwomen, at $240 each per annum, from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive, $1,600, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I hope the Senator will not do that. We should like to get through this bill by 2 o'clock, if possible.

Mr. KING. There are some Senators absent who are interested in some of the provisions of the bill and they desire to be advised.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Harding	New	Simmons
Brandegee	Harris	Newberry	Smith, Ariz.
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Nugent	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Smoot
Curtis	Kendrick	Owen	Spencer
Dial	Kenyon	Page	Sutherland
Dillingham	Keyes	Penrose	Swanson
Elkins	King	Phelan	Thomas
Fall	Kirby	Phipps	Townsend
Fernald	La Follette	Pittman	Trammell
France	Lenroot	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Gay	McCormick	Sheppard	Warren
Gronna	McCumber	Sherman	Watson
Hale	McKellar	Shields	Wolcott

Mr. KING. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 16, to insert:

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL AND LYING-IN ASYLUM.

Columbia Hospital and Lying-in Asylum: For general repairs and for additional construction, including labor and material for each and every item connected therewith, $2,900.

One-half of the foregoing amounts to meet deficiencies in appropriations on account of the District of Columbia shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and one-half from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Vocational rehabilitation: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, $5,000,000: *Provided*, That the salary limitations prescribed by the item of appropriation for vocational rehabilitation contained in the sundry civil act, approved July 19, 1919, shall apply to the appropriation hereby made.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think that may be deemed an independent amendment from that which follows. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what is the occasion for this very large appropriation, the greater part of which, doubtless, will go to the personal expenses of employees of the Vocational Board. I want to say to the Senator that I have had many complaints about the lack of efficiency and the extravagance of the Vocational Board, and it seems that the charge of extravagance is supported if an additional $5,000,000 is now asked for. There has been a desire upon the part of Congress to appropriate whatever was needed by the soldiers and sailors for their rehabilitation and for vocational training, but there has been a feeling that the administration of the fund created for such purpose has been inefficient and wasteful.

Mr. WARREN. To what board does the Senator allude?

Mr. KING. The Federal Board for Vocational Education having to do with the vocational rehabilitation of soldiers.

Mr. WARREN. There are two different matters involved. The appropriation here is $5,000,000, and is made upon the basis of an estimate that it will take to carry on the work to the end of the fiscal year about $19,000,000. This will carry them along only until some time in the early part of the next session, when we shall be called upon again to appropriate for this purpose.

The Senator knows—or if he does not I shall tell him—that I was opposed to as liberal treatment as we originally provided for this board, not that I wished to oppose the rehabilitation of the wounded soldiers, because I heartily approve of that work, but I believed that they were traveling with too much steam on and with too many employees at too large salaries. If I remember aright, we had one bill vetoed because we did not provide properly, as it was thought, and we met opposition on the floor and we met some opposition in conference, but finally we put in an appropriation of about $14,000,000.

In the military bill, as I recall, there were $6,000,000 provided to take care of those in the Army. This item of $5,000,000 in this deficiency bill is to take care of soldiers that have been discharged from the Army who have been injured and now, succeeding demobilization, are applying to the board in large numbers. It is expected there will be very heavy expenses for about eight or nine months, as nine months is the usual term during which the men are under instruction. This item of $5,000,000 is appropriated, however, with strict adherence to what has already been settled upon by the Senate and by the House as to what salaries shall be paid and how many employees there may be.

I am sorry the Senator has not examined the report, for it contains a list of all the employees and the compensation received by them and each of them.

Mr. KING. I have not seen the report, but I shall be very glad to examine it. I should like to ask the Senator whether this amount is in addition to the appropriation which was carried in the last appropriation bill?

Mr. WARREN. It is in addition to about $14,000,000 that was appropriated. It will take, however, to carry the work through the present year from $34,000,000 to $40,000,000. This will be the heavy year, as we have reason to expect. More and more men are applying every day, and I believe the peak of the load will be reached toward the end of the year.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator indicate what part of this $5,000,000 goes for salaries of the multitude of employees who are connected with this board and the board which will be undoubtedly attached to it within a short time?

Mr. WARREN. At the time we organized this institution and provided the compensation, or very soon thereafter, the salaries were a trifle less than $1,000,000. As I recall now—I can not always remember the exact figures—we were able to reduce the amount paid for salaries to about $825,000. I should have to look at the figures to give the Senator the exact amount. The matter was before the committee and was considered by it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there is no question that whatever amount is required for the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers we ought gladly to appropriate.

Mr. WARREN. The money appropriated under this bill can not be used for any other purpose except to provide the machinery with which to carry on the work; that is, for the teachers and, of course, for rental to some extent, because they have branches in various States. There is one in Denver that takes care of soldiers from Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Colorado.

There the highest salary is one man at $3,750, one at $3,500, two at $3,000, three at $2,750, three at $2,500, and seven at $2,400. That is the force of teachers or members of the staff. The clerical personnel consists of clerks at $2,300, $2,250, $2,200, $2,100, $2,000, and so on down, employees and teachers, aggregating 72 individuals. As I say, they care for the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. There is a rather larger personnel than in most of these establishments.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will permit me, I was about to observe a moment ago when the Senator interrupted me, that no Senator would refuse to appropriate whatever is required for the proper protection of the soldiers and for their rehabilitation, but the trouble is—and that complaint is constantly being made—that millions of dollars of appropriations made for the soldiers will be consumed in salaries, in needless expenditures made by extravagant and in some instances incompetent officials; and this appropriation, I think, is a partial justification of the view that there is extravagance and waste upon the part of the Vocational Board. There is a disposition to give positions to a number of broken-down individuals and to create too many positions. The overhead expenses are too great and too much of the appropriations made for the soldiers is expended in salaries, traveling expenses, and so forth. There is too large a personnel in the service of the Government in this particular work, as there is in so many other agencies and departments of the Government.

Mr. WARREN. The total number of employees of every nature is 2,529. Out of a requirement here of $34,000,000 and a little over, the salaries of the employees—that is, what they have expended and what they will expend during the year—would be three million forty-four thousand and some odd dollars.

Mr. KING. It seems to me an outrage that such a large part of the appropriation should be utilized for the expenses of administration. It merely illustrates that even where the Government undertakes the care and education of boys who have served their country in a heroic and splendid manner there are a lot of individuals who fasten themselves upon the Government and consume a large part of the amounts appropriated by Congress for such praiseworthy and laudable purposes. When the question of vocational training of soldiers was before the Senate for consideration at the last session of Congress it was apparent from the record before us that the expense of administration was wasteful, and that extravagance was justly charged against those in control of its activities.

Mr. WARREN. I want to say to the Senator, in answer to his inquiries, that the board started with 91 of these wounded soldiers. The number in September, prior to the 1st of October, was 29,667, and there are more who have applied and who are to be taken in. I do not understand that they expect to increase the salaries—in fact, they can not increase the salaries, because there is an inhibition against that in the former legislation, which is repeated here—but they expect that those soldier students will run probably to 30,000 and possibly more, and then from that time the number will recede; perhaps not in the same proportion as the number increased, but very nearly the same, as they are entitled under their present plan to about nine months each.

Mr. KING. I will say to the chairman of the committee that a number of letters which I have received from persons who have been importuned to accept the benefits of this act indicate that there is a determined plan upon the part of some of those connected with this board to make as great a showing as possible, and for that purpose and to that end they have solicited men who did not care to take advantage of the provisions of the act and who were not entitled to it, because their ailments were so unimportant as to not bring them under the provisions of the act, and complaints have been made that efforts were being put forth to induce people to claim benefits under this act when they were not entitled thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 5, after line 15, to insert:

The Secretary of War shall have authority to transfer to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, without compensation therefor, certain surplus machine tools and other equipment of the approximate value of $250,000 belonging to the War Department and now in possession of the Federal board and being used by that board as equipment in schools for vocational education controlled by the board. Property so transferred shall be dropped from the records of the War Department on the filing with the War Department of an itemized receipt for the articles thus transferred. The Federal Board for Vocational Education shall annually report to Congress the disposition and use of the articles the transfer of which is herein authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of State," on page 7, line 9, after "1920," to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

Salaries: For additional officers and employees in the Department of State during the fiscal year 1920, $200,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceding $4,500 per annum.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, in reference to that item the estimate made was for an appropriation of $300,000 for the department. It appears that the House only allowed $100,000, and the Senate committee has increased that amount to $200,000. The estimate also requested an appropriation of $242,500 additional for additional personnel for the department.

I have not only had my attention called to this matter by certain officials of the State Department, but I have had the necessity for these appropriations very seriously impressed upon me within the last two months and a half because of certain official business which I have been transacting upon two different committees, in the transaction of which I have been thrown very intimately with the State Department; and I may say that in both instances I have been cooperating, as the representative of one of the Senate committees, with the officials and with the personnel of the State Department. If the committee understood, as I think I more or less understand, the necessity for the appropriations which were asked in this estimate, I can not conceive that there would be any hesitation whatsoever in granting the appropriations.

I have read the testimony of the Secretary and others who appeared before the committee with reference to these items. As the presiding officer and the Members of the Senate know, the Secretary of State has been absent from this country for quite a period, and I am confident that he did not understand the details of the estimates, but simply the requirements of the service in general. I talked this matter over with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am making this statement at his request.

I think that to cut the appropriation to $200,000 and to leave out the appropriation for extra employees would be practically suicidal. The State Department is now taking over the business under peace conditions, and a large portion of that business has been transferred to the State Department from the War Departments and other departments of the Government. The report accompanying the estimate is a very instructive one, and from my personal knowledge and personal information I think I can say without hesitation that if the appropriations requested here are not made the State Department will be practically compelled to suspend business.

The Congress provided for the appointment of something like 411 additional temporary employees and made appropriations for them. These additional employees have been at work, and the service has broken down; that is, they have not been able recently to keep up with the business. If this appropriation is not allowed, or any part of it is cut off—in other words, if the $300,000 is not allowed—the force will be reduced from 411 to 186, and instead of being reduced it needs to be very largely increased. To cut it down by any amount from the estimate requested in this particular item of $300,000 means so to cripple the service that it would be impossible for the State Department to perform that duty which it is necessary to have performed by some department.

I want to call attention to the report from the Secretary of State made on June 5, 1919, in submitting the estimate:

There are now 411 persons temporarily employed at an annual rate of expenditure of $449,281.68. To meet the anticipated deficiency in the existing appropriation an item has already been inserted in the pending deficiency bill to carry the existing personnel to June 30, 1919.

Therefore, unless Congress shall take prompt action and provide an additional amount for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next, it will be necessary to reduce the temporary force 55 per cent, or from 411 to 186 persons. The result will be that the department will be hopelessly handicapped and impotent to perform the important duties with which it is charged.

In a later part of the report the Secretary sympathizes with the Congress in its desire to curtail expenses, and states that he has no purpose at all to fix permanently in the service the 411 temporary employees, but that at the present time in the particular division in which they are employed the necessity exists for the continued employment of these 411 temporary employees, and that at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. WARREN. Has the Senator his amendment ready?

Mr. FALL. I move to strike out "200" and insert "300," making it "$300,000"; and I move an additional appropriation to be inserted immedately following this amendment of $242,500 for additional officers to aid in important drafting work. I will present the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. I know what it is.

Mr. FALL. It calls for $242,500.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to make a few observations to see whether the Senator wanted to do just that. I appreciate quite fully the situation, and I wish to say to the Senator that in the last deficiency appropriation act the committee did not give, in fact, anywhere near what the State Department wanted. I am aware of the extra work that comes in the clean-up in relations with foreign countries following the war.

Under the rules of the Senate, we have provided that hereafter the Diplomatic appropriation bill shall go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, presided over, as Senators know, by the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]; but the deficiencies will continue, probably, to go to the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely within the estimates in his proposal. What occurred to the committee on the House side, I think, was that they did not want to create these statutory places in a deficiency bill, and I think it is a question of procedure. Therefore they put in one hundred thousand, by which they sought to cover the two items of three hundred thousand and two hundred and forty-two thousand five hundred. The question arises whether, in view of the attitude of the House, you want to put in two amendments to operate that way, or to offer one amendment covering the two, following the same procedure as that followed by the House, and increase the amount accordingly.

Mr. FALL. The difficulty is, Mr. President, that the appropriation of $300,000 asked is under the act of March 1, 1919, volume 40, page 1224, section 1. The appropriation asked is to cover the number of employees provided under that act, and the appropriation necessary for that particular purpose is $300,000.

The department states, and I know that they are correct in it, that it is necessary to give them an additional appropriation for the appointment of extra assistants in what they call generally the drafting department. The business in that department is increasing so enormously that it is entirely congested. The report of the department states that—

The Consular Service, involving a personnel of more than 2,000, and appropriations of more than $5,000,000 for the next fiscal year, is being administered by a director who has to assist him only two men receiving salaries greater than $1,800, and only three receiving as much as $1,800. The Diplomatic Service is being administered by the Assistant Secretary with little help other than his confidential clerk. The Russian division, specializing upon European and Asiatic Russia, one of the enormous political and commercial fields in the world, is administered by a chief and a few clerks. There ought to be at least five or six high-grade specialists in that division, men upon whose judgment the Secretary of State could rely. The result of this condition is that officers in responsible charge are compelled constantly to work overtime, and give their nights, Sundays, and holidays to their tasks.

Mr. President, that was one of the matters which was brought to my personal attention. As the chairman of one of the subcommittees of the Foreign Relations Committee, I myself have been at work with representatives of the State Department as late as 1 o'clock in the morning and half the day on Sundays; I have had my morning hours taken up; and I know that these representatives, in addition to their regular work at their desks, have been compelled to work overtime, as much as 18 to 20 hours out of the 24, because of the congestion. One of our ministers to a foreign country is doing work here which should be handled by solicitors and other expert officers in the department. I know that in one matter alone he is doing work that should be done by three or four on the regular staff in the office, and he has been retained here because it was impossible to detail anyone else to the work. The State Department simply have not the personnel. They want some additional help.

This report further states:

The Index Bureau, which receives and dispatches correspondence by mail and telegraph, employs 134 clerks, paid from the fund under consideration.

I only call attention to this to show how the work in the department has increased. If the $300,000 is not given for this particular work to which it is to be devoted, that force will be reduced from 134 to 60, instead of being increased.

The report further states:

During the month of May it received and sent out more than 1,800 mail communications a day, and in addition an average of 337 telegrams each day.

You will find on an examination, so I am told, that the work has increased from prewar times by from 200 to 500 per cent in each one of these bureaus, and now it is increasing by leaps and bounds as the peace settlement comes around, and the work which has formerly been handled by other departments devolves entirely upon the State Department.

They therefore have asked, in addition to the $300,000, for $242,500 for additional officers to aid in important drafting work. That does not mean drawing plans, Mr. President; it does not mean map making and work of that kind. It means getting up the diplomatic documents and notes, and handling work of that character, particularly work in the solicitor's department.

The Secretary refers, just incidentally, in his testimony to one of the difficulties, and I happened to be brought face to face with that myself. One of the experts of the department, who has not yet been replaced, who took up certain work with the committee at the request of the Secretary of State, who transacted a portion of that work and assisted in getting it started, failed to appear. My information was, upon asking the question, that he had been getting $3,500 a year, and he stepped out into private employment at $15,000. As the Secretary says, the difficulty is that you get a man at $3,500, $4,000, or $4,500 a year who is capable of transacting the very important business devolving upon him as solicitor or assistant solicitor or in the drafting department generally, and private individuals, exporting firms or importing firms, or those doing business with foreign countries are on the watch out for a competent man, and when they find him in the State Department they make it so interesting to him that he can not remain in the State Department at the salaries which we pay.

Mr. President, the amount which is asked here, $242,000, is for additional officers, as follows:

Eleven at $4,500 each; 25 at $4,000 each; 22 at $3,500 each; 2 at $3,000 each; and 4 at $2,500 each, to be appointed by the Secretary of State, all of whom may be appointed as chief of division of Far Eastern Division, Latin-American Division, Near Eastern Division, Division of Western European Affairs, or upon other work in connection with the foreign relations—

Under the act of March 1, 1919, the same act.

The Chief of the Division of Latin-American Affairs of the United States State Department draws the munificent salary of $4,500. For anything like the same amount of work any commercial establishment or any banking establishment in the United States would not think of offering a competent man less than $25,000 per annum, but in the State Department he can receive only $4,500. The consequence is that it is necessary to secure an inferior man or to appeal to the patriotism of some man who can afford to live on a salary of $4,500 because he has some additional revenue on the side. Yet they are not asking for an increase of salaries, but simply that they may be allowed an increase in the personnel.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, what the Senator from New Mexico says is entirely correct. The amendment is within the estimates. However, the estimates are made for 12 months, and, of course, we would have to confine the deficiency bill to the balance of the present fiscal year, which would be 8 months instead of 12 months.

Mr. FALL. That would be approximately three-quarters of the amount asked.

Mr. WARREN. It would be about $166,000.

Mr. FALL. Very well. If the Senator will allow it to go in at that figure, I will be willing to agree to it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I want to say a single word in support of what the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has said. The Senator in charge of the bill has accepted the amendment; so I do not wish to consume time.

It is a matter of the utmost importance that the State Department should have money to the amount asked for. I can testify to the need of it from my knowledge of the work with which the committee has been brought in contact. The work is now so congested that it is extremely difficult to get anything done, and the proposed reduction of the House would absolutely cripple the department.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has referred to some of the duties of the subcommittee of which he is chairman, with which I am familiar. In order to get that work done, in order to get the correspondence with the country with which we were in negotiation completed, the Senator from New Mexico and some of the principal officers of the State Depart-

ment had to work after midnight and far into the night, night after night, in the simple work of drafting and preparing the dispatches that were necessary. That ought not to be. We ought to have a sufficient force there. It is not an extravagant department, and I am extremely anxious, owing to my experience on the committee and from what I know of the situation, that these increases shall be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the amendment of the committee, changing the amount from $100,000 to $300,000.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FALL. Now, let the vote be taken on the additional amendment to the amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the additional amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The SECRETARY. Add to the amendment the following:

Additional officers to aid in important drafting work, as follows: Eleven at $4,500 each, 25 at $4,000 each, 22 at $3,500 each, 2 at $3,000 each, 4 at $2,500 each, to be appointed by the Secretary of State, all of whom may be employed as chief of division of Far Eastern Division, Latin-American Division, Near Eastern Division, Division of Western European Affairs, or upon other work in connection with the foreign relations, $161,666.67.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign intercourse," on page 7, after line 12, to insert:

Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Belgium: Toward the payment of the salary of the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Belgium as authorized by public resolution No. 16, approved September 29, 1919, at the rate of $5,500 per annum, from September 30, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive, $4,140.28, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $12,000 for the salary of an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Belgium for the fiscal year 1920, appropriated in the Diplomatic and Consular act approved March 4, 1919, is hereby made available to be applied to the salary of the ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Belgium.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 4, after the word "peace," to strike out "$388,000" and insert "$588,000," so as to make the clause read:

To reimburse the appropriation "Emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, fiscal year 1920," on account of allotments made therefrom for expenses of the American mission to negotiate peace, $588,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department," subhead "Office of the Secretary," on page 8, line 11, after the word "from," to strike out "October" and insert "November," and in line 14, after the words "in all," to strike out "$7,650" and insert "$6,800.02," so as to make the clause read:

Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants: For additional employees from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Clerks—1 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 2 of class 1; in all, $6,800.02.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Auditor for Treasury Department," on page 8, line 16, after the word "from," to strike out "October" and insert "November," and in line 21, after the words "in all," to strike out "$29,535" and insert "$26,253.42," so as to make the clause read:

For additional employees from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Clerks—7 of class 1, 13 at $1,000 each; 5 calculating-machine operators (nonapportioned) at $1,200 each; check assorters (nonapportioned)—4 at $720 each, 13 at $700 each; in all, $26,253.42.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Auditor for Navy Department," on page 8, line 23, after the word "from," to strike out "October" and insert "November," and on page 9, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "$46,890" and insert "$41,680.10," so as to make the clause read:

For additional employees from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Clerks—10 of class 4, 10 of class 3, 10 of class 2, 10 of class 1; assistant messenger at $720; 2 laborers at $660 each; messenger boy at $480; in all, $41,680.10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office Auditor for State and Other Departments," on page 9, line 4, after the word "from," to strike out "October" and insert "November"; and in line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "$5,850" and insert "$5,200.02," so as to make the clause read:

For additional employees from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Clerks—one of class 4, two of class 3, two of class 2; in all, $5,200.02.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Comptroller of the Currency," on page 9, line 15, after the word "from," to strike out "October" and insert "November," and in line 16, after the word "inclusive," to strike out "$7,500" and insert "$6,666.70," so as to make the clause read:

National currency (reimbursable): For 10 money counters at the rate of $1,000 each per annum from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, $6,666.70.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public buildings," on page 10, after line 8, to insert:

Repairs and preservation: The provision for the limitation of $16,000 for the Treasury, Treasury Annex, Arlington, Liberty Loan, Butler, Winder, and Auditors Buildings in the District of Columbia, expendable from the appropriation of $800,000 contained in the sundry civil act approved July 19, 1919, is hereby extended so that not exceeding $21,000 may be expended for repairs to those buildings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 15, to insert:

Mount Olive, N. C., post office: For continuation (site), $2,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 17, to insert:

Nashville, Tenn., rent of buildings: For additional for rent of temporary quarters for the accommodation of Government officials, and moving expenses incident thereto, $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 21, to insert:

Newport, R. I., rent of buildings: For additional for rent of temporary quarters for the accommodation of Government officials, and moving expenses incident thereto, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 11, to insert:

Cape Charles, Va., quarantine station: For wharf, bulkhead, breakwater, and dredging of channel, $125,000: *Provided*, That all work authorized in this paragraph shall be performed under the supervision and direction of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Secret Service Division," on page 12, line 1, after the words "United States," to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$75,000," and in line 7, after the word "courts," to insert:

Provided further, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a compensation greater than that allowed by law except not exceeding three persons who may be paid not exceeding $12 per day.

So as to make the clause read:

Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes: For expenses incurred under the authority or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in detecting, arresting, and delivering into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction dealers and pretended dealers in counterfeit money and persons engaged in counterfeiting Treasury notes, bonds, national-bank notes, and other securities of the United States and of foreign Governments, as well as the coins of the United States and of foreign Governments, and other felonies committed against the laws of the United States relating to the pay and bounty laws, and for the enforcement of section 18 of the War Finance Corporation act; hire and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for no other purpose whatever, except in the protection of the person of the President and the members of his immediate family and of the person chosen to be President of the United States, $75,000: *Provided further*, That no part of this amount be used in defraying the expenses of any person subpœnaed by the United States courts to attend any trial before a United States court or preliminary examination before any United States commissioner, which expenses shall be paid from the appropriation for "Fees of witnesses, United States courts": *Provided further*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a compensation greater than that allowed by law except not exceeding three persons who may be paid not exceeding $12 per day.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Treasurer," on page 12, after line 19, to insert:

National currency (reimbursable): For additional employees in redeeming Federal reserve and national currency, to be reimbursed by the Federal reserve and national banks, for the period November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Assistant superintendent, at $3,000; chief of money section, at $2,750; chief of accounting section, at $2,750; clerks—3 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 7 of class 2; expert counters—50 at $1,100 each, 60 at $1,000 each, 62 at $900 each; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 2 assistant messengers, at $720 each; 1 messenger boy, at $480; 3 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $136,813.94.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of War Risk Insurance," on page 13, line 22, after the word "abroad," to insert "advertising, $1,000,000"; in line 23, after "$75,000," to insert "addressograph supplies, $161,536"; and

on page 14, line 4, after the words "in all," to strike out "$4,701,640" and insert "$5,863,176," so as to make the clause read:

For expenses of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as authorized by law: For salaries of the director and commissioners, and of such deputies, assistants, accountants, experts, clerks, and other employees in the District of Columbia, as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary, $4,000,000; stationery and minor office supplies, $550,000; miscellaneous expenses, including telephones, telegrams, freight, express, foreign postage, not exceeding $100 for street car fares, not exceeding $500 for law books, books of reference, and periodicals, $60,000; not to exceed $800,000 of the appropriation for "salaries and expenses of employees engaged in field investigations and expenses of branch offices, fiscal year 1920," is made available for printing and binding, to be done at the Government Printing Office, and necessary printing of forms, etc., for use abroad may be done abroad; advertising, $1,000,000; furniture, equipment, and supplies, $75,000; addressograph supplies, $161,536; traveling expenses (exclusive of field investigations), $10,000; purchase, maintenance, and repair of a motor-propelled passenger vehicle, $1,000; for payment to the National Museum on account of repairs and other expenses made necessary by the occupancy of that building by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, $5,640; in all, $5,863,176: *Provided*, That all employees appropriated for by this paragraph shall be engaged exclusively on the work of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance during the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I reserve a point of order against this amendment until the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] returns to the Chamber. I ask that it be passed over until his return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 8, to insert:

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General shall formulate and promulgate such regulations as will enable persons insured under the provisions of the war-risk insurance act to make payments of premiums at such post offices or branches or stations of post offices as they may designate or to any city letter carrier or rural carrier while on duty. The Post Office Department is hereby authorized and directed to receive sums so tendered in payment of such premiums, and to receive and transmit to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance applications for the reinstatement of lapsed insurance.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also reserve a point of order against the amendment just read on page 14, lines 9 to 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

Mr. WARREN. It was passed over with the other, I understood. The Senator reserves a point of order against it?

Mr. McKELLAR. All right; I reserve a point of order, especially to lines 9 to 19 on page 14, until the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] comes back.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 19, to insert:

COAST GUARD.

For all purposes of the appropriation mentioned under the following heading in sundry civil act approved July 19, 1919: For telephone lines and their maintenance, $31,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 23, to insert:

CUSTOMS SERVICE.

For construction and installation of special automatic and recording scales for weighing merchandise, etc., in connection with imports at the various ports of entry under direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, $55,000; and the unexpended balance of the appropriation for these purposes for the fiscal year 1919 is hereby appropriated and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "American Printing House for the Blind," on page 15, line 10, after "$30,000," to insert:

Provided, That two copies of each of the publications printed by the American Printing House for the Blind shall be furnished free of charge to the National Library for the Blind located at 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

So as to make the clause read:

To enable the American Printing House for the Blind more adequately to provide books and apparatus for the education of the blind in accordance with the provisions of the act approved August 4, 1919, $30,000: *Provided*, That two copies of each of the publications printed by the American Printing House for the Blind shall be furnished free of charge to the National Library for the Blind located at 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 15, to insert:

MISCELLANEOUS.

Credit in the accounts of C. G. Duganne: The accounting officers of the Treasury Department are hereby authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of C. G. Duganne, formerly disbursing officer, United States Reclamation Service, Denver, Colo., the sum of $147, representing amount paid by him to the Hendee Manufacturing Co. ($144) and overpayment to M. Killian ($3), the former having been disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department as having been paid in contravention of the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes, and the latter because of the item representing an overpayment to the payee named, $147.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 4, to insert:

The accounting officers of the Treasury are directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Sydney E. Smith, disbursing clerk of the War Department, the sum of $550 expended by him from the appropriation for contingent expenses, War Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, for the removal of certain partitions in the State, War, and Navy Building, and for this purpose the sum of $550 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. WARREN. After line 4, there should be a subhead "Credit in the accounts of Sydney E. Smith."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will make the correction.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department," subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 16, line 21, after the word "gas," to insert ", and heating apparatus for and repairs to buildings (outside of the State, War, and Navy Department Building) occupied by the War Department and its bureaus," so as to make the clause read:

For purchase of professional and scientific books, law books, including their exchange; books of reference, blank books, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, maps; typewriters and adding machines; furniture and repairs to same; carpets, matting, oilcloth, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges, fuel, gas, and heating apparatus for and repairs to buildings (outside of the State, War, and Navy Department Building) occupied by the War Department and its bureaus; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor trucks and motor cycles, and one motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges; street car fares, not exceeding $1,000; and other absolutely necessary expenses, including a per diem allowance not to exceed $4 in lieu of subsistence, $400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Engineer Department," on page 17, after line 13, to insert:

Aqueduct Bridge: For continuing the construction of the bridge authorized in section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the removal of what is now known as the Aqueduct Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for the building of a bridge in place thereof," approved May 18, 1916, one half to be payable out of the Treasury of the United States and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 3, to strike out:

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Ordnance reservation civilian schools: Authority is granted for the expenditure during the fiscal year 1920 of not to exceed $64,000 from appropriations heretofore made for the "purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition for mountain, field, and siege cannon," for the operation and maintenance on Ordnance reservations of schools for children of persons employed thereon, where public schools are not conveniently available for such children, including salaries, supplies, stationery, and industrial work, replacement and repair of books and equipment, and all incidental and necessary expenses in connection therewith.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 19, to insert:

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

For the purchase of bridge across Missouri River connecting the two portions of the United States military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 20, to insert:

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Barracks and quarters: For completing payments to Chamber of Commerce, Anniston, Ala., under contract between said chamber of commerce and the United States dated March 16, 1917, and supplemental agreement thereto dated July 15, 1918, for purchase of the tract of land designated as Camp McClellan, title to which is now vested in the United States, the sum of $13,872, from the remaining unexpended balances of the appropriation "Barracks and quarters, 1918," is reappropriated and made available for said purpose for the fiscal year 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 12, to insert:

AIR SERVICE.

For the activities of the Air Service of the Army during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $15,681,350 is hereby made available from the unexpended balance of funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1918, by the act approved July 24, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Signal Corps of the Army and to purchase, maintain, manufacture, repair, and operate airships and to make appropriations therefor, and for other purposes," and of the funds appropriated for the Air Service for the fiscal year 1919, by the act approved July 9, 1918, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 14, to insert:

NAVY DEPARTMENT.

HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE.

For an amount to increase the compensation of draftsmen and chiefs of sections directing their work, in no case to exceed 33⅓ per cent of the present basic compensation of any such employee, $15,244.45.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 20, to insert:

For an amount to increase the compensation of engravers and chief of section directing their work, in no case to exceed 33⅓ per cent of the present basic compensation of any such employees, $6,444.45.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 22, to insert:

OFFICE OF NAVAL RECORDS AND LIBRARY.

Authority is hereby given to purchase books, periodicals, photographs, maps, and other publications, documents, and pictorial records from the appropriation of $20,000 for the collection or copying and classification, with a view to publication, of the naval records of the war with the Central Powers of Europe, etc., made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 9, to insert:

Not exceeding $15,500 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the continuation for the fiscal years 1913 and 1914 of the publication of an edition of 11,000 copies of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion, which were continued and made available until June 30, 1918, by the act approved September 8, 1916, are further continued and made available until June 30, 1921.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 17, to insert:

RENT.

For the rental of additional quarters for the Navy Department, fiscal year 1919, $175.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 20, to insert:

DAMAGE CLAIMS.

To pay the claims adjusted and determined by the Navy Department under the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1911 on account of damages occasioned to private property by collisions with vessels of the United States Navy, and for which naval vessels were responsible, certified to Congress in Senate Document No. 104 of this session, $6,289.94.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Naval Establishment," on page 23, after line 4, to strike out:

The aggregate of the sums of $7,300,000 and $2,000,000, respectively, of the appropriations "Pay of the Navy" and "Provisions, Navy," contained in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, may be transferred to the following naval appropriations for the fiscal year 1920 in the following amounts, respectively:

"Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," $2,500,000;

"Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," $1,050,000;

"Construction and repair of vessels, Bureau of Construction and Repair," $3,250,000;

"Engineering, Bureau of Steam Engineering," $2,500,000;

In all, $9,300,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be expended upon repairs to any vessel which is not to be retained permanently in the Navy: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress not later than February 1, 1920, a statement showing, for each navy yard and naval station, the total number of employees, by occupations, on December 31, 1919, and the proportion of such employees who are below a fair standard of efficiency.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the committee amendment. The Navy Department asked $18,000,000 for the purposes enumerated in the item stricken out. The Committee on Appropriations of the House refused to approve the recommendations of the Navy Department in that regard, and instead have provided for the transfer of certain funds of the Navy for the purposes covered in the House provision of the bill.

I have carefully examined the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations of both the Senate and the House. It seems to me that this transfer of funds is very necessary. An examination of the hearings would seem to indicate that the money appropriated during the last Congress for the repair and maintenance of naval vessels was insufficient to put them in proper condition; this applies particularly to the larger ships. All of these vessels have been in active service, and many of the dreadnaughts and superdreadnaughts, as well as the torpedo boats, have not been overhauled since the war began. Then, too, Mr. President, the hearings seem to indicate that we have to-day in the navy yards about 15 or 20 per cent fewer men than were employed in the war days. If we allow this transfer we will be able to keep the navy yards at the highest state of efficiency, to keep trained men, men accustomed to Government work, until next spring. The Secretary of the Navy suggests that even with the $9,000,000 provided for in this item he will be compelled to lay off 10 per cent on the 1st of March, 10 per cent more the 1st of April, and 10 per cent more the 1st of May, so that by the 1st of July next we will have gotten down to about 60 per cent of the number of men employed in the navy yards during the war. This number would be about 15 per cent more than before the war and they will be needed in view of our largely increased Navy.

I think perhaps Senators generally appreciate what it means to keep a Government or private plant in its highest state of efficiency, and for men to know that they are to be retained in their employment, particularly when the work is needed. This money is to be used only for the purpose of employing men on ships that are required for immediate service and not on emergency vessels that were brought into Navy for the period of the war. At least every year the machinery, hull, and ordnance of every naval vessel needs overhauling to be kept in the highest state of efficiency.

I believe, Mr. President, that failure to retain the House provision in the bill will prove most unfortunate. It is important, most important. I hope the Senate committee amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course, during the war we had to have thousands of men employed at various points in the Navy and Army and in the War and Navy Departments, and now that the war is over, and since the Navy itself has been cut down to but a fraction of the number of men to man these ships which are still in service, unless we are to begin to cut down the great amount of help that has been employed we shall never get it done. We have appropriated money enough at all times to keep these vessels up. It is true that during the active period of the war they were unable to get men enough to use the money that we appropriated, but they have men enough now and money enough now to bring these ships up on time for the service, and to bring them up even faster than they can man them with the forces to sail them and to arm them.

The only difference is that every department, so far as I can observe—I will not say every department, because the War Department has already reduced its help 38½ per cent—but there seems to be generally in the departments, first, the proposition on the part of the employees to remain forever, and, on the other hand, on the part of the heads of the divisions and bureaus, unfortunately all the way up, that they can not let go. They can not let go now. If we are to get back on a peace basis we have got to make a beginning. The Committee on Appropriations desires to follow the law, desires to keep inside of good, economical business lines; but Congress by frequent acts of legislation which require the appropriation of large amounts of money makes it impossible for the Committee on Appropriations to effect the economies we desire. We have an instance or two on this bill.

Now, in this proposed naval appropriation it is simply a matter of whether we shall keep a great horde of men to repair these ships within the next five or six months, or whether we shall repair them as fast as we may. They are in the service; we have more in the service now than we can man; vessels fit for service are tied up because the Government has not the men to man them. I think the amendment of the committee ought to be sustained.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I want to read from the hearings of the committee the testimony of Admiral McKean on this point:

Admiral McKEAN. The necessity for the appropriation, as the Secretary has explained, is for fitting the fighting ships. We had, as you know, all of our ships busily employed in training, in convoy work, and two divisions abroad. They were kept working for 24 hours a day. They were kept away from the navy yards just as long as they could run, and when sent to the yards the repairs made were just sufficient to enable them to go ahead on the next trip. The result has been not the normal amount of repairs, but they have been going down, going down, going down, until some of them stopped, and we had to take them off of the convoy of troops.

I have fallen in with the divisions that were over on the other side with the British fleet, where they were kept on from four to eight hours' notice all the time to get under way. Those officers and men worked very hard and very conscientiously in their efforts to keep the ships fit during that time, and when they came back they were very proud of their success in keeping the ships operating up to high efficiency and high speeds. Whenever they were called for they went. They came back and told us that self-maintenance, which we had preached as a theory in the Navy Department, was all right. They were convinced for the first time of its possibility. They had done it, they said, and the ships were all right.

I was then in charge of matériel. I told them: "I do not believe it. You are too enthusiastic. The matériel will talk for itself when you get it opened up." It does. All of those ships to-day are requiring from 50 to 100 per cent more repairs than the same ships would have required had we been able to take them out of the fleet, send them to the yards, and do the "stitch in time that saves nine."

Mr. President, I hesitate to disagree with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but it seems to me, after a careful examination of the whole subject, that in the long run it would be most uneconomical if the Senate committee amendment is adopted. Our Navy has always prided itself on its efficiency, and this action will materially lessen our actual fighting force. I therefore hope that the committee amendment will be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," on page 24, line 5, after the words "sum of," to strike out

"$800,000" and insert "$500,000," so as to make the clause read:

The limitation on expenditures from the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, fiscal year 1920," for pay of classified employees is increased by the sum of $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of the Interior," on page 24, after line 10, to insert:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Old Telephone Exchange Building: For repairs and improvements to Old Telephone Exchange Building, 23 B Street NW., to make it an annex to the Senate Folding Room, 21 B Street NW., and to connect up both buildings with heating plant of Maltby Building, $3,500, to be expended under the direction and supervision of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 19, to insert:

GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

Protecting public lands, timber, etc.: To reimburse the appropriation "Protecting public lands, timber, etc.," fiscal year 1920, for expenditures for protecting timber on the public lands from forest fires, $160,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office," on page 26, line 8, after the word "from," to strike out "October" and insert "November"; and in line 12, after the words "in all," to strike out "$14,700" and insert "$13,066.99," so as to make the clause read:

For additional employees from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Clerks—1 of class 4, 1 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 2 of class 1, 2 at $1,000 each, 2 at $900 each; 15 copy pullers, at $480 each; in all, $13,066.99.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 13, to insert:

For additional employees to bring up to date the trade-mark work of the Patent Office from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: First assistant examiner of trade-marks, $2,400; 2 assistant examiners of trade-marks, at $1,800 each; 2 assistant examiners of trade-marks, at $1,500 each; and 2 clerks, at $1,000 each; in all, $7,333.34.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 2, to insert:

TERRITORY OF ALASKA.

Alaskan Engineering Commission: For carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 12, 1914, entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," as amended, including expenses incident to conducting hearings and examining estimates for appropriations in Alaska, to be available until expended, $17,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Postal Service," subhead "Out of the postal revenues," on page 27, after line 13, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For compensation to clerks and employees at first and second class post offices, $750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Third Assistant Postmaster General," on page 27, line 22, after "1919," to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$700,000," so as to make the clause read:

For 1919, $700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Justice," subhead "Salaries," after line 4, to insert:

For additional compensation to the chief clerk for services as general administrative agent of the Department of Justice, at the rate of $1,000 per annum from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive, $666.67.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 8, to insert:

For additional compensation to the private secretary and assistant to the Attorney General for special assistance to the Attorney General, at the rate of $1,000 per annum from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive, $666.67.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 13, to insert:

For additional compensation to the attorney in charge of pardons, at the rate of $1,000 per annum from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, both dates inclusive, $666.67.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 2, to insert:

For official transportation, including the purchase (if possible, from the War Department) or exchange, the maintenance, repair, and operation, of a motor-driven passenger car, delivery truck, and motor cycle, to be used only for official purposes, and purchase and repair of bicycles, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask that the next amendment, which is in reference to the enforcement of the antitrust law, be passed over for the present.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I should like to know what the request of the Senator from Wyoming is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is to pass over the next committee amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. The amendment relating to the enforcement of the antitrust law?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The Chair will state to the Senator from Mississippi that the amendment which will be passed over at the request of the Senator from Wyoming is under the heading "Miscellaneous—Enforcement of antitrust laws."

Mr. HARRISON. That is the amendment to which I desire to address myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 30, line 19, after the words "Attorney General," to insert "maintenance, purchase (if possible, from other Government services) and," so as to make the clause read:

Detection and prosecution of crimes: For the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; the investigation of the official acts, records, and accounts of marshals, attorneys, clerks, referees, and trustees of the United States courts and the Territorial courts, and United States commissioners, for which purpose all the official papers, records, and dockets of said officers, without exception, shall be examined by the agents of the Attorney General at any time; for the protection of the person of the President of the United States; for such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice or the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General, maintenance, purchase (if possible, from other Government services), and hire of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General; in all, $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Agriculture," on page 34, line 20, after the word "expenses," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$70,000," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the recent and sudden spread of the Japanese beetle in the State of New Jersey and to provide means for the control and prevention of spread of this insect in that State and to other States, in cooperation with the State of New Jersey and other States concerned and with individuals affected, including the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service," on page 34, line 26, after "1920," to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,950,000," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the existing emergency and to pay expenses heretofore incurred or which may hereafter be incurred in fighting and preventing forest fires endangering the national forests during the fiscal year 1920, $2,950,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Commerce," on page 35, after line 1, to strike out:

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS.

Authority is granted for the expenditure of not to exceed $1,000 from the appropriation for the expenses of the Fourteenth Decennial Census, contained in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 1, 1919, for the purchase, maintenance, and repair during the fiscal year 1920 of a motor-propelled passenger vehicle for official use of the Director of the Census.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 35, after line 10, to strike out:

Office force: For an amount to increase the compensation of topographic and hydrographic draftsmen and the engineer directing their work, in no case to exceed 33⅓ per cent of the present basic compensation of any such employee, $12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 15, to strike out:

For additional topographic and hydrographic draftsmen from October 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Three at $2,000 each; three at $1,750 each; in all, $8,437.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 19, to insert:

For additional topographic and hydrographic draftsmen from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Three at $2,000 each; three at $1,750 each; in all, $7,500.03.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 23, to strike out:

For an amount to increase the compensation of copper-plate engravers, in no case to exceed 33⅓ per cent of the present basic compensation of any such employee, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 2, to strike out:

For additional employees from October 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Watchmen, firemen, messengers, or laborers, seven at $840 each; plumber and steam fitter, $1,200; in all, $5,310.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 7, to insert:

For additional employees from November 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, inclusive, at annual rates of compensation as follows: Watchmen, firemen, messengers, or laborers, seven at $840 each; plumber and steam fitter, $1,200; in all, $4,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 10, to insert:

For an amount to increase the compensation of topographic and hydrographic draftsmen and the engineer directing their work, astronomical, geodetic, tidal, and miscellaneous computers, copper-plate engravers, lithographers, lithographic draftsmen, transferrers, lithographic pressmen and their helpers, plate printers and their helpers, and other skilled laborers and the chief directing their work, and the disbursing clerk, in no case to exceed 33⅓ per cent of the present basic compensation of such employee, $35,622.23, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Labor," on page 42, after line 10, to insert:

INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE.

For stenographic and other services and contingent and miscellaneous expenses, including printing, in connection with the approaching industrial conference, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 14, to insert:

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF LABOR.

For salaries and expenses of the International Conference of Labor, as follows:

United States Government executive staff: For two and one-half months, at monthly compensation as follows: Assistant to the Secretary, $450; first assistant, $300; three executive assistants, at $200 each; two assistants at hotels, at $200 each; private secretary, $200; two stenographers, at $150 each; typist, $125; and two messengers, at $75 each; in all, $6,312.50.

Conference staff, for two months, at monthly compensation as follows: Two stenographers, at $150 each; two deputy secretaries, at $300 each; four subsecretaries (for commissions), at $200 each; four interpreters, at $200 each; three English-French translators, at $125 each; three French-English translators, at $125 each; six French stenographers at $83.33 each; six English stenographers, at $150 each; chief messenger, $125; eight messengers, at $75 each; expenses, at not exceeding $10 per diem for each person, $12,000; in all, $22,749.96.

Chief clerk's office, for two months, at monthly compensation as follows: Chief clerk, $200; assistant chief clerk, $150; and stenographers, $150; in all, $1,000.

Telegraph room, for two months at monthly compensation as follows: Day operator, $150; night operator, $175; in all, $650.

Expenses: For reporting proceedings, $20,000; printing proceedings, $10,000; paper, $2,500; expenses of moving departments to provide offices, $10,000; in all, $42,500.

Total, International Conference of Labor, $73,212.46: *Provided*, That all accounting in connection with the conference shall be done by the disbursing officer of the Department of Labor: *Provided further*, That no part of the money herein appropriated for the International Conference of Labor shall be available for the payment of an allowance for per diem expenses in lieu of subsistence to any person residing in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Legislative," on page 44, after line 1, to insert:

Botanic Garden: For pay to the statutory employees of the Botanic Garden, at rates to be fixed by the superintendent, $2,150.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 4, to insert:

SENATE.

For additional expenses of reporting and transcribing the debates and proceedings of the Senate and to equalize more nearly the amounts paid by the Senate and the House of Representatives for reporting their respective proceedings from June 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, payable in equal monthly installments from October 1, 1919, $10,716.66.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 11, to insert:

For pay to the chief telephone operator, office of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, $300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 13, to insert:

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers to committees, at such rate as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding $1 per printed page, $135,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 18, to insert:

For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails, and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, fiscal year 1919, $1,033.85.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 22, to insert:

For fuel, oil, cotton waste, and advertising, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1919, $400.97.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 24, to insert:

For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 5, to insert:

JUDGMENTS, UNITED STATES COURTS.

For payment of the final judgments and decrees, including costs of suits, which have been rendered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," certified to Congress during the present session by the Attorney General in Senate Document No. 100, and which have not been appealed, namely:

Under the War Department, $1,578.90;
Under the Navy Department, $7,725.05;
In all, $9,303.95, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on the respective judgments at the rate of 4 per cent per annum from the date thereof until the time this appropriation is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 19, to insert:

JUDGMENTS, COURT OF CLAIMS.

For payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims and reported to Congress during the present session in Senate Documents Nos. 102 and 125, namely:

Under the Treasury Department, $61,300.20;
Under the War Department, $26,038.60;
Under the Navy Department, $29,076.13;
Under the Interior Department, $215.76;
In all, $116,630.69.

None of the judgments contained herein shall be paid until the right of appeal shall have expired.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 21, to insert:

SEC. 4. Public act No. 152, Sixty-fifth Congress, entitled "An act authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government," is hereby repealed.

Mr. OVERMAN. I make the point of order that the amendment is in contravention of Rule XVI, being new legislation and repealing an act now existing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). What is the point of order?

Mr. OVERMAN. I raise the point of order that the amendment is new legislation and proposes on an appropriation bill to repeal a law now existing.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I can not contest——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WARREN. I do not. I simply wish to say that I am sorry the Senator from North Carolina has made the point of order. The Senator from North Carolina knows more about the existing law than does anyone else, as he was its originator, and it has undoubtedly done a great deal of good, but at the present time it is a load upon the back of the Appropriations Committee. Congress hardly has possession of its own, and matters come to the Appropriations Committee for which provision must be made which have come about because of the existence of the law. I hope the condition requiring the law may soon end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the point of order is insisted upon, it is well founded and must be sustained.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I am aware that the Chair has ruled the amendment out of order, but in reply to the Senator from Wyoming I desire to put in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of War in regard to this matter. The act referred to expires, in any event, six months after the declaration of peace, but the Secretary of War says that to repeal the act before some legislation is passed to take its place would be a calamity, and shows that he could not have won the war without the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 31, 1919.

Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I beg leave to reply to your letter of March 10, 1919, in which you request information as to the use made by the War Department of the provisions of the Overman Act.

This act has very materially facilitated and expedited the task of the War Department in organizing, training, transporting, equipping, and maintaining the Army. It has permitted a centralization of control, a coordination of effort, a flexibility of organization to meet changing requirements and an increased efficiency in the procurement and distribution of material and supplies, including an elimination of competitive purchasing and a standardization of specifications and procedure, without which the military program which had been so successfully carried out by this country would have been impossible of realization.

Estimates of requirements and the purchase and distribution of all equipment and supplies, except that very highly technical, has been consolidated under the direction of the Purchase, Storage and Traffic Division of the General Staff. This has prevented duplication and a condition formerly frequently occurring, a shortage of supplies in one branch of the service while another had temporarily a surplus. The same result particularly as to avoiding duplication of equipment and effecting economy was obtained by the consolidation of all motor transportation under another branch of the General Staff.

The consolidation, under the Chemical Warfare Service, of the research work involved in the development of new and improved offensive and defensive chemical warfare material, and the reorganization of the Air Service, have been very potent factors in the result attained in these very important services.

In view of the marked economy and the increased efficiency that has been made practicable under the provisions of this act, I believe that it would be a misfortune if it were revoked before such time as new legislation of a permanent nature, based upon the experience of the war, may be enacted.

Below you will find specified the rearrangement of duties and responsibilities that have been effected within the bureaus of the War Department:

1. Assigned to the Purchase, Storage and Traffic Division of the General Staff: Requirements, purchase, storage, distribution, fiscal accounting and property accounting. Transferred from Ordnance Department, Quartermaster Corps, Signal Corps, Engineer Corps, and Medical Corps.

The duties transferred include:

(a) Office of the Director of Purchase, Storage and Traffic, General Staff. Duties: Responsibility for and authority over—

(1) Supply of the Army, including analysis and computation of requirements, purchase, production, inspection, acceptance, transportation, storage, issue within the United States, and embarkation.

(2) Relations with all other agencies, governmental and otherwise, in regard to Army supply, including representation of the War Department on the War Industries Board and business with representatives of the allied Governments.

(b) Facilities Department. Duties: Responsibility for and authority over procurement of real estate.

(c) Accounts Department. Duties: Responsibility for and authority over disbursements, fiscal accounting, preparation of estimates, and reports of accounts.

(d) Traffic Department. Duties: Responsibility for and authority over inland transportation.

(e) Embarkation Department. Duties: Responsibility for and authority over embarkation and ocean transportation.

The procurement of highly technical equipment and supplies not transferred—

(1) By the Corps of Engineers: Arc searchlights and gas-electric generators.

(2) By the Medical Corps: Vaccines and serums.

(3) By the Ordnance Department: Cartridge cloth, blast furnace and steel mill products, substantially all metals, coal tar, coal gas and water gas products, optical glass and optical instruments, acids, etc.

(4) By the Bureau of Aircraft Production: Aeroplanes, Liberty motors, barometers, clocks, watches, gauges, thermometers, compasses, etc.

(5) By the Chemical Warfare Service: All chemicals entering into the production of toxic gases, liquid chlorine, laminated glass, etc.

2. To the Bureau of Aircraft Production and the Division of Military Aeronautics: The production of airplanes, airplane engines and equipment and the duty of operating and maintaining or supervising the operation and maintenance of military aircraft, including balloons, airplanes, and all aircraft equipment. Transferred from the Signal Corps.

3. To the Motor Transport Corps, a section of the Operations Division, General Staff: The design, production, procurement, storage, maintenance and replacement of all motor vehicles and accounting for the same. Transferred from Quartermaster Corps, Ordnance Department, Engineer Corps, Medical Corps, and Signal Corps.

4. To the Chemical Warfare Service: The duty of operating and maintaining or supervising the operation and maintenance of all plants engaged in the investigation, manufacture, or production of toxic gases, gas-defense appliances, the filling of gas shells, and proving grounds utilized in connection therewith, and the necessary research connected with gas warfare. Transferred from the Ordnance Department, Sanitary Corps, Medical Corps, and the Experimental Station, American University.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 48, after line 2, to insert:

AUDITED CLAIMS.

SEC. 5. That for the payment of the following claims certified to be due by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1917 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 94, reported to Congress at its present session, there is appropriated as follows:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

For collecting the revenue from customs, 58 cents.
For freight, transportation, etc., Public Health Service, $243.06.
For care of seamen, etc., Public Health Service, $63.
For preventing the spread of epidemic diseases, $3.75.
For Quarantine Service, $2.78.
For refunding internal revenue collections, $5.
For miscellaneous expenses, Internal-Revenue Service, $7.18.
For refunding taxes illegally collected, $191,314.82.
For redemption of stamps, $3,287.29.
For payment of judgments against internal-revenue officers, $147,874.77.
For allowance or drawback, internal revenue, $5,314.56.
For Coast Guard, $4,683.73.
For pay of crews, miscellaneous expenses, etc., Life-Saving Service, 95 cents.
For materials and miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, $3,441.35.
For contingent expenses, assay office at New York, 69 cents.
For operating supplies for public buildings, $15.41.
For furniture and repairs of same for public buildings, $259.61.
For repairs and preservation of public buildings, $12.32.
For mechanical equipment for public buildings, $2.45.
For general expenses of public buildings, $35.01.

Mr. WARREN. The section containing the amendment just stated by the Secretary will have to be numbered section 4. I ask that the Secretary may be allowed to renumber the sections, and that the bill may be printed accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will be instructed to correct the section numbers. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 18, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

For contingencies of the Army, 1918, $5,000.
For Signal Service of the Army, $434.86.
For pay, etc., of the Army, $438,866.44.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, inviting his attention to the bottom of page 49, as to the item of $438,866.44, how such a large deficit was permitted?

Mr. WARREN. I may say that this appropriation includes thousands of little items that have accumulated and are reported in a public document and sent to Congress. All these items are taken up before the proper officers and audited, and we put them in here, giving the number of the document, so that the Senators may see the document, the committee having established the correctness of the items before including the appropriations in the bill. They are simply debts owed by the Government which have been adjudicated, but the money is not in the Treasury for the purpose of meeting them. Some of these claims, in fact the larger portion of them, arise where we make appropriations that are not used up on the 1st of July, when the money goes back into the Treasury, although bills are on the way from the Philippines or from France or other distant points which are payable under the appropriations and should be paid, but can not be paid because of the money having gone back into the Treasury. Hence we have these audited claims provided for in this bill.

Mr. KING. It would not mean, then, that some of the officers of the War Department had made expenditures not authorized by law?

Mr. WARREN. No; nothing of that kind. In fact these items assume the same attitude as judgments of courts, so far as the exactness of the amounts is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the top of page 50, to insert:

For extra-duty pay to enlisted men as clerks, etc., at Army division and department headquarters, $1,018.70.
For mileage to officers and contract surgeons, $121.12.
For supplies, services, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps, $29,629.48.
For transportation of the Army and its supplies, $39.54.
For barracks and quarters, $15,346.45.
For regular supplies, Quartermaster's Department, $56.67.
For roads, wharves, walks, and drainage, $2,541.01.
For quarters for hospital stewards, $5.
For transportation of rifle teams to national matches, $108.88.
For encampments and maneuvers, Organized Militia, $124.80.
For civilian military training camps, $828.44.
For medical and hospital department, $10.
For burial of indigent soldiers, $81.
For disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civil employees, $234.38.
For maintenance of channel, South Pass, Mississippi River, 1918, $900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 51, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For contingent expenses, Navy Department, 1918, $16,271.73.
For contingent and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Observatory, 50 cents.
For pay, miscellaneous, $18.75.
For pay, Marine Corps, $228.80.

For contingent, Marine Corps, $837.20.
For maintenance, quartermaster's department, Marine Corps, $1,036.08.
For pay of the Navy, $1,779.59.
For freight, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $20.67.
For engineering, Bureau of Steam Engineering, $15.15.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 14, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

For contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1918, $2,102.05.
For contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, $135.95.
For scientific library, Patent Office, $59.20.
For return of funds of patients, St. Elizabeths Hospital, $7.60.
For Capitol power plant, 1919, $10,000.
For surveying public lands, $554.
For Geological Survey, $8.38.
For investigating mine accidents, $92.47.
For books and publications, Bureau of Mines, $37.39.
For testing fuel, Bureau of Mines, $138.80.
For enforcement of the act to regulate explosives, Bureau of Mines, 1919, $25.05.
For fees of examining surgeons, pensions, $42.
For relieving distress and prevention, etc., of diseases among Indians, $6.60.
For Indian schools, support, $27.47.
For Indian school and agency buildings, $218.40.
For Indian school transportation, $11.58.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1918, $15,617.62.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $786.80.
For telegraphing and telephoning, Indian Service, 1918, $231.93.
For telegraphing and telephoning, Indian Service, 19 cents.
For general expenses, Indian Service, $28.98.
For water supply, Papago Indian villages, Arizona, 1918, $69.45.
For Indian school, Fort Mojave, Ariz., repairs and improvements, 1918, $612.35.
For Indian school, Fort Bidwell, Calif., 1918, $2.90.
For support of nonreservation Indians in Nevada, 1918 and 1919, $1.87.
For Indian school, Chilocco, Okla., repairs and improvements, 1919, $22.23.
For Indian school, Carlisle, Pa., $88.33.
For support of Sioux of different tribes, subsistence and civilization, South Dakota, $26.07.
For Indian school, Rapid City, S. Dak., repairs and improvements, 1918, $69.33.
For education, Sioux Nation, South Dakota, $60.90.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, after line 10, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

For stationery, furniture, etc., Department of State, 1918, $5.40.
For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, 1919, $1,267.14.
For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, $1,786.45.
For contingent expenses, foreign missions, 1919, $6.632.
For contingent expenses, foreign missions, 1918, $52,620.95.
For contingent expenses, foreign missions, $10,229.33.
For salaries, Consular Service, $2,897.61.
For post allowances, to diplomatic and consular officers, $100.
For allowance for clerks at consulates, $415.20.
For contingent expenses, United States consulates, 1919, $43,229.61.
For contingent expenses, United States consulates, 1918, $96,859.54.
For contingent expenses, United States consulates, $466.50.
For relief and protection of American seamen, 1918, $2,359.68.
For relief of protection of American seamen, $251.27.
For Smithsonian Institution, preservation of collections, National Museum, $16.95.
For miscellaneous expenses, Supreme Court, District of Columbia, 1919, $354.06.
For support of convicts, District of Columbia, 1919, $24.039.
For general expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, $44.73.
For meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry, $50.13.
For general expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, 50 cents.
For general expenses, Forest Service, $1,404.20.
For enforcement of the food and drugs act, $22.84.
For general expenses, Bureau of Biological Survey, $3.45.
For general expenses, States Relations Service, $294.88.
For general expenses, Office of Markets and Rural Organization, $161.28.
For general expenses, Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering, $25.25.
For general expenses, Weather Bureau, $10.
For library, department of agriculture, $16.10.
For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, $2,061.20.
For miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Fisheries, $15.22.
For equipment, Bureau of Standards, $133.
For expenses of regulating immigration, $24.
For contingent expenses, Department of Justice, stationery, 1919, $81.
For contingent expenses, Department of Justice, transportation, 1919, $95.62.
For contingent expenses, Department of Justice, miscellaneous items, 1919, $270.94.
For contingent expenses, Department of Justice, miscellaneous items, $4.
For books for judicial officers, $11.50.
For inspection of prisons and prisoners, 1919, $358.38.
For salaries and expenses of district attorneys, United States courts, $157.80.
For fees of clerks, United States courts, 1918, $1,073.95.
For fees of clerks, United States courts, $63.50.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1918, $1,113.91.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, $9.85.
For fees of jurors, United States courts, $4.
For fees of witnesses, United States courts, $8.75.
For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, $24.30.
For supplies for United States courts, 1918, $28.84.
For support of prisoners, United States courts, $20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 10, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

For shipment of supplies, $22.43.
For freight on stamped paper and mail bags, $208.89.
For Star Route Service, special mail carriers, $47.92.
For indemnities, international registered mail, $996.25.
For railroad transportation, $2,943.63.
For Rural Delivery Service, $174.06.
For rent, light, and fuel, $845.49.
For Railway Mail Service, miscellaneous expenses, $6.73.
For village delivery service, $490.50.
For office appliances, $45.50.
For clerks, first and second class post offices, $43.75.
For city delivery, incidental expenses, $15.70.
For city-delivery carriers, $17.27.
For Railway Mail Service, salaries, $50.89.
For compensation to postmasters, $72.05.
For indemnities, domestic mail, $19.51.
Total, audited claims, section 5, $1,160,333.82.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 5, to insert:

AUDITED CLAIMS.

SEC. 6. That for the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1917 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 126, reported to Congress at its present session, there is appropriated as follows:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

For collecting the revenue from customs, $2.10.
For refunding internal-revenue collections, $20.
For refunding taxes illegally collected, $123,690.81.
For redemption of stamps, $496.41.
For allowance of drawback, $13.18.
For Coast Guard, $2,129.29.
For operating supplies for public buildings, $6.79.
For furniture and repairs of same for public buildings, $119.50.
For repairs and preservation of public buildings, $168.24.
For mechanical equipment for public buildings, $42.13.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 6, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

For pay, etc., of the Army, $508.76.
For extra-duty pay to enlisted men as clerks, etc., at Army division and department headquarters, $170.50.
For supplies, services, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps, $1,258.53.
For arming, equipping, and training the National Guard, $2.71.
For civilian military training camps, $29.17.
For headstones for graves of soldiers, 62 cents.
For disposition of remains of officers, soldiers, and civil employees, $60.96.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 20, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For contingent, Marine Corps, $128.80.
For pay of the Navy, $1,130.25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 59, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

For contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 25 cents.
For contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1918, $30.73.
For collecting statistics, Bureau of Education, $44.32.
For Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, 1919, $1,040.20.
For Hawaii National Park, 1919, $1.85.
For protection of national monuments, 1919, $451.85.
For reproducing plats of surveys, General Land Office, 1919, $144.50.
For Geological Survey, $6.50.
For mineral mining investigations, Bureau of Mines, $1,729.70.
For investigations, petroleum and natural gas, Bureau of Mines, $5.11.
For inspecting mines in Alaska, $1.75.
For enforcement of the act to regulate explosives, Bureau of Mines, 1919, $1,410.80.
For relieving distress, and prevention, etc., of diseases among Indians, $8.99.
For Indian school and agency buildings, $61.70.
For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, 1918, $655.58.
For pay of Indian police, $100.98.
For water supply, Navajo and Hopi Indians, Arizona (reimbursable), 1918 and 1919, $499.08.
For Indian school, Riverside, Calif., 1919, 109.28.
For Indian school, Lawrence, Kans., 1919, $53.57.
For Indian school, Cherokee, N. C., 1919, $1.02.
For Indian school, Bismarck, N. Dak., $11.55.
For Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., 1919, $5.09.
For support of Chippewas of Lake Superior, Wis., 1919, $86.50.
For Indian school, Hayward, Wis., repairs and improvements, 1918, $17.94.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 14, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

For contingent expenses, Executive office, 50 cents.
For contingent expenses, Department of State, 1919, $383.25.
For stationery, furniture, etc., Department of State, 1919, $868.43.
For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, $1.15.
For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, 1919, $3,759.70.
For salaries of secretaries, Diplomatic Service, $1,968.75.
For contingent expenses, foreign missions, $269.70.

For contingent expenses, United States consulates, 1918, $8,411.07.
For contingent expenses, United States consulates, 1919, $13,310.14.
For relief and transportation of destitute American citizens in Mexico, $18.
For Board of Mediation and Conciliation, 31 cents.
For miscellaneous expenses, Supreme Court, District of Columbia, 1919, $592.37.
For general expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, $8.57.
For general expenses, Weather Bureau, $4.27.
For equipment, Bureau of Standards, $131.55.
For general expenses, Bureau of Standards, $2.85.
For color standardization, Bureau of Standards, $13.11.
For equipping chemical laboratory building, Bureau of Standards, $70.
For radio research, Bureau of Standards, $61.87.
For testing miscellaneous materials, Bureau of Standards, $8.20.
For testing structural materials, Bureau of Standards, $10.05.
For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, $11,700.
For expenses of regulating immigration, $1,164.
For expenses of regulating immigration, 1917 and 1918, $47,028.35.
For general expenses, Children's Bureau, $7.78.
For detection and prosecution of crimes, $127.61.
For contingent expenses, Department of Justice, miscellaneous items, 1919, $596.84.
For contingent expenses, Department of Justice, transportation, 1919, $46.35.
For salaries, fees, and expenses of marshals, United States courts, $98.76.
For support of prisoners, United States courts, $80.85.
For salaries and expenses of district attorneys, United States courts, $39.
For fees of commissioners, United States courts, 1918, $65.60.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 16, to insert:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

For indemnities, international mail, $273.45.
For railroad transportation, $1,140.43.
For star route service, special mail carriers, $4.77.
For shipment of supplies, $20.18.
For Railway Mail Service, $2.40.
For equipment, City Delivery Service, $18.68.
For unusual conditions at post offices, $110.89.
For clerks, first and second class post offices, $202.01.
For clerks, third-class post offices, $37.50.
For city delivery carriers, $20.70.
For Rural Delivery Service, $3.33.
For Railway Mail Service, miscellaneous expenses, $1.72.
For foreign mail transportation, $124,777.87.
Total audited claims, section 6, $353,920.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. WARREN. Now, Mr. President, I ask to return to the first amendment that was passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The first amendment passed over is on page 13, line 22, after the word "abroad," where it is proposed to insert:

Advertising, $1,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that particular amendment is to be considered in connection with the amendment on page 14, which provides as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General shall formulate and promulgate such regulations as will enable persons insured under the provisions of the war-risk insurance act to make payments of premiums at such post offices or branches or stations of post offices as they may designate or to any city letter carrier or rural carrier while on duty. The Post Office Department is hereby authorized and directed to receive sums so tendered in payment of such premiums, and to receive and transmit to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance applications for the reinstatement of lapsed insurance.

Of course, there can be no question about the fact that this provision is new legislation and subject to a point of order. I really do not know that it is necessary to discuss the matter at all, because if there is no question about its being subject to the point of order I will merely make the point of order against the provision.

Mr. WARREN. I understand the Senator is referring to the amendment on page 14.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am referring to that part of the amendment which is on page 14. I take it the chairman of the committee admits that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. WARREN. You mean lines 9 to 19?

Mr. McKELLAR. Lines 9 to 19 on page 14.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before the point of order is pressed by the Senator from Tennessee, I simply want to take time enough to let the Senate know really what is intended by this amendment.

It is well known by all Senators that there were some 4,700,000 insurance policies issued to the soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Army and Navy. To-day we find that there are less than 1,000,000 of them in force. If we are going to continue the War Risk Bureau, and if we are going to try to issue insurance for the soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Army and the Navy, we ought to provide the simplest and most inexpensive means for those soldiers, sailors, and marines to pay their monthly premiums. I know that the director of the bureau claims, whether it be true or not, that the great majority of the 3,700,000 lapses come about from the fact that the soldier does not know where to send his money, he is not prepared to write his letters every month, and there is no place where he can take his money and pay his monthly insurance dues, as would be the case if he were carrying insurance with a regular life insurance company.

Mr. President, there is only one agency and one organization that is in force to-day in the Government of the United States that can take care of this situation without much cost to the Government, and that is the Post Office Department. I am not discussing whether or not it is a good thing to maintain the War Risk Bureau, nor does this amendment have anything to do with that question. But as long as there are at least a million policies in force, and with the hope of the bureau officials that they will be increased threefold, the way to make it as convenient for the soldier to pay his premium as possible is to provide that the soldier has but to drop into any post office in any town or city in the United States designated to receive these premiums, pay his money, and get his receipt. He need send no letters, he receives no letters, he knows that his premium is paid, and there is no question of delay in carrying the mail from where he lives to Washington, passing through the hands of the bureau here, returning the letter to the soldier. Perhaps, he not being home, the receipt is lost in the mail, and other things could happen that would make it very inconvenient for the soldier.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does not my colleague think that before inaugurating a policy so radical as that contemplated by this amendment it is important for Congress to decide whether it purposes to continue this war-risk insurance activity longer? If the Senator will pardon me, I received the impression when we passed the war-risk insurance bill that upon the termination of the war a paid-up policy of insurance for a given amount—whatever would be right and just under the tables that obtain in insurance companies—would be given to each soldier and sailor, or that some arrangement would be made with one or more life insurance companies of the United States by which there would be transferred from the Government to such companies the various policies then in force and suitable arrangements would be made for the insurance companies to take the place of the Government, if necessary the Government to pay whatever would be fair for the increased cost that would be incident to the companies carrying and meeting the obligations under the policies. I certainly did not get the idea, and I am sure that many other Senators did not, that the Government was projecting itself into the life insurance business for an indefinite period, and that it purposed to continue to carry these four or five millions of policies as long as any of the persons holding the policies were alive.

It seems to me the first thing for Congress to do is to determine whether it is going to adhere to the plan then announced or whether the Government is to enter the general life insurance business for an indefinite period. Before I would be prepared to vote upon this proposition, which is concededly new legislation, and which, it seems to me, if enacted, would tend to fasten more firmly than ever the insurance business upon the Government, I should like to know what the policy of the Government is going to be.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say in answer to my colleague that the unfortunate thing was that the policy which the Senator has just outlined was not adopted by Congress. Some of us took the position at the time that that should be the policy of the Government, but that the Government should, for the extra risk assumed during the war, see that soldiers were given insurance at the regular insurance rate in peace times, but shortly after the war terminated that the activities of the Government in carrying insurance policies for its discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines would cease. But Congress took the other view and by the legislation has put the Government into the insurance business.

The law specifically provides that the present term insurance can be carried by the insured for a period of five years after peace is declared. Then it also provides that at the end of five years each of the insured has the right to transfer that insurance into forms of insurance carried to-day by the old-line insurance companies.

Mr. President, that is what Congress decided, and in order to change that there must be a repeal of the law. But as long as the law is upon the statute books it is our duty to make the payment of these premiums as convenient to the insured as possible.

Mr. President, I offered this amendment to the bill not only with the view of making it as convenient as possible for the insured, but to make it as inexpensive to the Government as possible. Of course, I recognize that this is general legislation upon an appropriation bill. I am not going to resist any question of its being such, and if the point of order is made against it I expect the Chair to sustain the point of order.

Mr. KING. Without expressing any opinion one way or the other, I ask my colleague whether he thinks that, notwithstanding the legislation to which he has just adverted, which perpetuates these policies for a period of five years, at the expiration of which time some change may then be made, the obligation rests upon the Government to spend a million dollars or more in advertisements setting forth inducements for the further payment of premiums upon lapsed or lapsing policies? Should the Government spend a million dollars or more and incur millions of dollars of expense annually in other directions for the purpose of inducing men to take out insurance or to continue the payment of their premiums from year to year? I express no opinion upon this question, because my information upon the matter is not sufficient to enable me to form an intelligent judgment. I can see some reasons why this should be done, and I can perceive some serious objections to this course. Should it not be a voluntary matter on their part, and should the Government be called upon to induce them to continue their insurance?

Mr. SMOOT. There is only one reason I can give my colleague for the Government of the United States doing it, and that is that if this insurance is carried as Congress intended it would be carried it would in a way prevent in the future our soldiers, our sailors, and our marines from applying for pensions from the Government. It is true that in that same legislation we provided allowances for soldiers who were wounded in service, and in connection with that Congress thought it wise to provide an insurance system, so that in case of death of the insured there would come to the beneficiary an amount which, if reasonably and safely handled, would be sufficient to assist in taking care of his or her absolute necessities of life.

If my colleague were here at that time he would remember that I stated to the Senate then, as my opinion now is, that no matter what the insurance might be, whether a million of them carried insurance or whether five million did so, the time would come when there would be applications made for pensions by the soldiers of the late World War.

The million-dollar advertising is, I think, for the purpose of carrying out a system of advertising following in part the plan adopted in our Liberty loan campaigns. I expect, if we give this appropriation, to see posters in the windows of public buildings, and on the fences along the roadside, advising the soldiers and sailors and marines of the last war to carry life insurance, to reinstate that which has already lapsed. There is no effort upon the part of the director of the bureau to hide the fact that the bureau is going to do everything it can, everything that is in its power, and spend every dollar that the Government will give it, to get all of the soldiers, sailors, and marines who have allowed their insurance to lapse to reinstate it.

Senators must know that the ruling of the Treasury Department made of late, granting the privilege of reinstating insurance allowed to lapse, and do not compel them to pay for the insurance during the months when not carried, but they can take up, at any time now within a given period, the amount of insurance that was originally taken and go on with it just the same as before they permitted the insurance to lapse.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. And every effort will be made to see that every soldier of the war carries the amount of insurance that he had during his service in the war. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. My colleague upon the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. SMOOT] serves on other subcommittees than this one, and so did not get one part of the testimony of the War Risk Insurance Bureau Director. It is true, as the Senator says, that the Treasury Department has given out the length of time as, I think, a year within which these men may renew their insurance and take it all up again; but the director, in answer to advice given him by the committee that the Government did not intend to prolong the insurance business as such, and had no interest in undertaking to have men renew who wished to drop their insurance, assured the committee that from now on his only ambition would be, and his labors would only be, to reach everyone at least once, so that a man might know where to communicate his wishes and that he might get a reply. Hence the advertising matter that comes in appears to be useful, that these men may know where and when and how to dispose finally of this insurance matter—whether they will drop it; whether they will convert it into a different kind of policy; or whether they will renew the old policy and go on with that.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. Cholmeley-Jones, the director of the bureau, has been in my office many times upon this question. Not only that, but the subcommittee of the Finance Committee has before it now a bill that was passed in the House amending the war-risk insurance act so as to extend its provisions to a larger range of beneficiaries. I am perfectly willing that the act should be amended in that regard. It also provides that in case of death insurance shall be paid in one lump sum or in 36 monthly payments. I want to say to the Senate, as was said here by many of the members of the committee not long ago, that the lump-sum payment plan was prohibited in the original act, for the reason that experience shows that wherever an insurance company pays to a beneficiary the full amount of the insurance in a lump sum that within three years' time 92 per cent of all of the beneficiaries are without a dollar of the money received. Congress provided for 240 monthly payments, covering a period of 20 years, during which the beneficiaries of the insured should at least have enough to assist in taking care of their necessary wants. The beneficiary of a soldier carrying insurance of $10,000 under the present act would receive from the Government of the United States $57.50 every month for 20 years. It is now proposed in the bill that has passed the House, and which is before the subcommittee of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to change that whole system and provide that the full amount of the insurance shall be paid to the beneficiaries of the insured in a lump sum. The reason for that is given by Mr. Cholmeley-Jones, the director of the bureau, that they have to liberalize the act in order to compete with the insurance companies of the country. I know that many of the posts of the American Legion have already passed resolutions in which they indorse the principle of a lump-sum payment. I do not know whether Congress intends to change the policy or not, but I want to say this now, that if the policy is changed it may be of benefit to a very small percentage of the beneficiaries of the insured soldiers, but as to the great bulk of those beneficiaries it will be a decided disadvantage and they will find themselves in a few years after receiving the money with not a single cent of it left.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator what the aggregate sum of these payments will be if they are made in the lump sum?

Mr. SMOOT. Insurance policies run all the way from $2,000 up to $10,000. Ten thousand dollars was the limit under the law, but the average, I will say to the Senator, is about $8,750.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator misunderstood my question. If we pay these amounts in one sum, practically, what will be the drain on the Treasury?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, here is the statement of the business of the War Risk Insurance Bureau, showing that we have estimated profits of over $17,000,000, and showing what has been done by the bureau, giving the amount of money received and expended. I think it ought to go into the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it go in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. WARREN. I do not want to take the Senator from the floor to have this done, but I think it covers the point very fully.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the excerpt referred to by the Senator——.

Mr. SMOOT. That does not cover the point which the question of the Senator from Colorado implied.

Mr. WARREN. He wants to know what the drain is on the Treasury, how much has been paid out.

Mr. SMOOT. There has been no lump sum paid out.

Mr. THOMAS. As I understand the Senator from Utah, the House has passed a bill which is now before a committee of the Senate, which substitutes what is popularly called a lump-sum payment for these annual payments extending over a period of 20 years. If we are to pay these soldiers in that manner the aggregate drain upon the Treasury must be very large, and I wanted to get an approximate idea of the amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to Senators that the discussion has taken rather a wide range on the point of order. The Chair understands that the point of order is still pending and that is the only matter now before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Has any objection been made to a reading of the report as requested by the Senator from Wyoming?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Chair understands that has been included in the RECORD without objection.

Mr. WARREN. I ask to have it read at the desk. I should like the attention of all Senators to it, because I will confess that, as much as we have seen of our appropriations connected with it, it astonished me when I learned the amount of business they have done. It also covers, I think, to some extent, the inquiries which have been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE,
Washington, October 9, 1919.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Appreciating your keen interest in the war-risk insurance act and the carrying out of that act by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, I think that you may like to have at this time a brief summary of our activities in order that you may be fully informed as to the present situation.

Other than the Members of Congress there are few people who realize the full scope of the war-risk insurance act, and little do they appreciate that within the bureau there are four of the largest businesses of their kind the world has ever known. Our records show, for instance:

A marine and seamen's insurance company—	
Doing a total business of	$2,390,080,236.54
With premiums collected amounting to	$47,592,510.61
Having issued policies to the number of	33,384
Paid claims to the extent of	$28,737,146.47
With a surplus over expenses and refunds of	$17,124,903.84
A stupendous banking business—	
For the dependents of men in the service making monthly payments of allotments and allowances on 2,057,842 awards during the period of a year and a half exceeding	$526,000,000.00
An employers' liability company—	
Now making payments each month on claims for compensation to the extent of	$2,410,271.91
Having paid burial expenses amounting to	$1,834,763.33
The largest insurance company in the world—	
Having written during the period of one year and a half 4,561,974 individual policies, representing a total amount of insurance of	$39,817,391,500.00
With premiums between Oct. 6, 1917, and Sept. 30, 1919, of approximately	$233,599,432.95
With claims payable to the extent of	$1,035,958,004.48

Up to June 30, 1919, the cost of administration of the bureau had been approximately $19,000,000, which, as you can see, has been almost entirely covered by the profit of approximately $17,000,000 on the business done under the marine and seamen's feature of the act.

Outsiders who are constantly making statements as to the great expense of maintaining the bureau and the carrying out of the provisions of the war-risk insurance act entirely ignore the fact that up to June 30 the net cost was approximately but $2,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I should not feel justified in even attempting to estimate what the cost would be. I know the Post Office Department is opposed to this amendment, and I am not going to take time to go into the details as to why they are opposed to it or why, in their judgment, it would be a mistake to adopt it.

I desire to say that the subcommittee of the Committee on Finance having the amendment to the existing war-risk insurance act under consideration has not considered the House bill, because there have been representatives from the American Legion, time and time again, who have called upon me, as chairman of that subcommittee, and asked that nothing be done with the bill until after the American Legion meets on November 11 next. I have received a number of letters, however, of late stating that the Secretary of the Treasury thinks that some amendments are quite vital and ought to be enacted into law as quickly as possible. The subcommittee has begun the consideration of that bill and we hope soon to report at least upon the questions as to which there is no particular dispute.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why can not this provision be taken up at that time by the committee and be passed upon in connection with the various other provisions that must necessarily come before the committee in the consideration of the bill? It seems to me that this is a half-baked plan. It so appears on its face; for it provides that "the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General shall formulate and promulgate such regulations as will enable," and so forth; which means that the method of carrying out this provision is left to those two departments. If they do not agree, how are they going to get along? I think the Senator from Utah will agree with me that, however meritorious the proposition contained in the bill may be, as arranged here it is not as it should be. I should think that the Senator would prefer that the matter should come before his committee. I will ask him if that is not correct?

Mr. SMOOT. The subcommittee of the Committee on Finance could take it up and consider it in connection with the bill that is now before them; but I had in mind saving a little money for the Government of the United States. I know I am foolish in contemplating such an effort.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Utah is not only foolish, but he will make himself very unpopular in this body.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah is fully aware of that, because of the fact that the Senator from Colorado has already made himself unpopular in some quarters for trying to do the same thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment, Mr. President?

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Utah says that he desires to save the Government money?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. This bill provides that the collection of insurance money shall be taken out of the hands of the War Risk Insurance Bureau. It does not provide for the lessening of the force of the War Risk Insurance Bureau at all, but requires the services of 53,000 postmasters, 35,000 letter carriers, and 41,000 rural carriers.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, the Senator from Tennessee is mistaken about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. It says so on its face.

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. And it will necessarily involve the creation of an additional accounting system by the Post Office Department. I say to the Senator from Utah that, instead of saving the Government money, this system, if adopted, will cost the Government many millions of dollars in instituting in a separate department of the Government a coordinate branch of the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the discussion is entirely outside of the record.

Mr. McKELLAR. I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has not carefully read the amendment or he would make no such statement as he has made. Not only that, but I desire to say that if the amendment should be adopted there would be no necessity of having 16,500 employees in the War Risk Insurance Bureau in Washington. I desire to say further that it would not cost a single solitary cent outside of the cost of printing of the slips used by the post offices in this country on which to give a receipt for the amount of money collected and the expense that might be incident to the little work that would be done by the postmaster in making out his monthly statement. That would be the expense and nothing more in the field. The Senator from Tennessee does not think for a minute that we intend to pay the postmaster additional compensation for giving six or seven receipts a month?

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I happen to be on a commission that is undertaking to deal with the readjustment of the postal salaries in this country, and I desire to say to the Senator from Utah that if this legislation passes there will be an application made before that commission to increase the salaries of every letter carrier and of every postmaster on account of the increased work of collecting the premiums on war-risk insurance. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that that will be done.

Mr. SMOOT. I guarantee, Mr. President, that there is hardly a rural carrier in any part of the country, outside of a large city—and I think the statement will apply to most of the city carriers—who would collect more than three or four premiums a month.

Mr. McKELLAR. But I would pay for that.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Tennessee says he wants to pay for that; and I say to the Senator that there will be application for an increase of wages in any event. This provision will make no difference; such demands come regularly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Postal employees ought to have an increase of wages where their work is increased.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say in this connection, Mr. President, that of all the employees of the Government of the United States I think the rural carrier is the poorest paid.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. SMOOT. If there is anything they can do more than they are now doing which will justify them receiving a little more salary, I think we should provide it.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield, I desire to say that I think that we ought to pay them more salary and not impose more duties upon them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is going to rule that this discussion is all out of order; and is going to hold that the point of order is well taken and sustain it. So the amendment goes out.

Mr. KING. In the committee amendment on page 13, line 22, I move to strike out the figures "$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000," so that it will read:

Advertising, $500,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the committee amendment on page 13, line 22, by striking out "$1,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000," so as to read:

Advertising, $500,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment, I shall not withdraw it, and move that the amount be reduced to $250,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I simply desire to make an observation or two. As the Senator knows, this is a committee amendment, and he knows what it will have to go through before it becomes a law. I hope he will not insist upon his motion, but if he does—and I am not going to discuss it at any length—I hope it will be voted down; because, I repeat, the matter has got to go to conference and be considered there. Therefore, I hope that if it goes in at all, it may go in at $1,000,000, and I certainly want it to go in.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me, that I may ask the Senator from Wyoming a question?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming for what this amount is going to be expended? It says for "advertising"; but what kind of advertising? I am not in the fortunate position in which the Senator from Utah is; I do not understand it; and I should like to know what it means.

Mr. WARREN. The mode proposed by the amendment of reaching the men who have been injured seems to be far more economical than the present system of circularizing them.

Mr. McKELLAR. What mode is proposed here?

Mr. WARREN. It is proposed to advertise, under contract with various magazines and papers which reach the remotest quarters of the country, and in that way to convey the necessary information to all the men who may be interested. It is expected that on account of the large volume of such business low figures may be obtained and that it may be possible to cut down vastly the circularization business.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should be very glad, of course, to yield to my distinguished friend from Wyoming; but it seems to me that the amount of $500,000 for this purpose is ample, and that it will accomplish all he desires and designs shall be accomplished. I have no doubt that if we gave five million or ten million dollars it would be expended by the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

I listened to the reading of the laudatory report, written probably by some member——

Mr. WARREN. What was read was simply evidence before the committee prepared under the direction of the head of the bureau, of course.

Mr. KING. I withdraw my statement. It is a laudatory report made by some person in the bureau——

Mr. WARREN. Exactly.

Mr. KING. Desiring to exonerate the bureau from the charges of excessive extravagance and waste that have characterized the administration of the bureau. An an evidence of the fallacies that lie at the base of their calculations, reference is made to profits which were derived from a certain branch of insurance. They do not state what the facts are; that there are obligations to be paid out of that fund which has been accumulated. When those obligations are paid, instead of there being a surplus or profit there will be, of course, a deficit. That is the way that some of these departments and departmental heads and agencies of the Government do. When their profligacy is challenged, they tender figures for the purpose of justifying their extravagance, and misleading Congress and misleading the country. Everybody knows that the War Risk Insurance Bureau has been a scandal in its administration and has come in for the severest criticism at the hands of governmental officials who have investigated it, as well as those who are cognizant of its maladministration.

I wish to say, however, that the present director is attempting to remedy many of the defects, and I have no doubt if he had been in charge in the past, many of the evils of which we have been aware would have been avoided; but it is an extravagant branch of the Government. There has been the grossest kind of incompetency in the administration of the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

I insist upon the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KING. I reserve the right in the Senate to present this amendment again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. On line 23, page 13, after the numerals "$75,000" and after the semicolon, the committee proposes to insert:

Addressograph supplies, $161,536.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 14, line 4, the committee proposes to strike out "$4,701,640" and to insert "$5,863,176."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is found on page 29, where, after the numerals "$200,000," the committee proposes to strike out the following words:

Provided, however, That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization other than an organization of public officers or any individual other than a public officer for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof, not in itself unlawful: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I dislike very much to disagree with my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, but I reserved the right in the committee to oppose this proposed amendment.

I believe at this particular time it would be very unfortunate to make the change which has been proposed by the Senate committee. I want to call the attention of the Senate to what this amendment is.

As the bill passed the House, the paragraph under consideration read as follows:

Enforcement of antitrust laws: For the enforcement of antitrust laws, $200,000: *Provided, however,* That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization other than an organization of public officers or any individual other than a public officer for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof, not in itself unlawful: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

In the first place, let me call the attention of Senators to the fact that in the food bill which has just passed Congress, and which, I believe, is still in the hands of the Chief Executive, we incorporated this provision in Part I of the bill as it passed both Houses:

And provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed to forbid or make unlawful collective bargaining by any cooperative association or other association of farmers, dairymen, gardeners, or other producers of farm products with respect to the farm products produced or raised by its members upon land owned, leased, or cultivated by them.

If we adopt this amendment in the form that it is proposed by the committee, we simply repeal that law.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, does the Senator think, on reflection, that he is justified in that assertion? Here is an old law—the antitrust act. There is a provision for the enforcement of the antitrust law. The Senator has spoken of a law which this provision does not repeal or obstruct. It is a straight matter of legislation favoring the people of whom he speaks. I think it is hardly supposable that the class of business covered there could by any ordinary construction of language be brought under the enforcement of the antitrust law as the law reads and as it should be construed.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator from Wyoming what would the Attorney General of the United States be obliged to do if there were no provision here stating explicitly that none of this money shall be used for the prosecution of the industries to which I have referred? What would the Attorney General of the United States have to do? We have just passed a law

which contains a provision, which I have just read, exempting farm organizations.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator mean to say that he has constituted a trust? This appropriation is for the enforcement of the antitrust law. I do not understand that the Senator has created any trust of farmers in his legislation.

Mr. GRONNA. Oh, no; but that is a question which has been debated ever since the antitrust law was passed. We know that the only trusts that have been successfully prosecuted are these men who get together and form their little associations—dairymen, farmers, and labor men. I know that it applies to the farmers, because there are any number of cases over in the State of Illinois where the dairymen have been prosecuted, thrown into jail, and fined for what they call collective bargaining. The same is true of a number of cases over in the State of Ohio. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I know of no case where the Government of the United States has been successful in prosecuting the large trusts.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is certainly mistaken about that.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not know about that.

Mr. WARREN. The Government does not succeed in its prosecution of all cases, but quite a large number of violators of the law have been sent to jail and fined heavily.

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

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the adoption of this amendment as reported to the Senate by the committee will not repeal the law referred to by the Senator. This relates to an annual appropriation. If a dollar of this money is not spent between now and June 30, 1920, every cent of it will go back into the Treasury of the United States. Of course, I will say to the Senator, that will not happen; but it does not say what class of individuals or combination of individuals the antitrust law shall be applied against. It is a deficiency created in the department in regard to the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; exactly.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it may be that if there are dairymen, as spoken of by the Senator, who are violating the antitrust laws, a part of this money may be used for their prosecution. It may be that every dollar of this money will be used for the prosecution of some other corporation for violating those laws. Even if the language stricken out were in here, however, it does not say that the money shall not be expended for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, but it would say that none of it should be used for the purpose of prosecuting farmers or those engaged in the lines of industry specified.

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

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. We forget some of the provisions of what is known as the Clayton Act, and I think I should read part of it into the RECORD right here to show that there is no need for this amendment, because, as I understand, the Attorney General could not use this money for this purpose, anyway, under this section.

Mr. GRONNA. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. OVERMAN. Section 6 of the Clayton Act says:

That the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce. Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations, instituted for the purposes of mutual help, and not having capital stock or conducted for profit, or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof; nor shall such organizations, or the members thereof, be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade, under the antitrust laws.

Mr. GRONNA. Furthermore, it would be unfair to the Attorney General to adopt this amendment. I want to read just a sentence or two from the House hearings, on pages 449 and 450:

The CHAIRMAN. I note you are asking that the following language carried in the present appropriation act for this appropriation be eliminated:

"*Provided, however*, That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof, not in itself unlawful: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products."

Mr. PALMER. I have no objection to that being eliminated at all. I do not know why that is put in. We simply estimated for the enforcement of the antitrust law $200,000. We did not go into the question of repeating legislation on it. I assume that stays.

The CHAIRMAN. You carried all the provisions except those two provisos, and when that is done the estimate is marked as this estimate is marked for elimination.

Mr. STEWART. The department has never included that language. That legislation is inserted by the committee, and we assumed it would be each time.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not asking the elimination of it?

Mr. STEWART. No.

Mr. PALMER. No; I voted for it when I was in the House.

Mr. President, the Attorney General, as I understand, is in favor of this language as it is written into the bill by the House.

I have only referred to the farmer. I hold no brief particularly for labor organizations, but I believe that labor is entitled to fair dealing. I believe that if those who labor feel that it is for the interest of labor and in the interest of humanity that they shall form associations, they ought to have a perfect right to do so.

As long as these things are all being done in accordance with law, there is absolutely no reason why we should say that such associations shall not be permitted to organize; and I am very glad that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has called the attention of the Senate to the Clayton Act. There is absolutely no need for striking out this language, because, as the Senator has said, in all probability it could not be used in any event.

Mr. WARREN. Then I ask the Senator, Why need it be put in, as the Clayton Act provides for it?

Mr. GRONNA. We want to make it plain, Mr. President.

Mr. WARREN. You want to make it plain that we pass a law and then reserve certain industries to which it can not be applied?

Mr. OVERMAN. The question is, Why put it in?

Mr. WARREN. That is what I say.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why strike it out?

Mr. WARREN. Why leave it in? I will tell you why, because it says, openly and aboveboard, that the Congress of the United States, when it passed the law, meant it to apply only to certain individuals and certain interests, and to exclude all the others. That is what it means.

Mr. OVERMAN. You want to make an appropriation for the enforcement of the antitrust law and appropriate $300,000?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; $200,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then you say that you ought to put that in, when you have the Clayton Act here before you?

Mr. WARREN. The Clayton Act is all right, and so is the act the Senator speaks of. But the idea, every time we pass a law, of having the necessity of making a reservation of that kind, does not seem to me to be good legislative practice.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I wanted to ask the Senator from Wyoming, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, if it is not a fact that in practically every appropriation bill a provision similar to this has been carried since 1913? Has not this proviso been written into it?

Mr. WARREN. It has at times, and at times it has not.

Mr. HARRISON. Practically speaking, the policy of Congress since 1913 in making appropriations has been to put this proviso in, has it not?

Mr. WARREN. I do not consider it a policy of Congress; no. It may pass it one year and not pass it another.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that in the Sixty-second Congress a similar provision was passed by Congress, and Mr. Taft, who was then President, vetoed it, and both Houses passed it over the President's veto?

Mr. WARREN. That was quite different.

Mr. HARRISON. It was in the same language, was it not?

Mr. WARREN. I think not.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator from North Dakota will permit, I should like at this time to insert in the RECORD the exact wording of the proviso that President Taft vetoed.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit me to inquire if the Clayton Act was on the statute books at the time the President vetoed that bill?

Mr. HARRISON. No; the Clayton Act was passed about six months after President Taft vetoed that measure.

Mr. KING. There is a general act now that exempts these organizations from prosecution under the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. HARRISON. Year by year since then a similar provision has been incorporated in appropriation bills. Here is the way the proviso read at that time:

Provided, however, That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the condition of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof not in itself unlawful: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of pro-

ducers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

Both provisos are practically the same as the proviso in this appropriation bill, and that was passed over the President's veto.

Mr. WARREN. As the Senator says, the bill was vetoed, and afterwards the Clayton Act passed, which provides for all that should be provided for in that respect, I think.

Mr. HARRISON. I am not reading from the Clayton Act.

Mr. WARREN. I understand that. I understand what the Senator is reading. He is reading from the bill that was vetoed.

Mr. HARRISON. The bill that was vetoed and passed over the President's veto.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I do not care to further occupy the time of the Senate, but I simply want to say that this is no time to pass this kind of legislation. I believe that whatever legislation we enact ought to be made plain, not couched in ambiguous language, but in plain language. We know that there is considerable unrest in the country. We also know that these labor and farm organizations can not, by the very nature of things, become monopolies or trusts. I am not now defending either farm organizations or labor organizations when they violate the law. But they should have the right to form their associations to talk matters over, and that applies to labor as well as to farm organizations.

Mr. President, I was impressed with the statement made by a gentleman from Pennsylvania by the name of Miller, who, I believe, is chairman of the dairy association of that State. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to read his statement, but I know that many of those associations to which he referred were being not only prosecuted but persecuted. Of course none of them were convicted, but they were put to a lot of trouble and unnecessary expense.

I want this language so plain that no man can have the right to point his finger at the Attorney General and say that he is not doing his duty, and unless we say, in plain language, that this money shall not be used for the prosecution of these associations; if the Attorney General receives complaints against farm associations, he might have to proceed and prosecute them if he knows that they are getting together and discussing prices, or if labor gets together and talks or discusses wages or advocates associations for the purpose of bettering their conditions, for the purpose of shortening hours or increasing wages, as I understand it, that might be construed to be a violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. President, I for one do not want that to be done, and I do not believe that a majority in the Senate wish that to be done.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am in somewhat the same position as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], being a member of the committee. I voted against this amendment in the committee, and reserved the right to oppose it on the floor of the Senate.

Notwithstanding the provision of the law read by the Senator from North Dakota, notwithstanding the provisions of the Clayton Act read by the Senator from North Carolina, and notwithstanding the provisions of the national defense act, which read as follows:

That this section shall not apply to any farmer, gardener, cooperative association of farmers or gardeners, including live-stock farmers, or other persons with respect to the products of any farm, garden, or other land owned, leased, or cultivated by him, nor to any retailer"—

And so forth; and notwithstanding the reading of the provisions of section 6—

that any accumulating or withholding by any farmer or gardener, cooperative association of farmers or gardeners, including live-stock farmers, or any other person, of the products of any farm, garden, or other land owned, leased, or cultivated by him shall not be deemed to be hoarding within the meaning of this act.

The fact is that prosecutions have been brought against organizations of farmers.

I had a wire the other day advising me of a suit that had been brought, and called the matter to the attention of the Attorney General to get the facts upon which the suit had been based. He advised me that his office had not been informed and therefore could not give me the information. I do not know the facts in the case, but I do know that these organizations have been threatened with prosecution. They have been organized under the law. They must deal with large corporations. They must deal with millers and elevator men who have a monopoly of the trades in their neighborhoods, and they have organized all over Kansas, North and South Dakota, and other agricultural States, to protect themselves. They have organized under the law. They had a right to organize, and I claim that no part of this appropriation should be used to prosecute those men, and I hope this amendment may be defeated. They have not organized in restraint of trade, and they have no desire to create a monopoly; they have formed associations and organized in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator if he does not, from his statement, believe that the trust law ought either to be repealed or amended so that we would not have to protect them in every item of appropriations, which, of course, should call for only money to carry the laws out as they stand on the statute books?

Mr. CURTIS. I think if the Clayton law were liberally construed there would be absolutely no necessity for such provisions as these. But, notwithstanding the Clayton Act, they are prosecuting these associations of farmers. What I want is that these men be protected; that the Attorney General be notified time and again, if necessary, that these men who have organized to protect themselves, as they must, shall not be prosecuted under this law.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask the Senator from Kansas a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I did not hear all that the Senator from Kansas said; but for information, and in order to get the point of view of the Senator, I should like to know whether the Senator is contending that if farmers, or any other class of people, acting in their individual capacity or as corporations, should organize for the purpose of restraining trade and commerce and for the purpose of creating a monopoly, they ought to be exempt from prosecution?

Mr. CURTIS. No. But these people do not organize for that purpose. They are endeavoring to obtain fair and reasonable prices. But, notwithstanding that fact, they are prosecuted or are threatened with prosecution.

Mr. KING. I do not know, of course, to whom the Senator is referring.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe the people who do organize for the purpose of creating a monopoly and for the sole purpose of increasing prices should be prosecuted. But I believe the men who organize in small trading centers—farming communities, where there is little or no competition—to handle their own grain, to handle their own cream, and to handle their own butter, ought to be exempted from prosecution under this act or any other act.

Mr. KING. If I understand the Senator, I agree with his position. May I inquire of the Senator further, suppose a large number of communities organize for the purpose of creating a monopoly and then extend their operations so as to embrace a State, or a number of States, and they then fix the price of butter, or cheese, or other farm products, and do create a monopoly, and their organization is such as to constitute a restraint of trade. I am curious to know whether the Senator thinks that such combination would come under the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, if they organize all over the country and created a monopoly, they would come under the antitrust law. But these are not large organizations. They only apply to small communities, where they have no competition. In some places the markets are not good, they have poor railroad facilities, there is only one organization there to buy their products, and that organization fixes the price, and the farmers are helpless. They must organize to protect themselves against those who have no competition and who buy and control the market, as they do in many communities. I know of cases in my own State where there was paid a difference of 10 to 20 cents a bushel for wheat at stations within 10 miles of each other. Should not the farmers there, when they were being robbed of 10 or 20 cents a bushel, be permitted to organize, build an elevator, and hold their wheat until they could get a fair and reasonable price for their products?

One farmer could not compete with a big elevator, but 5, 6, 10, 20, or 30 of them could.

Mr. KING. I was expressing no opinion. I was interested in finding out where the Senator would draw the line between a big trust and a little trust, a large combination in restraint of trade and a little combination in restraint of trade.

Mr. CURTIS. The farmers have not organized in restraint of trade. I might state, in further answer to the Senator's question, that the last two lines of the amendment read:

And organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

This is all they ask, and they are entitled to this protection, and it is this amendment in behalf of the farmers that is pro-

posed to be stricken out. I hope the amendment may be defeated.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows, of course, that the Clayton Act contains a provision which legalizes all the organizations for which the Senator is contending, and prohibits any prosecution against them.

Mr. CURTIS. I know that is true. But I stated, in the opening of my remarks, that notwithstanding the Clayton Act, notwithstanding the national-defense act of August, 1917, notwithstanding the act read by the Senator from North Dakota, prosecutions are now pending. As I stated, I had a wire of a prosecution, called the matter to the attention of the Attorney General, and he was unable to give me the facts, because no report had been made to his department.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will permit the suggestion, perhaps those who initiated the prosecution thought they were going beyond the provisions of the Clayton Act; that they were charging more than a fair price; that their organization was not for the purpose of obtaining fair prices for their products, but was for the purpose of obtaining an unfair price for their products.

Mr. CURTIS. Then why should any Senator object to a provision in this bill which says they can only hold out for a fair and reasonable price?

Mr. KING. I am making no argument in respect to that. I am merely trying to find out what the views of the Senator were as to when an organization would become a monopoly and when it was not a monopoly. The thought also occurred to me that if there is a statute already upon the books which protects the organizations for which the Senator is speaking, as I understand him to admit that there is, how can that statute be affected by the measure which is now under consideration? It does not propose to repeal that law.

Mr. CURTIS. Up to date it does not seem to have protected it. That is the point I am making.

Mr. KING. Would it protect it any more by merely reaffirming the statute?

Mr. CURTIS. It shows a desire to prevent the use of any part of this money for the purpose of bringing a prosecution against farmers' organizations, which were organized solely for the purpose of obtaining fair and reasonable prices.

The Attorney General stated before the House committee that he would obey this provision if it were put in the act and we ask that the committee amendment be defeated so the provision may be retained in the act and that the associations of farmers may cooperate and organize, and in that way secure reasonable prices for their products.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I merely want to express, on my own behalf, a complete approval of the views which are being expressed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] and to say that I am altogether in sympathy with them. The big combinations are not really controlled by the antitrust law. They are flagrantly carrying out now their monopolistic plans throughout the country, and that contributes largely to the high cost of living. The big organization which can bring within its own hands the purchasing of products raised by the farmers can absolutely exercise control over those prices to the injury of those who produce and thereby discourage production in this country, just exactly as the American Tobacco Trust could, by setting such low prices on tobacco that at last they drove people into absolute revolution.

The thing that we ought to do in this country is to go far beyond what the Senator is now trying to do, to protect these little producers against injury and harm from failure of administration of some officer who does not know enough to draw a line of discrimination between the two. We have to go far beyond that. We have got to put a limitation upon these monopolies in this country as to the extent they can tax the people of the country under the powers which they are permitted to exercise under the laws as they exist. I think the Sherman antitrust law might as well be wiped off the statute books for all the good it does.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I notice that in the Sixty-second Congress, on March 4, 1914, when the veto message of the President came before the House for consideration and the passage of the bill over his veto, the present Attorney General was at that time a Member of the House, and that he voted to override the President's veto with this provision in the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that he made that statement in the hearings.

Mr. HARRISON. I call to the attention of the Senator also the fact that on this provision in the House there were only 30 votes against it and 201 for it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, some days ago, in discussing a proposition somewhat analogous to the one presented by this amendment, I inserted in the RECORD the veto message of President Taft to the first appearance of the proviso which is here under discussion and which has appeared in every appropriation bill since that time which makes appropriations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. That message came to the Senate on the last day of the life of the Sixty-second Congress, and of course could not be acted upon here; hence the bill died with all other unfinished business of the Congress. It made its appearance at the special session which was called by President Wilson for April, when the appropriation bill, which had failed of passage, was renewed. It came from the House with this proviso and was here opposed by a very small minority of Senators under the leadership of the late lamented senior Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Gallinger. President Wilson signed the bill and took occasion to state—I will not say that he said he regarded the proviso as unconstitutional, but while he regarded it as unlawful, he realized that unless he signed the bill it would again fail, and he therefore concluded to sign it, because there was plenty of money in the previous appropriation for the prosecution of violations of the antitrust law to make it practically ineffective. In other words, two Presidents of the United States, one a Republican and the other a Democrat, have officially voiced the opinion that the proviso was unconstitutional. I mention both these circumstances lest it might appear that the opposition to the appearance of this sort of legislation in a congressional enactment was based upon some partisan motive or purpose. Such is not the case.

I have objected, Mr. President, to this proviso wherever it has appeared, and because I have been unable to make that objection effective I have felt it to be my duty to vote against every measure containing it. My objection to it has nothing whatever to do with the classes which it affects, with the need for it, if need there be, or with the manner in which the antitrust laws have been executed.

If the exception related to any other class of people, if, instead of relating to classes, it were confined to sections, my objection would be the same. It consists in the fact that, under this sort of legislation, the general laws of the country are made to apply to only certain sections of the people, while other sections are expressly excluded from its operation.

Now, I contend that it is beyond the power of the Congress of the United States, however great its authority, to enact general legislation and make it applicable to only a part of the people of the country. It has been done a great many times; in fact, I think such legislation has disfigured the legislative history of the United States ever since the close of the Civil War. Privileges have been extended many times, and improperly, to corporate influences, combinations, and to vested interests. I shall not attempt to specify any particular ones at this time. Suffice it to say that I always condemned them long before I was honored with a seat in the Senate.

Fundamentally it is undemocratic and in practice it is a violation of the political cry, because that is all it now amounts to, of "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." Class legislation disfigured the action of Congress in behalf of vested interests so long as vested interests were politically more powerful than any other. Class legislation has disfigured our action since vested interests ceased to be more powerful and other interests and combinations have taken their places. But the principle is vicious in either case, and it is one which in my judgment has more to do with the present unsatisfactory condition of the country than any other single element, with the exception of the effect of the war itself upon the human race.

Let me read this proviso:

> For the enforcement of antitrust laws, $200,000: *Provided, however,* That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization other than an organization of public officers or any individual other than a public officer for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof, not in itself unlawful: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

Let me say, Mr. President, at the outset that if any attempts were made to use or if any use were actually made of this appropriation for the purpose of prosecuting such organizations as are included in the proviso, it would be unlawfully used, since the character of organizations there cited is not and can not under any circumstaces constitute a violation of the antitrust law. Men have the right to associate, to combine, if you please, for the purpose of doing everything which is mentioned in the proviso, and by so doing they violate no law whatever, so far as I know, either State or National.

The difficulty with this proviso, Mr. President, is not in what it recites but in what it actually accomplishes. Section 6 of

the Clayton Act, which I opposed, is harmless as regards its phraseology, but under its operation have grown up enormous aggregations of men frequently engaged in conspiracies against trade, as exemplified by Nation-wide strikes, against which the Government can not lift a finger or does not lift a finger, because of the exemption from the Clayton law of these classes of society.

We are face to face with a threatened strike of the employees of all of the bituminous coal mines of the country. The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] took occasion this morning to address the Senate upon that all-important subject and very graphically outlined not only the probabilities of this Nation-wide calamity but its consequences. Needless to say, both of them are appalling, as both of them are un-American and unjust. There 446,000 men, engaged in a great basic industry, protected by the provisions of the Clayton anti-trust law, meet in convention, announce terms under which they will continue their employment, instruct their leaders to call a strike upon a day to be fixed; and they can do so, so far as regards any lawful remedy, with absolute impunity. In every other department of life, responsibility goes with power; amenability to law is the inevitable condition of the exercise of a business right or pursuit. We require capital to organize; we give it privileges of incorporation that are just as pernicious and have been the source of just as much abuse as any other privileges founded on legislation; but there is an element of responsibility, since if my business is ruined by a process that is forbidden by law I can summon my adversary into court, and, if I can prove my case, I can secure a judgment, and that judgment will be in whole or in part my reimbursement. But the suffering inflicted upon the members of my family by an organization which I have never injured, consequent upon the shortage in coal during the winter season, and which comes not only to mine but to every family in the United States, however serious it may be and however long continued, carries with it absolutely no remedy whatever, since, under the laws of our country, those engaged in that sort of a conspiracy against trade are not even required to incorporate.

So I say, Mr. President, it is not the phraseology of a proviso like this, but the construction that is placed upon it, and the things done under it, that make it formidable and which would require the repeal of both, by which I mean the proviso in this bill and the exemption found in the Clayton Act. I say again that associations of men designed to better their condition, to bring about "collective bargaining," if you please, can be formed, and all those activities of men, short of conspiracies against trade, can be exercised in this country, always have been and always will be.

It is the carving out of a class—I care not what that class may be—and making it immune from the operations of the general statute, I repeat, that has been the prolific source of industrial and social evils in this country for the last 50 years. The thing itself is what I oppose, whether the moving cause of the thing comes from the one or the other direction, whether it comes from the vested interests or from associations of men. In each instance the great public is the sufferer; in each instance the laws are brought into disrespect; and in each instance the impulse is furnished for further class legislation, either exempting other elements from the operation of general law or increasing the privileges already enjoyed by those who are so fortunate.

Mr. President, if this proviso should read that "no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization in the States of North Dakota and Colorado," no Senator within the sound of my voice would hesitate for a moment in characterizing it as class legislation and in voting aganst it; but there is no more difference, in legal effect, between such an exemption and the one which is set forth in the proviso itself.

If we should enact a law against highway robbery—and perhaps the activities of the Federal Government will extend that far very soon—and then exempt from its operation all of the red-headed men and women of the country, no one for a moment would hesitate in pronouncing it class legislation, yet such a statute would differ not a whit from the one which now confronts us.

I do not want to see any small organization of any sort engaged in the very credible task of promoting the interests of its members subject to prosecution by the Attorney General or by anybody else; and if it be true, as stated by the Senator from Kansas, that such prosecutions now exist, then it is equally true that this proviso, if it be not stricken out, will not protect such organizations, for they are being prosecuted under statutes containing this proviso, thus showing that it is not operative.

I know that producers in this country have or have had a hard time; there is no question about that. I know that organizations of some kind are necessary for their well-being, because when one part of the community organizes for a certain purpose, aimed at the rest of the community, they also must organize as a counter-defense. Such local organizations should be encouraged along every legitimate line that will promote their welfare and, through such promotion, contribute to the general welfare. But, Mr. President, there are organizations and organizations. Those which were referred to by the Senator from North Dakota are those that should be encouraged; those which are immune and must be immune, regardless of this proviso, are those which will be prosecuted, as I have just stated, if they are to be prosecuted at all, whether this proviso is in the bill or not.

Only last week there was an announcement in the public press by some gentleman who declared that he represented an organization consisting of 40 per cent of all the farmers in the United States in which he outlined a national program. I read that program with a great deal of interest. While I may be mistaken, I am free to confess that if it is carried out it is apt to prove quite as objectionable to the consumers of this country—to the great mass of the people—as is the present steel strike. That is the sort of an organization, Mr. President, that should be but is not included in the Clayton Act; that is the sort of an organization that will escape under the practical application of provisos like this; while those with which Senators are concerned will, independently of the law, continue as they have before; in other words, the public construction given to these exceptions, the practical operation of affairs under them, is to give immunity to the huge organizations that are quite as apt to interfere with the normal flow of business and of ordinary affairs as are institutions which are known as combinations of capital. If 40 per cent of all the agriculturists of the United States lay down a national program which virtually demands the nationalization of what they call the national resources of the country—which, in my judgment, necessarily includes every farm in the United States—and then place the force of the organization behind it, and, by the power which that organization represents, virtually defy the antitrust laws of the country, then their success is absolutely certain, especially in view of the other consideration that there is no corresponding responsibility.

Mr. President, it has been said by one of the Senators who preceded me that this is no time to change laws; that this is not an occasion for interfering with or altering those conditions which have prevailed in the last few years. I wish I could agree with that view of things. My mind would be a great deal easier. My own view is that inasmuch as every day now brings us face to face with the consequences of our past legislation, inasmuch as the events of every week demonstrate the power of individual organizations, and bring forcibly to us, either by object lessons in existence or those which are sure to come, what they can accomplish, and propose to accomplish, under the special privileges and exemptions given to them by the statutes of the United States, now is the time of all times to wipe these excrescenses from our statute books, and get back to the good old level where all legislation was designed for the benefit or the punishment of every citizen, high and low, of every man and woman in the United States, of all classes and conditions of men.

Mr. President, the consumers, the noncombatants in this country, the men upon whose shoulders rests the burden of taxation, the people who have to pay for every rise in the cost of living, constitute 90 per cent of the people of the United States, and they are entitled to a little consideration at the hands of their representatives in the two Houses of Congress. They are not very well organized; they may never be; but their resources are not absolutely inexhaustible, and when they break the Nation breaks. When the burden becomes so great that they stagger under it and fall, the Nation falls, and all of these classes whose favor we so earnestly seek and whose votes we need so badly will cease to be classes, because the Nation itself will have undergone collapse.

The papers announced a day or two ago that the fares upon the traction lines of Washington were to be increased 40 per cent after the 1st of November—that is to say, from 5 to 7 cents. The 1st of November is getting to be the most attractive day in the calendar. All the coal mines are going to stop, and city fares are going to be raised 40 per cent. What else will happen I suppose will be announced in due season. The man riding to his business and back home, paying two fares per day, will have his general expense increased $14.60 every year. One of the companies is prosperous, paying dividends, I understand, and has asked for no increase, but it gets it just the same. The other seems to be a bankrupt concern, water-logged with over-issues of stock and bonds, trying to keep out of the hands of the receiver, and has appealed to the commission for help, and the commission has finally concluded to give it, but at the expense

of the consuming public. It is an outrage, and it is one of these outrages that are spread as thin as possible, and then spread over the whole community. The man who pays 2 cents additional pays but little attention to it at the time, but every day means an aggregate increase of revenue to these companies of thousands upon thousands of dollars. That is but one of the little things that are placed upon the broad backs of the consuming public, due to the increasing demands from these classes protected by our statutes from any of the consequences to which others are exposed.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States will have the courage to begin right here and strike out this legislation. I have no doubt that it is true, as stated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], that many violations of the antitrust law by some of the corporations of the country either have not been prosecuted, or have not been properly prosecuted. I think there is no doubt about that; but, Mr. President, that may be a fact and at the same time constitute a very poor argument. It is a fact, unquestionably, but I am unable to apply it to the consideration of this question. The remedy is not to continue an exception, thereby creating a favored class, but to ascertain why the law is not enforced against everybody, and if there be reasons why it is not so enforced which we can ascertain and remove, then that is the legislative course which the Senate and the House should pursue.

The House, Mr. President, when this question came before it, by a viva voce vote struck out this proviso, and then some one demanded a record vote. If there is anything that the average Senator or Congressman likes to dodge on anything of this sort, it is a record vote. Nobody takes account of the viva voce vote, but when a man's name is called he has either got to vote or run, and when the viva voce vote was called for upon it the amendment was overwhelmingly defeated in the House.

That, Mr. President, was not an entirely creditable performance. If the House were not a body of equal power and dignity with this, I should speak of it in more expressive terms. It is not only not a creditable performance, but it is not an unusual performance. It happens many times. I am told that when the Congress increased the salaries of its own Members, an arrangement was very carefully made whereby a record vote was avoided. Every Senator and Member wanted the extra $2,500, but he did not want to go on record as wanting it. Consequently refuge was taken in the viva voce vote. Now, that may be successful, but it is not manly. It may be politics, but it is not right. We either should do here what we are willing to face our constituencies with or not do it.

So far as I am concerned, I am not particular how the vote is taken upon this particular amendment, so long as it is successful. I have gone on record a number of times concerning it, and I am quite willing to go on record again. I repeat that it is the beginning or the effort to begin the right legislative course, and do away with this unfortunate practice of listening to special privilege whispering in our ears from all sources and becoming more and more successful as time passes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations has acted wisely in proposing this amendment to the pending bill. The House provision temporarily, so far as this appropriation is concerned, suspends our trust laws. It does indirectly what Congress ought to have the courage to do directly, if it is right to have class legislation. I will not consent with my vote to enforce laws against one class of the people and not against the others. The antitrust laws are good laws, and they should be either enforced impartially or repealed. Senators do not dare to repeal them, but seem not to hesitate to provide for a partial enforcement of them. It is proposed by the House provision to make an appropriation for enforcing the Sherman antitrust law and then to provide that the money shall not be used in enforcing it in certain cases. This procedure brings about a contempt for law. It is simply a recognition of class distinctions, and we are suffering to-day more from that fact than from almost any other.

I believe it is true that a great many of the organizations that are established by farmers are perfectly innocuous, are entirely helpful, and, in my judgment, do not violate any law; but if they do, then those laws ought to be amended, and it ought to be done directly. If the laws prevent desirable combinations by either farmers or laborers or manufacturers, then they should be amended so as to permit good combinations, and I know there are such, and they should be encouraged. I am ready to revise the trust laws, but am not willing to permit favoritism in their enforcement. But no Senator uninfluenced by political considerations, it seems to me, can stand in this Chamber and advocate a law for one class of the people which is not applicable to all of them. If you want to encourage class antagonism and class distinction you can encourage it no more than by this kind of legislation.

I have opposed this character of exceptional legislation ever since I have been in Congress, because it has seemed to me to be instrumental in creating the most serious wrongs and the greatest dangers. But this House provision is not intended to relieve the farmers of the country. They are put into this as a sop in an effort to make it more popular and respectable. I know that the farmers themselves do not want to do anything that is contrary to the public welfare. They are public-spirited, and if proper organizations are denied existence by the existing antitrust laws, I repeat that those laws should be amended. But I submit that it is an improper and a cowardly thing to do to exempt from a general law certain classes of our people and permit them, if that is what they are seeking—and I deny that is what farmers are seeking—to do things which would be unlawful for others to do.

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, does not that always form a direct invitation really to attempt to go in opposition to the Clayton Act when we specifically and directly exempt them? Is it not more or less by inference an invitation that they can go ahead without fear of prosecution?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think it is. I have no doubt about it myself. Such exemptions as these in the past have not been of benefit to labor. I believe that they have been injurious to it, and I am sure that any special provision now for any class of our people will result in injury rather than benefit. The country is suffering from lawlessness. Why encourage the evil?

I have no doubt this amendment will be defeated if a vote is taken on it. Very many amendments of this character have been defeated, and I think Senators who have cast votes on similar provisions in the past have realized that an injury rather than a benefit was done, especially to the people as a whole. If a thing is wrong for one man to do, it is wrong for all men to do it, and honest men are not demanding special privileges.

Mr. President, I have understood that there were some bills being considered for the purpose of making a distinction between the efforts of people who are operating under the provisions that would be affected by the Sherman antitrust law, or the Clayton law, so as to classify combined activities and separate those which are clearly beneficial from those which ought to be prohibited. Will it be contended that any act which labor might do, or which farmers might do, however detrimental to the public welfare, would be perfectly lawful and ought to be exempted from the operations of the general law? I do not think the farmers themselves want any such provision adopted. I have not been notified by any of my farmer constituents that they want this exemption from a general statute. They want only their legitimate rights, and if any statute denies them these it should be repealed. When they want legislation they will ask for it, and we can consider it upon its merits and not sidetrack the issue by an exemption in an appropriation bill affecting a law which should be universal in its application.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote for the committee amendment, believing it is proper and consistent with an honest effort to serve all the people of the United States impartially. Many times have class legislation and partial enforcement of laws risen to plague the country. Can Congress afford to add to this trouble? If the people's representatives would serve their constituents with the same zeal that they employ in looking after their individual political fortunes the distance between capital and labor, between the masses and the classes, would be lessened and a greater respect for law would exist.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNARY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 29, on which the yeas and nays are requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], which I transfer to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUM-

BER] to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I wish to announce that I have a pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call having been concluded,

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who is absent on official business. He is paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS].

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] and vote "yea."

Mr. PENROSE (after having voted in the affirmative). I observe that the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has not voted. As I have had for many years a standing pair with that Senator, I will withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]; and

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. KING. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] are detained from the Senate on official business.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent on account of illness in his family. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are absent on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Borah	Kellogg	New	Smoot
Calder	King	Page	Sterling
Chamberlain	Knox	Phipps	Thomas
Colt	Lodge	Poindexter	Townsend
Dillingham	McNary	Pomerene	Underwood
Edge	Myers	Sherman	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Nelson	Smith, Md.	Warren

NAYS—31.

Brandegee	Gronna	La Follette	Simmons
Capper	Harris	Lenroot	Smith, Ga.
Cummins	Harrison	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Spencer
Dial	Kendrick	Nugent	Swanson
Fall	Kenyon	Overman	Trammell
France	Keyes	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Gay	Kirby	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—37.

Ashurst	Hale	Martin	Smith, Ariz.
Ball	Harding	Moses	Stanley
Bankhead	Henderson	Newberry	Sutherland
Beckham	Hitchcock	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Watson
Elkins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Williams
Fernald	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Wolcott
Fletcher	McCormick	Reed	
Gerry	McCumber	Robinson	
Gore	McLean	Shields	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have an amendment, which I send to the desk. It is a slight matter. We will have to reconsider one amendment in order to insert the word "agent" in place of the word "clerk."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment was heretofore agreed to will be reconsidered. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

The SECRETARY. On page 36, in line 18, strike out the word "clerk" and insert in lieu thereof the word "agent."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask to have it read.

The SECRETARY. Add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. That no money, now, heretofore, or hereafter appropriated by the Congress for the pay, salaries, or maintenance of the Metropolitan police department of the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia, shall be paid to any member, officer, policeman, or patrolman of such force or such department of the District of Columbia who shall be a member of any organization of policemen or patrolmen which is affiliated, directly or indirectly, with any other labor organization or any branch or body of organized labor; and that the auditor of the District of Columbia and the Auditor of the Treasury Department and all other auditors and auditing officials of the United States Government be, and are hereby, ordered, directed, and commanded not to audit or approve any claims, warrants, or vouchers for services by any such member, officer, policeman, or patrolman under such circumstances; and that the Treasurer of the United States and all other officials are hereby ordered, directed, and commanded not to pay or cash any claim, warrant, or voucher of any such member, officer, policeman, or patrolman under such circumstances.

That all auditing and disbursing officials of the District of Columbia and of the United States Government shall be governed in the matters and orders herein set forth, made, and provided by such action in the premises as may be taken and such notice as may be given by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and it shall be the duty of such board to notify and keep informed all necessary auditing and disbursing officials of the District of Columbia and of the United States, from time to time, of the names of all such members, officers, policemen, and patrolmen of such police department or such police force as may be members of any such organization of policemen as is herein described and prescribed.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I feel that it is my duty, as chairman of the committee, to make a point of order against the amendment, but I wish to say that I am entirely in sympathy with the object stated, and if it were on some bill that contained legislation I would not make the objection. It is not a matter that can be considered in a deficiency appropriation bill, and I am therefore compelled to make the point of order against it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about the point of order.

Mr. WARREN. I withhold the point of order for that purpose.

Mr. MYERS. I have given that question some thought. It occurs to me that the amendment does not change existing law, but is merely a limitation upon the expenditure of money appropriated by Congress. I have always understood that it is permissible to put an amendment upon an appropriation bill which is merely a limitation upon the expenditures of moneys appropriated by Congress. That is my understanding of the rule, and I think this is merely a limitation upon the expenditure of money appropriated by Congress. For that reason I have been of the opinion that it would not be out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any appropriation in the bill providing pay for the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia?

Mr. WARREN. I desire to say that that is the particular point on which I base my point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no appropriation for the Metropolitan police?

Mr. WARREN. There is not. I renew my point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained. If there had been an appropriation for that purpose in the bill, the amendment would be in order.

Mr. POMERENE. I send to the desk the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. Add a new section as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Natural-gas supplies of the Northern Appalachian States: For the investigation of the stage of exhaustion, the amounts remaining available in the ground, and the probable life of the natural-gas fields tributary to the cities of Ohio, western New York, western Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and eastern Kentucky, there is hereby appropriated the sum of $15,000, to be expended under the direction of the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I should be glad to vote for a bill which carries that item, if it came as a separate measure, but I am compelled to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. Will not the Senator withhold the point of order for a moment?

Mr. WARREN. I will withhold it while the Senator addresses the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as everyone familiar with the subject knows, there is considerable gas territory in Ohio and West Virginia and western Pennsylvania. A large portion of our industrial cities are supplied with natural gas, not only for industrial purposes but for housekeeping purposes. Franchises are granted by the different municipalities to different companies. There has been a good deal of difference of opinion as to what price should be paid for the gas, and during the last 10 years, to my certain knowledge, there have been different representations as to the amount of natural-gas territory and

the supply which can be produced, not only at the present time but in future years. As a result, many of the cities are uncertain as to what ought to be done.

This proposed amendment simply asks for a preliminary survey. I have taken up the subject with the United States Geological Survey, and they advise me that they have no funds now whatever with which to have the survey made. Similar surveys have been made in the past in the Texas-Oklahoma territory and the Kansas territory, possibly in some others, and the information which they have gathered, while not mathematically certain, of course, has been of very great value to those communities.

I hope the Senator can see his way clear not to insist on the point of order. I hope he will consent to have the amendment adopted. It will no doubt go to conference; and if any reason occurs to Senators then why it should not be permitted to remain in the bill, of course I shall make no objection, but I make an appeal now to the good nature of the chairman of the committee and ask him to let it go in the bill under these circumstances.

Mr. WARREN. It is not a matter of good nature at all. It is a mere matter of a construction of the rules of the Senate. I have no pleasure but really have pain in insisting upon the point of order.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator smiles when he says he has pain. I am very sorry he feels that he must make this objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must sustain the point of order if it is made. It is not estimated for.

Mr. POMERENE. I observe an expression of pain on the face of the Vice President at the same time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to offer an amendment. On page 19, between lines 23 and 24, I move to insert the following:

For extra and special services performed by a United States district attorney, Clarence L. Reames, of Portland, Oreg., in the prosecution of certain cases in the northern district of California and in the western district of Washington, pursuant to the request of the Attorney General, during the years 1916 and 1917, $2,000.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say to the Senator offering the amendment that that was considered in the committee, and there was some question whether it should go in or not. I am perfectly willing, if the Senator wishes, to let it go in the bill and go to conference.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to have it go to conference, because I am satisfied the Attorney General will recommend it, in view of statements that he has already made about it.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RESERVATIONS TO TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire to have printed a number of suggested compromise reservations for the treaty of peace. These represent efforts of the different Senators to get together on some line of reservations on which a majority could agree.

As is well known, I think, no one claims to-day that the treaty can go through without reservations. It is necessary to secure 64 votes to put the treaty through. In order to secure those 64 votes it is necessary that some reservations be agreed upon. Those which I present, while not being reservations that have been agreed upon in every respect and in each detail, do represent the effort to agree of those who might be called mild reservationists and those who desire most radical reservations. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD of the proceedings of to-day, so that we may have them before us during the consideration of this matter to-morrow.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, in addition to printing them in the RECORD, would it not be well to have them printed as bills are printed, and laid on the desks of Senators?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have no objection, if the Senator wishes that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). The reservations will be printed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask that the reservations offered by the Senator from North Dakota may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed reservations being read? The Chair hears none.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, before that is done I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota whether we are to understand from his statement that he is offering these reservations not only on his own behalf but on behalf of other Senators who have agreed to them?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will scarcely say that, Mr. President. Many of them we have agreed upon. To others there are some slight objections, I will say, upon my own part and some on the part of others. These represent rather the effort to get together, perhaps, as nearly as we shall be able to get together until we may decide the matter in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have no objection to their being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the proposed reservations.

The Secretary read as follows:

SUGGESTED COMPROMISE RESERVATIONS.

CONCERNING WITHDRAWAL.

1. That the United States understands, and so construes article 1, that in case of notice of withdrawal from the league of nations, as provided in said article, the United States shall be the sole judge as to whether all its international obligations and all its obligations under the said covenant have been fulfilled.

CONCERNING ARTICLE 10.

2. The United States assumes no obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country or to interfere in controversies between nations, whether members of the league or not, under the provisions of article 10, or to employ the military and naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress which, under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military and naval forces of the United States, shall, by act or joint resolution, so declare.

CONCERNING DOMESTIC QUESTIONS.

3. The United States reserves to itself exclusively the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction, and declares that all domestic and political questions relating to its internal affairs, including immigration, coastwise traffic, the tariff, commerce, and all other domestic questions, are solely within the jurisdiction of the United States and are not, under this treaty, submitted in any way either to arbitration or to the consideration of the council or the assembly of the league of nations or to the decision or recommendation of any other power.

CONCERNING THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

4. The United States does not bind itself to submit for arbitration or inquiry by the assembly or the council any question which, in the judgment of the United States, depends upon or involves its long-established policy commonly known as the Monroe doctrine. Said doctrine is to be interpreted by the United States alone and is hereby declared to be wholly outside the jurisdiction of said league of nations; and it is preserved unaffected by any provision in said treaty contained.

CONCERNING SHANTUNG.

5. The United States refrains from entering into any agreement on its part in reference to the matters contained in articles 156, 157, and 158, and reserves full liberty of action in respect to any controversy which may arise in relation thereto.

CONCERNING VOTE OF DOMINIONS (WHERE NEITHER PRINCIPAL COUNTRY NOR DOMINION IS PARTY TO DISPUTE).

6. The United States reserves the right, upon the submission of any dispute to the council or the assembly, to object to any member and its self-governing dominions, dependencies, or possessions having in the aggregate more than one vote; and in case such objection is made the United States assumes no obligation to be bound by any election, finding, or decision in which such member and its said dominions, dependencies, and possessions have in the aggregate cast more than one vote.

CONCERNING VOTES OF DOMINIONS (WHERE PRINCIPAL COUNTRY OR DOMINION IS PARTY TO DISPUTE).

7. That the United States understands and construes the words "dispute between members" and the words "dispute between parties," in article 15 to mean that a dispute with a self-governing dominion, colony, or dependency represented in the assembly is a dispute with the dominant or principal member represented therein and that a dispute with such dominant or principal member is a dispute with all of its self-governing dominions, colonies, or dependencies; and that the exclusion of the parties to the dispute provided in the last paragraph of said article will cover not only the dominant or principal member, but also its dominions, colonies, and dependencies.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, so that these reservations that have been offered in the form of resolutions may all appear in the RECORD together, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, following the proposed reservations, the reservations presented by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] on behalf of the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee, the reservations heretofore offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] on September 15, the reservations and amendments suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] on June 12, the reservations of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] under date of June 9, the reservations of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] on October 2, and the reservations of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] under date of August 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that all of these reservations be printed in one document and laid on the desks of Senators in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. POMERENE. If it is the purpose of the Senate to reprint these reservations it seems to me that all of them should be reprinted.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think they ought to be reprinted together and laid upon the desks of Senators.

Mr. POMERENE. Some reservations were offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that they have already been printed.

Mr. POMERENE. I know; but it is proposed here to reprint them.

Mr. McKELLAR. They ought to be printed in the RECORD also, and I do not understand that the Senator's request would exclude them.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all. They have already been ordered printed in the RECORD.

Mr. POMERENE. Also, certain reservations were presented by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. I think those were prepared, perhaps, by former Justice Hughes; and I think, as I now recall, that certain reservations were presented by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG].

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have here the reservations suggested by Mr. Hughes and presented by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] under date of July 24. I present them to accompany the unanimous-consent request. I also present the reservations offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] under date of October 11, and ask that they take the same course.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if these reservations are to be printed, I ask that all the reservations which have been proposed and not merely a part of them be printed and laid on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the suggestion as first made was to have all these reservations printed in the RECORD. Now, there seems to be another suggestion, that they shall all be printed as one document and laid on the desks of Senators. Is that the idea?

Mr. CURTIS. My request applies to the document which is to be laid on the desks of Senators.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that if we are going to put them all together as a document it would be sufficient for every Senator to have them all together in that form. All of them, I think, have been printed in the RECORD already. What the Senators want is to have them handy, so that they can get to them at once. If they are published in a document, that is the proper way and the best way for Senators to see all of the reservations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object to including these reservations in the RECORD?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator making the request if he will not change it so as to have them printed as a document?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I thought they ought to be printed in both ways, for this reason: The document is only immediately available to Senators until it is mailed out, while anything that appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD goes to the country, and gives everyone the benefit of the comparison of the various reservations. That was my object.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course I recognize that fact, and I will say to the Senator that I understand that all of them have already been printed in the RECORD; but if the Senator really thinks that it is necessary, and as we are paying no attention anyhow to what we put in the RECORD, I have not any objection if the Senator desires to have it done.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think at the present time it is becoming more important than it was at the time they were offered.

Mr. SMOOT. It is understood, then, that all of the reservations of every kind and character shall be printed not only in the RECORD but also in document form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the reservations, and then that all the reservations shall not only be included in the RECORD, but that they shall be printed as one document and laid on the desks of Senators. Does the Chair hear any objection?

Mr. PITTMAN. Also in the RECORD and in this one document.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Shall this suggestion reach to printing these reservations as a public document—the Chair presumes, a Senate document? What is the pleasure of the Senate on that question?

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator to request that they be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I requested that they be printed as a Senate document and laid on the desks of Senators, so that Senators can compare them and examine them without having to refer to the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only difference seems to be that Senate documents are exclusively for the use of Senators, while public documents go out to the various libraries in the country.

Mr. OVERMAN. I only wanted them printed as a Senate document.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to present and have printed and lie on the table to be printed with the other reservations in the document that was ordered printed this afternoon what is intended to be proposed by me as an additional paragraph to the resolution of ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. All reservations presented up to this time will be printed as a document and also in the RECORD.

The reservations are as follows (S. Doc. No. 139):

Senate resolution 76.

Mr. KNOX submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Congress of the United States in declaring, pursuant to its exclusive authority under the Constitution, the existence of a state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government, solemnly affirmed that the Imperial Government has so "committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States" that a state of war had been thrust upon them by that Government, and thereupon formally pledged the whole military and national resources of the country "to bring the conflict to a successful termination"; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States, being a coequal part of the treaty-making power of this Government, and therefore coequally responsible for any treaty which is concluded and ratified, is deeply concerned over the draft treaty of peace negotiated at Versailles by which it is proposed to end our victorious war and is gravely impressed by the fact that its provisions appear calculated to force upon us undesirable and far-reaching covenants inimical to our free institutions under the penalty that failing to accept these we shall continue in a state of war while our cobelligerents shall be at peace and enjoying its blessings; that it is proposed to make us parties to a league of nations, under a plan as to which the people of the United States have had neither time to examine and consider nor opportunity to express regarding it a matured and deliberate judgment, whereas the treaty may be easily so drawn as to permit the making of immediate peace, leaving the question of the establishment of a league of nations for later determination; and that the treaty as drawn contains principles, guaranties, and undertakings obliterative of legitimate race and national aspirations, oppressive of weak nations and peoples, and destructive of human progress and liberty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States will regard as fully adequate for our national needs and as completely responsive to the duties and obligations we owe to our cobelligerents and to humanity a peace treaty which shall assure to the United States and its people the attainment of those ends for which we entered the war, and that it will look with disfavor upon all treaty provisions going beyond these ends.

2. That since the people of the United States have themselves determined and provided in their Constitution the only ways in which the Constitution may be amended, and since amendment by treaty stipulation is not one of the methods which the people have so prescribed, the treaty-making power of the United States has no authority to make a treaty which in effect amends the Constitution of the United States, and the Senate of the United States can not advise and consent to any treaty provision which would have such effect, if enforced.

3. That the Senate advises, in accordance with its constitutional right and duty, that the great paramount if not sole duty of the peace conference is quickly to bring all the belligerents a full and complete peace; that to this end the treaty shall be so drawn as to permit any nation to reserve without prejudice to itself for future separate and full consideration by its people the question of any league of nations; that neither such an article nor the exercise of the rights reserved thereunder, whether at the time of signature, the time of ratification, or at any other time, shall affect the substance of the obligations of Germany and its cobelligerents under the treaty, nor the validity of signature and ratification on their behalf; and that any indispensable participation by the United States in matters covered by the league covenant shall, pending the entry of the United States into the league, be accomplished through diplomatic commissions which shall be created with full power in the premises.

4. That this resolution indicates and gives notice of the limits of the present obligations against the United States in which the Senate of the United States is now prepared to acquiesce by consenting to the ratification of a treaty embodying peace conditions that may be found otherwise acceptable to its judgment, and that the adoption by the peace conference of the foregoing reasonable limitations and positions will facilitate the early acceptance of the treaty of peace by the Senate of the United States, will in nowise interfere with the league of nations as between these countries prepared to ratify the treaty without further consideration, and will afford such a manifestation of real respect for the wishes of a great people as can not fail more firmly to cement the friendship already existing between ourselves and our cobelligerents.

5. That, finally, it shall be the declared policy of our Government, in order to meet fully and fairly our obligations to ourselves and to the world, that the freedom and peace of Europe being again threatened by any power or combination of powers, the United States will regard such a situation with grave concern as a menace to its own peace and freedom, will consult with other powers affected with a view to devising means for the removal of such menace, and will, the necessity arising in the future, carry out the same complete accord and cooperation with our chief cobelligerents for the defense of civilization.

—

Senate resolution 86.

Mr. SPENCER submitted the following resolution, which was ordered to lie over under the rule:

Resolved, That the Senate approaches the consideration of the league of nations with entire sympathy and in the earnest desire to cooperate as fully as it may in thus establishing and preserving the peace of the world.

That in the interest of a frank and full understanding with the other nations of the world, and particularly with the signatory nations to the covenant itself, candor and friendship alike require that the danger of future misunderstanding should as far as possible be eliminated, and to that end the following declarations should be clearly and definitely made:

First. That the Monroe doctrine is an essential national policy of the United States, and that the necessity and extent of its application and enforcement are matters to be determined alone by the United States as the occasion for interpretation may from time to time arise and without interference, direct or indirect, on the part of any other nation.

Second. That internal questions entirely domestic in character, such as immigration and tariff, notwithstanding certain international results that may from time to time naturally be connected therewith, are matters to be determined entirely by the country in which they arise, and are under no circumstances questions for settlement under the provisions of the league of nations.

Third. That inasmuch as the United States is governed by a written constitution, the provisions of which are supreme and controlling in this Republic over every act, legislative, executive, or judicial, and by such constitution it is expressly provided that the power either to declare war or to continue war for more than two years is vested exclusively in the Congress of the United States, it is apparent that the United States can not bind itself in advance to either make war in the future or to send its Army or Navy into other lands for purposes of control, which is an act of war, without the express authorization of Congress at the time, and, therefore, whether the United States, as the necessity for such action in the future may arise, shall by any military or naval force cooperate in maintaining any of the provisions of the league of nations is a matter which the Congress under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States is, and must be, entirely free to determine by what in its judgment is at the time consistent with the honor and interest and duty of the American people.

—

Reservations by Mr. Hale.

The Senate of the United States of America advises and consents to the ratification of said treaty with the following reservations and understandings as to its interpretation and effect to be made a part of the instrument of ratification:

First. That whenever two years' notice of withdrawal from the league of nations shall have been given, as provided in article 1 of the covenant, the power giving the notice shall cease to be a member of the league, or subject to the obligations of the covenant of the league, at the time specified in the notice, notwithstanding any claim, charge, or finding of the nonfulfillment of any international obligation or of any obligation under said covenant: *Provided, however*, That such withdrawal shall not release the power from any debt or liability theretofore incurred.

Second. That questions relating to immigration, or the imposition of duties on imports, where such questions do not arise out of any international engagement, are questions of domestic policy, and these and any other questions which, according to international law, are solely within the domestic jurisdiction are not to be submitted for the consideration or action of the league of nations or of any of its agencies.

Third. That the meaning of article 21 of the covenant of the league of nations is that the United States of America does not relinquish its traditional attitude toward purely American questions, and is not required by said covenant to submit its policies regarding questions which it deems to be purely American questions to the league of nations or any of its agencies, and that the United States of America may oppose and prevent any acquisition by any non-American power by conquest, purchase, or in any other manner of any territory, possession, or control in the Western Hemisphere.

Fourth. That the meaning of article 10 of the covenant of the league of nations is that the members of the league are not under any obligation to act in pursuance of said article except as they may decide to act upon the advice of the council of the league. The United States of America assumes no obligation under said article to undertake any military expedition or to employ its armed forces on land or sea unless such action is authorized by the Congress of the United States of America, which has exclusive authority to declare war or to determine for the United States of America whether there is any obligation on its part under said article and the means or action by which any such obligation shall be fulfilled.

—

Senate resolution 168.

Mr. PITTMAN submitted the following resolution, which was ordered to lie over under the rule:

Resolved, That when the Senate of the United States shall advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany, signed at Versailles on the 28th day of June, 1919, now pending in the Senate, that it be done with and in consideration of the following understanding as to the present and future construction and interpretation to be given to the treaty:

1. That whenever the two years' notice of withdrawal from the league of nations shall have been given by any member of the league, as provided in article 1, the Government giving such notice shall be the sole judge whether all its international obligations and all its obligations under the covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of withdrawal.

2. That the suggestions of the council of the league of nations as to the means of carrying into effect the obligations of article 10, the execution of which may require the use of military or naval forces or economical measures, can only be carried out through the voluntary separate action of each of the respective Governments, members of the league, and that the failure of any such Government to adopt the suggestions of the council of the league, or to provide such military or naval forces or economical measures, shall not constitute a moral or legal violation of the treaty.

3. That all domestic and political questions relating to the internal affairs of a Government which is a member of the league, including immigration, coastwise traffic, the tariff, and commerce, are solely within the jurisdiction of such Government, and are not by the covenant of the league of nations submitted in any way either to arbitration or to the consideration of the council or assembly of the league of nations or to the decision or recommendations of any other power. If a dispute arises between parties with regard to a question other than those which are herein specifically exempted as domestic questions, and it is claimed by one of the parties that such question is a domestic and political question, relating to its internal affairs, then the council shall not consider or make recommendations thereon, except upon the unanimous vote of the council, other than the representations of the disputants.

4. There shall not be submitted to arbitration or inquiry by the assembly or the council any question which, in the judgment of the United States, depends upon or involves its long-established policy, commonly known as the Monroe doctrine, and it is preserved unaffected by any provision of the said treaty.

Senate resolution 169.

Mr. OWEN submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States in ratifying the treaty of peace wth Germany has done so with the understanding that the meaning and purpose of this instrument is as follows:

1. That there is nothing in the covenant establishing the league of nations capable of being interpreted as permitting the league of nations to interfere with any of the domestic affairs of the United States or of any other nation, such as matters relative to immigration, emigration, imports, or exports, coastwise traffic, or sovereignty within the 3-mile limit of its seacoast.

2. That nothing in the covenant can be construed as requiring the United States to use its military or naval forces except when the Congress of the United States within its own discretion may authorize it.

3. That if any member nation should see fit to withdraw from the league would not be precluded from doing so on the ground that it had not complied with its obligations.

4. That the covenant of the league will not in any degree impair the Monroe doctrine as heretofore interpreted by the Government of the United States.

5. That the league of nations is not authorized to interfere with the internal revolutions of any nation except in respect to the backward nations under a mandatory, nor to interfere with the readjustment of boundaries by agreement.

6. It is the opinion of the Senate that the reduction of armament should proceed as rapidly as the safety of the world shall permit.

7. It is the opinion of the Senate that the pledge contained in article 23 (b) that the members of the league "undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants under their control" is a moral pledge of the highest international character, made in pursuance of the principles enunciated by the President of the United States January 8, 1917, and in his subsequent addresses, which were accepted by the allied Governments on November 5, 1918, in arranging a basis for a treaty of peace with the Government of Germany.

8. The Senate has ratified the treaty upon the express understanding that the Japanese Government will fully and speedily carry out the pledge made to the Chinese Government in May, 1915, with regard to the Shantung Peninsula and has every confidence of the faithful and early compliance with this pledge.

—

Reservations reported by Mr. LODGE from the Committee on Foreign Relations to be made a part of the resolution of ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany when it is submitted, viz:

1. The United States reserves to itself the unconditional right to withdraw from the league of nations upon the notice provided in article 1 of said treaty of peace with Germany.

2. The United States declines to assume, under the provisions of article 10 or under any other article, any obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country or to interfere in controversies between other nations, members of the league or not, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States in such controversies, or to adopt economic measures, for the protection of any other country, whether a member of the league or not, against external aggression, or for the purpose of coercing any other country, or for the purpose of intervention in the internal conflicts or other controversies which may arise in any other country; and no mandate shall be accepted by the United States under article 22, Part I, of the treaty of peace with Germany, except by action of the Congress of the United States.

3. The United States reserves to itself exclusively the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction, and declares that all domestic and political questions relating to its affairs, including immigration, coastwise traffic, the tariff, commerce, and all other domestic questions, are solely within the jurisdiction of the United States, and are not under this treaty submitted in any way either to arbitration or to the consideration of the council or of the assembly of the league of nations, or to the decision or recommendation of any other power.

4. The United States declines to submit for arbitration or inquiry by the assembly or the council of the league of nations provided for in said treaty of peace any questions which in the judgment of the United States depend upon or relate to its long-established policy, commonly known as the Monroe doctrine; said doctrine is to be interpreted by the United States alone, and is hereby declared to be wholly outside the jurisdiction of said league of nations and entirely unaffected by any provision contained in the said treaty of peace with Germany.

—

Reservations intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCUMBER to be made a part of the resolution of ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany, viz:

1. That whenever the two years' notice of withdrawal from the league of nations shall have been given by the United States, as provided in article 1, the United States shall be the sole judge whether all its international obligations and all its obligations under this covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of withdrawal.

2. That the suggestions of the council of the league of nations as to the means of carrying the obligations of article 10 into effect are only advisory, and that any undertaking under the provisions of article 10, the execution of which may require the use of American military or naval forces or economic measures, can under the Constitution be carried out only by the action of the Congress, and that the failure of the Congress to adopt the suggestions of the council of the league, or to provide such military or naval forces or economic measures, shall not constitute a violation of the treaty.

3. The United States reserves to itself the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction and declares that all domestic and political questions relating to its internal affairs, including immigration, coastwise traffic, the tariff, commerce, and all other purely domestic questions are solely within the jurisdiction of the United States and are not by this covenant submitted in any way either to arbitration or to the consideration of the council or the assembly of the league of nations or to the decision or recommendation of any other power.

4. The United States does not bind itself to submit for arbitration or inquiry by the assembly or the council any question which in the judgment of the United States depends upon or involves its long-established policy commonly known as the Monroe doctrine, and it is preserved unaffected by any provision in the said treaty contained.

5. That in advising and consenting to the ratification of said treaty the United States understands that the German rights and interests,

renounced by Germany in favor of Japan under the provisions of articles 156, 157, and 158 of said treaty, are to be returned by Japan to China at the termination of the present war by the adoption of this treaty as provided in the exchanged notes between the Japanese and Chinese Governments of date May 25, 1915.

6. That the United States understands and construes the words "dispute between members" and the words "dispute between parties" in article 15 to mean that a dispute with a self-governing dominion, colony, or dependency represented in the assembly is a dispute with the dominant or principal member represented therein and that a dispute with such dominant or principal member is a dispute with all of its self-governing dominions, colonies, or dependencies; and that the exclusion of the parties to the dispute provided in the last paragraph of said article will cover not only the dominant or principal member but also its dominions, colonies, and dependencies.

—

Reservations intended to be proposed by Mr. SMITH of Georgia to the pending treaty of peace with Germany, viz:

Resolved, That the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the treaty with Germany with the following provisos, to be made a part of such ratification:

First. The United States understands and construes the words "dispute between members" and the words "dispute between parties," in article 15, to mean that a dispute with a principal member, self-governing dominion, colony, or dependency represented in the assembly is a dispute with the dominant or principal member represented therein and with each of the other self-governing dominions, colonies, or dependencies thereof, and that the exclusion of the parties to the dispute provided in the last paragraph of said article will cover the dominant or principal member, its dominions, colonies, and dependencies.

Second. The United States understands that, as the covenant provides no tribunal to pass judgment upon the subject, whenever the two years' notice for withdrawal from the league of nations shall have been given by a member nation, as provided in article 1, the member nation shall be the sole judge whether all its international obligations and all its obligations under this covenant have been fulfilled, and notice of withdrawal by the United States can be given by a concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States.

Third. The United States understands that the reference to the Monroe doctrine in the league covenant means that the long-established policy of the United States, commonly known as the Monroe doctrine, is preserved unaffected by the covenant, and that no question which depends upon or involves this policy is to be submitted to arbitration or inquiry by the assembly or the council of the league.

Fourth. The United States understands that under the league covenant no question can be raised either in the assembly or in the council of the league which will give either body the right to report or to make any recommendation or to take any action upon the policy of the United States or any other member nation with regard to domestic or political questions relating to its internal affairs, including immigration, coastwise traffic, the tariff, commerce, and all other purely domestic questions, but these questions, in whatever manner they may arise, are solely within the jurisdiction of each member nation, and are not by the covenant submitted in any way either to arbitration or to the consideration of the council or the assembly of the league of nations, or to the decision or recommendation of any other power, and, in the case of the United States, they are reserved for action by the Congress of the United States.

Fifth. The United States understands that the advice which may be given by the council or the assembly of the league with regard to the employment of the military or naval forces by a member nation, or with regard to the use of economic measures for the protection of any other country, whether member of the league or not, or for the purpose of coercing any other country or for the purpose of intervention in the internal conflicts or other controversies which may arise in any other country, is to be regarded only as advice, and leaves each member nation free to exercise its own judgment as to whether it is wise or practicable to act upon that advice, and that the Congress must determine for the United States its course.

The United States can not assume, under the provisions of article 10, or any other article, any obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country, or to interfere, under the provisions of article 16, in controversies between other nations, whether members of the league or not.

The authority for decisions in all matters referred to in this reservation is placed by the Constitution of the United States upon the Congress, and the failure of the Congress to adopt the suggestions of the assembly or the council of the league of nations or to take independent action shall not constitute a violation of the treaty, and no mandate shall be accepted by the United States, as provided in article 22, part 1, except by action of the Congress of the United States.

Sixth. The United States understands that the representatives of the other nations upon the reparations commission will interfere with exports from the United States to Germany or from Germany to the United States only when the United States also approves the interference.

Seventh. The United States understands that no one may represent the United States in any of the positions created by the treaty except when appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, unless provision is hereafter made by the Congress for selections in a different manner; and the representative of the United States, either in the assembly or the council, shall have no authority to agree for the United States to any amendment to or change in the covenant of the league until the same has been first submitted to and ratified by the Senate of the United States as other treaties.

—

Reservation intended to be proposed by Mr. CURTIS to the reservations proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations as a part of the resolution of ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany, viz:

5. The United States construes subdivision "C" of article 23 to mean that the league shall refuse to recognize agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children and that the league shall use every means possible to abolish and do away with such practice.

—

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. SHERMAN to the document (S. Doc. 85), treaty of peace with Germany, viz:

On page 17, line 10, before the word "agree," insert the following: "invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God and."

Reservations intended to be proposed by Mr. THOMAS to be made a part of the resolution of ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany, viz:

1. The United States declines to submit the credentials of its delegates and their advisers to the general conference to the determination of that body or to receive or act upon proposals of any conference from which its delegates and advisers or any of them have been excluded. And the United States understands and construes the Government delegates provided by article 389, and the 12 delegates representing governments upon the governing body of the international labor office and the person of independent standing to be nominated for the panel provided by article 412, to mean that both employers and workers are ineligible to selection or appointment to said positions or any of them. And the United States declines to submit the credentials or qualifications of any of its appointees under Part XIII of the treaty to any authority whatever.

2. The United States understands that the provisions of article 1, Part I, of the treaty, authorizing any member of the league to withdraw therefrom, mean that any such withdrawal, when made, is a withdrawal from the international organization created by Part XIII of the treaty. The United States also understands that amendments to Part XIII, under the provisions of article 422, shall not bind any member of the league which signifies its dissent therefrom, but in that case it shall cease to be a member of the league.

3. The United States reserves to itself exclusively the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction and that of the States respectively, and declares that all domestic and political questions relating to its affairs, including immigration, coastwise traffic, agriculture, the tariff, commerce, and all other domestic subjects, are not under Part XIII of this treaty submitted to the determination of the general conference, the governing body of the international labor union, or any other commission of inquiry to be chosen thereunder.

4. The United States reserves the right to decline to recognize the authority, except that of a member of the league, to file a complaint with the international labor office that it is not securing effective observance of any convention which both have ratified in accordance with the articles of Part XIII.

—

Mr. OWEN submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the United States in ratifying the covenant of the league of nations does not intend to be understood as modifying in any degree the obligations, entered into by the United States and the Entente Allies in the agreement of November 5, 1918, upon which as a basis the German Empire laid down its arms. The United States regards that contract to carry out the principles set forth by the President of the United States on January 8, 1917, and in subsequent addresses, as a world agreement, binding on the great nations which entered into it, and that the principles there set forth will be carried out in due time through the mechanism provided in the covenant, and that article 23, paragraph (b), pledging the members of the league to undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants under their control, involves a pledge to carry out these principles.

The protectorate which Germany recognizes in Great Britain over Egypt is understood to be merely a means through which the nominal suzerainty of Turkey over Egypt shall be transferred to the Egyptian people, and shall not be construed as a recognition by the United States in Great Britain of any sovereign rights over the Egyptian people or as depriving the people of Egypt of any of their rights of self-government.

—

SUGGESTED COMPROMISE RESERVATIONS.

October 21.

CONCERNING WITHDRAWAL.

1. That the United States understands, and so construes article 1, that in case of notice of withdrawal from the league of nations, as provided in said article, the United States shall be the sole judge as to whether all its international obligations and all its obligations under the said covenant have been fulfilled.

CONCERNING ARTICLE 10.

2. The United States assumes no obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country, or to interfere in controversies between nations, whether members of the league or not, under the provisions of article 10, or to employ the military and naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress which, under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military and naval forces of the United States, shall, by act or joint resolution, so declare.

CONCERNING DOMESTIC QUESTIONS.

3. The United States reserves to itself exclusively the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction, and declares that all domestic and political questions relating to its internal affairs, including immigration, coastwise traffic, the tariff, commerce, and all other domestic questions, are solely within the jurisdiction of the United States and are not, under this treaty, submitted in any way, either to arbitration or to the consideration of the council or the assembly of the league of nations, or to the decision or recommendation of any other power.

CONCERNING THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

4. The United States does not bind itself to submit for arbitration or inquiry by the assembly or the council any question which, in the judgment of the United States, depends upon or involves its long-established policy commonly known as the Monroe doctrine. Said doctrine is to be interpreted by the United States alone and is hereby declared to be wholly outside the jurisdiction of said league of nations; and it is preserved unaffected by any provision in said treaty contained.

CONCERNING SHANTUNG.

5. The United States refrains from entering into any agreement on its part in reference to the matters contained in articles 156, 157, and 158, and reserves full liberty of action in respect to any controversy which may arise in relation thereto.

CONCERNING VOTE OF DOMINIONS (WHERE NEITHER PRINCIPAL COUNTRY NOR DOMINION IS PARTY TO DISPUTE).

6. The United States reserves the right, upon the submission of any dispute to the council or the assembly, to object to any member and its self-governing dominions, dependencies, or possessions having in the

aggregate more than one vote; and in case such objection is made the United States assumes no obligation to be bound by any election, finding, or decision in which such member and its said dominions, dependencies, and possessions have in the aggregate cast more than one vote.

CONCERNING VOTES OF DOMINIONS (WHERE PRINCIPAL COUNTRY OR DOMINION IS PARTY TO DISPUTE).

7. That the United States understands and construes the words "dispute between members" and the words "dispute between parties" in article 15 to mean that a dispute with a self-governing dominion, colony, or dependency represented in the assembly is a dispute with the dominant or principal member represented therein, and that a dispute with such dominant or principal member is a dispute with all of its self-governing dominions, colonies, or dependencies; and that the exclusion of the parties to the dispute provided in the last paragraph of said article will cover not only the dominant or principal member, but also its dominions, colonies, and dependencies.

—

The following is proposed by Mr. JONES of Washington as an additional paragraph in the resolution of ratification:

Paragraph —. The United States hereby gives notice that it will withdraw from the league of nations at the end of two years from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty unless by the end of that period—

(1) The sovereignty of China shall have been fully restored over and in Shantung;

(2) The relations of Ireland to the British Empire shall have been adjusted satisfactorily to the people of Ireland;

(3) The independence of Egypt shall be recognized and that country set up as a free, independent, and sovereign State; and

(4) Each member of the league shall have abolished through the duly constituted authority the policy of maintaining its regular military and naval forces in time of peace by conscription.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, October 22, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *October 21, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Speak to us, Father, that we go forward with the strength, the courage, the fortitude, to obey Thy commands; that whatsoever we put our hands to, in private or in public, we may prove ourselves worthy of Thy care and protection.

Give to us a clearer vision of the psychological and physical conditions which environ us. The time has come when our statesmen must reach the golden mean between paternalism and individualism. Guide them by thy counsels and:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!"

Hear us, in His name. Amen.

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

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. EDWARD C. MANN has been elected from the seventh district of South Carolina to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Hon. Asbury F. Lever. His credentials are in the hands of the Clerk of the House. Mr. MANN is present and I ask at this time that he be permitted to take the oath as a Member of this body.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will come forward.

Mr. MANN of South Carolina appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1194. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins;

S. 126. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to permit the Yankton and Cuthead Bands of Sioux Indians to intervene in the action of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States (Docket No. 33731), and to hear, determine, and render judgment in said action in claims of Yankton and Cuthead Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States;

S. 193. An act to cancel the allotment of Little Bear, deceased Indian of the Crow Reservation, Mont.;

S. 1329. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain Indian lands necessary for reservoir purposes in connection with the Blackfeet Indian reclamation project;

S. 3193. An act to authorize the Tennessee Bridge Co., a corporation chartered under the laws of the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Loudon, Tenn.;

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the International Aircraft Standards Commission;

S. 2282. An act canceling Indian trust patents Nos. 307319 and 366449;

S. 2709. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to school district No. 8, Sheridan County, Mont., for block 1, in Wakea town site, Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., and to set aside one block in each township on said reservation for school purposes;

S. 2085. An act relating to the maintenance of actions for death on the high seas and other navigable waters; and

S. 2454. An act for the relief of certain members of the Flathead Nation of Indians, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 446) authorizing the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to transfer fractional block 6 of Naylor's addition, Forest Grove, Oreg., to the United States of America for the use of the Bureau of Entomology, Department of Agriculture.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below.

S. 3193. An act to authorize the Tennessee Bridge Co., a corporation chartered under the laws of the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Loudon, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of International Aircraft Standards Commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 126. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to permit the Yankton and Cuthead Bands of Sioux Indians to intervene in the action of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States (Docket No. 33731), and to hear, determine, and render judgment in said action in claims of Yankton and Cuthead Bands of Sioux Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 193. An act to cancel the allotment of Little Bear, deceased Indian of the Crow Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1329. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain Indian lands necessary for reservoir purposes in connection with the Blackfeet Indian reclamation project; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2282. An act canceling Indian trust patent No. 307319 and to confirm patents issued to certain members of the Turtle Mountain band of Chippewa Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2454. An act for the relief of certain members of the Flathead Nation of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2709. An act to amend the title so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to school district No. 8, Sheridan County, Mont., for block 1, in Wakea town site, Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1194. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2085. An act relating to the maintenance of actions for death on the high seas and other navigable waters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill and joint resolution:

H. R. 8624. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917, and to regulate rents in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare and issue a supplementary report on the condition of the cotton crop.

THE BUDGET.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9783.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9783, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9783, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9783) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: Page 8, strike out all of lines 1 to 7, inclusive.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Where is that?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Page 8, the first paragraph.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, let us have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read the lines of the bill proposed to be stricken out by this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 1:

"When a comptroller general or assistant comptroller general attains the age of 70 years, he shall be retired from his office, and, if he has held the office from which he is retired during the 10 preceding consecutive years, he shall, during the remainder of his natural life, be entitled to one-half the salary he is receiving at the time of his retirement from the office which he then held."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska has been recognized, but the substitute of the gentleman can be reported for the information of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute by Mr. CLARK of Missouri: On page 8, line 3, strike out all of the paragraph after the word "office," in line 3, down to the end of line 7.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph relates to the question of retirement upon half pay at the age of 70 years provided 10 years of service have been rendered. The whole paragraph relates to this subject of retirement with half pay, and the elimination of the entire paragraph to be followed by an amendment on page 7 will cover the question so as to leave the situation as it now stands. The comptroller and assistant comptroller under the present rule hold what are termed continuing commissions. They are not appointed for a series of years or a fixed period of time. Their commissions run now at the pleasure of the appointing power, the President of the United States. If this amendment should be stricken out the provisions of this bill would then leave the continuance of these officers in service according to the pleasure of Congress. The President would appoint and thereafter under the the terms of this bill lose the power of removal. The Congress would then have the power of removal, and if at any time Congress should see fit to make a change in these positions the way would be clear for it to do so, either before or after the retirement date. If this paragraph goes out and a man serving acceptably and efficiently had reached the age of 70 years, still in physical and mental vigor, could go on with the service here just as they go on with their service in the House and in the Senate. It will then be a question for Congress to determine whether the physical and intellectual condition of the comptroller general or the assistant comptroller general is such as to warrant continuance. They would serve at the pleasure of the Congress and no interruption would be occasioned by the cancellation of this entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to close debate, and I desire to see whether there is any other gentleman on the committee who would like to speak in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska. I take it that the question will first come on the substitute.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am going to withdraw the substitute for the present and offer it after this amendment is voted upon, provided the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska is voted down.

Mr. GOOD. If there is no other gentleman desiring to speak in favor of the amendment I will ask that debate upon this amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks that debate on this amendment be closed in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman desire to discuss it? I only desire to close whatever debate is had.

Mr. WALSH. I was wondering why the gentleman did not close right away.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this will not close debate on the balance of the section because there are other amendments?

Mr. GOOD. Not at all; it is on this single amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman——

Mr. GOOD. The question is on the unanimous-consent request I have submitted to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection has been made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. GOOD. I did not understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts made any objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman from Massachusetts object?

Mr. WALSH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the request for unanimous consent made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]. Is there objection?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute to strike out this entire section, and I want to be heard for three or four minutes.

Mr. GOOD. My request will not preclude the gentleman from offering an amendment or speaking to his amendment. My request refers to the pending amendment.

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS] strikes out the entire paragraph. The paragraph contains two provisions, first, that the comptroller general shall be retired at the age of 70 years. That stands by itself as a distinct provision. And then it provides for the retirement. Now, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] desires to offer a separate amendment, simply striking out the provision with regard to retirement, and I do not care particularly to speak on that provision now. But the entire provision is the present provision of law with regard to Federal judges. That provision with regard to Federal judges is:

That when any judge of any court of the United States, appointed to hold his office during good behavior, resigns his office after having held a commission or commissions as judge of any such court or courts at least 10 years continuously, and having attained the age of 70 years, he shall, during the residue of his natural life, receive the salary which is payable at the time of his resignation for the office that he held at the time of his resignation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when the bill was originally introduced it did not contain this provision, but it became apparent as the committee heard the witnesses that this office ought to be entirely removed from politics. The office is a semi-judicial one, and it will require a man of high standing, a man who is a lawyer, and a man who is familiar with auditing accounts. In order to make him an official of the United States it is necessary under the Constitution of the United States to place the appointing power in the President. But the official is at all times subject to the will of Congress, and if he becomes inefficient in office he can be removed by a concurrent resolution. If he fails to do his duty, if he performs his duty in a corrupt way, he can be removed, and it seemed to the committee that when a man attains the age of 70 years or thereabouts he ought to retire.

It ought not to be left to Congress to pass a concurrent resolution to remove a man who is old, because the sentiment in Congress would be with a man who had performed valuable services. Congress would hesitate to oust a man because he was old. To strike out the whole provision would be a great mistake it seems to me. If it is the desire of the committee to strike out the provision with regard to retirement, that is a different proposition; but we ought to have a law that will compel him to resign or make him ineligible to hold the office

when he has become old, and who by reason of his old age would not be as alert to perform the duties of the office as a younger man. The provisions of law with regard to the judges has been found to be a very valuable safeguard in this respect. Therefore the committee accepted that principle as laid down in the law already on the statute books and which has been on the statute books for a great many years.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. BEE. These appointments are made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Will the gentleman be kind enough to explain to us on what theory Congress would have the right to control—I am asking for information—the tenure of office, by removal or otherwise?

Mr. GOOD. Well, the provision in the bill, as the gentleman is well aware, is——

Mr. BEE. I understand the provision is there, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to know about the constitutional power of Congress over an officer appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. GOOD. I have not the time in five minutes to enter into that question now. I think the provision in this bill will meet the constitutional requirements.

Mr. MADDEN. The Constitution provides that we can fix the time.

Mr. GOOD. We fixed the tenure of office here by this law, and the tenure of office is only during the rendering of the kind of service required and during the good behavior provided for in the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Did the gentleman from Missouri desire to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes. If this amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska is voted down, then I shall offer this immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri is withdrawn.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. This amendment deals with a most serious question. I believe every Member of this House, almost, will agree, at least so far as details are concerned.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, debate is exhausted under the agreement, and I have no desire to extend the debate on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is closed.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think he would be justified in submitting that unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the debate is closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not obtain the floor for debate under those circumstances. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS].

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

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 8, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CLARK of Missouri: On page 8, line 3, strike out all of paragraph after the word "office," where it first occurs in line 3, down to end of line 7, and add a period after the said word "office."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes out the provision to retire the comptroller general and assistant comptroller general on the retired list at half pay for life. I am in favor of the budget system, and I always have been ever since I first got the hang of things here. But this proposition to put these two men on the retired list at half pay is the first long step in establishing a retired list from the civilian forces of the Government. They work at it all the time. Everybody knows that. They are very estimable people. I have not any criticism of them, and I do not blame them for undertaking to fix a soft berth for themselves. But we are the trustees of the money of the people of the United States, and there is no reason on earth that can be assigned why a man who draws a $10,000 salary and the other one who draws the $7,500 after 10 years' service should be put on the retired list for life, one at $5,000 a year and the other at $3,750 per annum for life.

Now, you begin this once, and there is no end to it. There are, as I understand, about a million and a half Government employees, every one of them wanting his salary raised, or if it had occurred to them—which it had not, probably, when this bill was brought in here—to be retired on half pay. There is not a bit of reason why these men should be retired on half pay.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Bills are pending and sentiment is running to retire everybody in the civil service at a given age at half pay. I am against that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So am I. [Applause.] So that there is nothing for us to quarrel about.

Mr. CANNON. No; nothing. But, being against that, I think maybe this would be a bad precedent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think so, too.

Mr. CANNON. If perchance the 70 years come and anything happens, then the Congress in being might make an exception. I do not know whether it would or not. But this is the nose of the camel.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course it is. I want somebody to straighten out that camel's nose business. [Laughter.] There have been several versions of it.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Who can tell the mental and physical condition of a man at 70? There is no uniform rule to go by. Some men at 80 are younger men than others at 50.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes. Clemenceau is 79.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. A man might be incapacitated for a year or two and continued forward in order to retain that pension. It is a dangerous thing to try to start it.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. The gentleman has informed the House concerning the ancient Clemenceau. Will he also inform the House of his own age and that of Uncle JOE CANNON?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes. Speaker CANNON's age is 83. Gen. SHERWOOD is 84. I am 69. The Speaker of the House is 68—right in the bloom of youth, just beginning to be Speaker. [Applause.] If he is Speaker as long as Speaker CANNON was——

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULINGS rose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, General.

Mr. HULINGS. Is the gentleman in favor of retiring at the age of 70 years these officers, the comptroller general and assistant?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I am not.

Mr. HULINGS. When the Democratic Party has arranged in its mind now to put a man in as President of the United States who is about 69?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are running one that is 75.

Mr. HULINGS. But they are all looking forward to putting a 69-year-old youth in as President. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that. I am much obliged. [Prolonged applause.] I will confess that when the general began I was not certain about the identity of the 69-year-old man. [Laughter.] Gladstone was premier of England at 83, and Palmerston as long as he lived. I think he was about 85 when he went out.

I do not care anything about the 70-year provision. I think maybe it is a bad one, but I am in dead earnest about this other thing, and I warn the House now that if they put these people on the retired list at half pay, the next time somebody wants to be put on the retired list at half pay or at full pay you can not with a straight face make objection to it. We have already two classes on the retired list. We have the United States judges, who retire on full pay when they have served 10 years and get to be 70, and you have the Army and Navy officers retiring on three-fourths pay, the Army at 64, and I believe they have raised the Navy to 64.

If the Spanish War had been postponed six months, Admiral Dewey never would have won the Battle of Manila Bay. He never would have been there, for he would have been on the retired list. I do not care so much about that, but I do care about

this other thing. People want these offices, all of them. You let a vacancy occur in one of them and there will be a dozen or two dozen applications for each one of them at the present salary. I am in favor of this and have been in favor of it for 10 or 15 years—to get up some kind of a system by which these Government employees will arrange a plan that a good actuary will say will save the Government from paying these pensions or salaries for civilians on the retired list, and whenever they do that I will vote for it. And I will go further than that. They say that these old ones will contribute nothing to the fund and the younger ones will have to pay it. If they will have that actuary work out a scheme by which the Government will be saved whole from paying these pensions afterwards I am willing to vote for one appropriation to take care of the old ones; that is, this generation of old ones, not the next generation. Let those of coming generations take care of themselves.

We talk much about economy. Here is the place to begin it. It is true it is only $5,000 in one case and half of $7,500 in the other. But this world is made up of little things. You have all sung that old song—

Little drops of water, little grains of sand—

And so forth, and if we can not make any big economies we surely can make some small ones. I am not a cheese-paring statesman. I think people should be paid wages tantamount to the work they do. I do not know who is going to be appointed comptroller general, and I do not care three straws; but if he gets $10,000 for 10 years, why can he not save a little of it? It is awfully hard to save any on $7,500 [laughter]; I have found that out by sad experience. But if we go on increasing every fellow's salary that wants it increased and retiring them this Government will get so topheavy that it will topple over. That is all I have got to say about it. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if some agreement can be made about time on this amendment.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Let us vote now.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use five minutes on this amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the debate close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to close debate on this amendment in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have not had time to find out just when Congress placed the retirement provision on the statute books with regard to Federal judges. I find in the Revised Statutes of 1878, which was a revision of the Revised Statutes of 1869, that the provision which I have read was on the statute books at that time. Therefore more than 50 years ago Congress provided by law that Federal judges upon their retirement should be retired at full pay. That has been the law for more than 50 years, and there has been no other official to whom it has been applied.

Mr. WALSH and Mr. WELTY rose.

Mr. WELTY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Is the gentleman in favor of retiring bank examiners and other Federal employees who get $10,000 and $12,000 a year?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. WALSH. Then why is he in favor of this particular provision?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will tell the gentleman why I am in favor of this. I think there are a great many good Federal judges upon the Federal bench to-day who would not be there if it were not for the retirement provision. They could make twice as much in the practice of the law, and if it was not for the fact that they will be retired at a certain age with pay the office would not attract them at all. They could not afford to accept it. I hope the salary of this great office will be attractive enough so that a man like John J. Fitzgerald or Swagar Sherley, men who to-day are receiving or making more than twice the amount of the salary of this official, would be attracted to the position, and that in this position, where the official will be called upon to pass upon billions of dollars per year, the man at the head of it will be of high character and high integrity, and that he will be able to conduct his office in such a manner that it will reflect credit not only upon him but upon the office itself.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. WELTY rose.

Mr. WELTY. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Has it not always been understood that the reason why this retirement provision was enacted with reference to Federal judges was because the Constitution provided that they should hold their office for life, and if some such provision was not enacted men who were really disabled by sickness or other cause would hang on to the office for years after they were incapacitated?

Mr. GOOD. I think that had something to do with it, and I think it was also done to make the office attractive to great lawyers. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] says that $10,000 is a big salary. The Speaker of this House receives $12,000 a year, and that has been the salary for a number of years, but I never heard either the Speaker or any ex-Speaker say that that salary was too large. I want to say that we must make this office attractive enough to invite the very best ability obtainable. I do not believe you will be able to get that kind of ability unless you place some retirement provision in the bill. I do not believe you are going to get that kind of a man unless you hold out some inducement of this sort. For more than 50 years we have had on the statute books a retirement provision for judges. I have said before that if this were the beginning of a retirement provision I would not offer it in the bill, because as a general proposition I am opposed to it, but I feel that this office is to be akin to that of a Federal judge, and if so I want to see it attractive enough so that we can get a man of high character and splendid attainments to occupy the position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. GOOD) there were—ayes 57, noes 45.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CLARK of Missouri: On page 7, line 18, after the word "time," insert the words "and who shall be removable at the pleasure of the President or."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply gives the President of the United States the right to remove these men whenever he gets ready. If these officers are going to be as important as the chairman of the committee [Mr. GOOD] makes out, then it would be both a calamity and an outrage to compel the President of the United States to keep these men in office after he came to doubt either their integrity, their capacity, or their friendliness toward either himself or his administration. There can not be any two opinions about that.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. BEE rose.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BEE. I want to ask the gentleman if there would not be danger in having a double control? In other words, the President will have the right to remove and the Congress will have the right to remove. Suppose the President did not want to remove a man, but Congress did remove him, would there not be a conflict, then, between the executive and the legislative branch?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think not.

Mr. BEE. I would like to ask the gentleman this further question: What power is possessed by the Congress to remove from office by concurrent resolution a man who has been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not believe there is any.

Mr. BEE. Then that ought to be stricken out.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Anybody else can make the motion who wants to.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. STEVENSON. I beg to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the provision that they can be removed for no other cause and in no other manner is directly in conflict with section 4 of Article II of the Constitution, which says that civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of certain things.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was going to state that.

Mr. STEVENSON. This provision sweeps away the power of impeachment. I have an amendment to include impeachment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There are several gentlemen here to-day who were not here yesterday, and I will state over again a case that might arise. If the President appoints a man of eminence and great ability, that man will have opinions of his own, which may come in conflict with those of the President. The President is responsible for his administration. It

would be a very curious condition to have the comptroller general and the President at loggerheads without any way of getting rid of the comptroller general except by this cumbersome congressional joint resolution.

President Johnson got crossways with Secretary of War Stanton. It is no use to discuss the question as to which of them was right and which of them was wrong. The President removed Secretary Stanton temporarily. In the meantime, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] states, Congress had passed the tenure of office act. The President had to submit his reasons to the Senate for suspending Stanton. The Senate refused to recognize his reasons as sufficient. In the meantime, while the Secretary of War was in suspense, Gen. Grant was appointed Secretary of War ad interim, and, as I stated yesterday, President Johnson and Gen. Grant fell out and came to be mortal enemies, so bitter that Johnson would not ride with Grant to the Capitol, and I do not suppose that any power on earth would have made him ride with him short of physical force. Anyhow, Stanton went back and took the office again.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is one case that illustrates what might happen, and it is the only case I know of, because, as I said yesterday, the Republicans repealed the act as soon as Grant was sworn in.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will.

Mr. FESS. The office of Stanton was a constitutional office provided for in the Constitution and not the office of the head of a department.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is true.

Mr. FESS. This is a statutory office and would not have the same force that it would have in the case of a constitutional office.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Congress is not under the slightest obligation to create a Cabinet office. Members of the Cabinet are simply head clerks; that is all they ever have been or ever will be. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] says that this comptroller general is going to have more power than any Cabinet officer, and probably more power than all the Cabinet officers put together. Suppose he and the President got at loggerheads, do not you think he should be fired?

Mr. FESS. If the law that created the office is to be for good behavior, it would appear to me that the President's power to remove would in that case be inhibitive.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I was President and I had one of these statesmen under me and he did not do things to suit me he would be fired as sure as the world. [Laughter.]

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I would like to ask what function the comptroller general will have that would interfere or forward any difficulty between him and the President. In other words, what are the specific functions of the comptroller general?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. To tell the gentleman the truth, nobody knows. [Laughter.] I will give you another illustration, cited by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON]. Right in the middle of Gen. Jackson's service, toward the beginning of his second administration, the Senate passed a resolution of censure on him for certain performances of his, removing the bank deposits, and so forth. Immediately after they voted the censure Senator Benton hopped up and notified the Senate that he was going to move to expunge the resolution. As the gentleman from South Carolina says, the only way to punish a President is by impeachment, and he is entirely correct.

Benton made a flaming speech; said he knew he was not going to get it expunged then, but he was making the speech for educational purposes to circulate throughout the country. They beat his resolution to expunge. At the next session he offered it again, coming a little nearer to expunging it. The sentiment in the country changed; every time an anti-Jackson Senator resigned or died they elected a Jackson Senator in his place. Finally, after five or six years, Senator Benton got it expunged, and it is one of the greatest curiosities in Washington. Col. Roosevelt said, in his Life of Benton, that it was all tomfoolery. Senator Vest said, in his speech on Benton, that it was all tomfoolery; but it was not; it went to establish what is the truth, that they have no right to punish a President except by impeachment.

Benton described the way that it should be expunged. Before that, when they offered to repeal it, he would not have it, but he directed the clerk to draw great black lines around the resolution and write on the face of it, "Expunged by the Senate" on a certain day.

If you people here think that the old-time statesmen did not know anything about playing tricks, you read his book on how he got that expunged. They did not have any saloons or eating houses on the Hill in those days. He forced an all-night session. He loaded up his committee room with everything good to eat and drink, and his supporters went out, two or three at a time, and loaded up with these good things. The anti-Jackson fellows did not have anything to eat or drink, and that was the way he accomplished it in 1837.

This clumsy arrangement of Congress removing the comptroller is all stuff. If the man was favored by the President, the entire administration would be here lobbying to keep him from being removed by a resolution of Congress; and, believe me, they have some influence when it comes to a vote. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Charman, if the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri is adopted it will devitalize the most important provision in the bill. The illustration given by the gentleman from Missouri is not analogous to the case before us. Stanton was a member of the Cabinet. This man we are providing for as comptroller auditor general of the United States is not a Cabinet officer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the gentleman from Illinois think that this man is bigger than that of a Cabinet member or all of the Cabinet members put together?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all; the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri giving power to the President of the United States to discharge this man whenever he pleases makes the office of the comptroller auditor general a political football.

That is what we are trying to avoid. We are trying in this bill to take away the power of the President of the United States to spend the money and at the same time audit his own expenditures. We are trying to give the power of audit to the people, and this provision of the bill reported by the committee does exactly that. The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] takes the power away from the people, takes away the safeguards that we are trying to throw around the expenditure of the people's money. The comptroller auditor general has no power to take away the discretion of a Cabinet officer as to what shall be done in the discharge of his duty, but he has the power only to pass upon the legal phases of the expenditure of the appropriations, and incidentally to report any delinquencies that may be found in any department in the course of the execution of the work of the department. Throw away the safeguards that this provision of the bill places around the expenditures and you make chaos worse confounded. What we are trying to do is to get away from politics. What the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is trying to do is to put us into politics. The man who is the comptroller general should be the instrument of the people, provided for by the Congress, and if you adopt the amendment suggested you destroy every vestige of the people's right to supervise and survey the expenditure of their own money.

I think I may safely leave the case with the committee, feeling assured that every man here, even including the gentleman who offered the amendment, wants this provision retained by the representatives of the people, and wants to do away with political chicanery that may follow the appointment and discharge of a man holding this high place by the President of the United States.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that no one knows the range of authority and jurisdiction of the comptroller. I hold in my hand a copy of the law that fixes that as it stands to-day, and I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. To what extent, if any, would his bill modify existing law in relation to the accounting system, in the main?

Mr. GOOD. It gives him some additional power. It gives him the power to go into offices and to call for information that I do not believe the auditors now have.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. But, if I understand it correctly, it does not destroy any of the vital principles of the accounting system as it now stands?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; it strengthens them, and requires that he shall report to Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I do not quite agree with the chairman. What this bill does is this. In the matter of accounting it provides that instead of following the heads of appropriations as now, the accounting system shall follow the head of the budget as proposed, and it revolutionizes the accounting system to the extent of furnishing information in detail that it is not possible to obtain under the present law.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the floor.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. I would like to have the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] explain in what way there would be an audit when an item is put in by the Congress which was not in the budget.

Mr. MADDEN. The audit is made after the expenditure, not before.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am confident that any form the budget may assume will not materially modify the fundamental laws of the accounting system as it now stands.

Neither the President of the United States, a member of his Cabinet, nor anyone that has a claim before the comptroller general, has any right to dictate to him what his decision shall be upon the law and the facts involved in the case. It is a judicial determination, just as clear and distinct as any question in court, and the chairman of this committee is absolutely right when he says that judicial powers reside here and must be exercised by the comptroller general. Beyond that the President can not go; beyond that a Cabinet officer can not go; beyond that a claimant can not go. There is a course of procedure, however, which may be adopted. Anyone who feels aggrieved by the decision, taking issue with the finding of the comptroller, may go to the Court of Claims and sue there to protect his rights, and may also go on to the Supreme Court of the United States. Here is a direct line of judicial procedure. If we should strike out this provision of the bill which would give to Congress the power to remove the comptroller general, we would destroy one of the most commendable features of the bill. The committee has made a very happy solution of this matter—appointment by the President and removal by the Congress, the comptroller to hold his position under a continuing commission in the future, as now.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Yes.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Is the contention of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] that the provision in the Constitution which provides for the removal by impeachment for malfeasance in office is nullified by this proposed law?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I do not think so.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. It takes a majority to impeach and two-thirds of the Senate to convict. This bill, if it passes, will make a majority of the House and a majority of the Senate all that is necessary to remove.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Just as the President would exercise the power of removal, if it were left with him.

Mr. CANNON. So that there will never be any impeachment——

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. In all probability not.

Mr. CANNON. There would be a readier—in fact, an immediate—opportunity to dispense with a dishonest man.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. In other words, if we discover wrongdoing we want to settle it at once, and this provides the way.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. I have not contended that you could not remove them in this way. The part I am calling attention to is this, that they can be removed by concurrent resolution of the Congress, after notice and hearing, when in their judgment the comptroller general or the assistant comptroller general has been inefficient or guilty of neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, and for no other cause and in no other way. I call attention——

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Just one moment, Mr. Chairman; I can not yield further in connection with that unless I can have five minutes more, in which event I shall be glad to yield. There are other amendments which may be offered which will not affect the vital element in this section and this feature of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of members of the committee to this fact. During the preceding years and under the system of accounting as it stands now when you call upon accounting officers to come here and disclose the record of facts, you are asking them to come and give testimony substantially against the men who hold their official lives in their hands. Under the arrangement here provided, if the House should call upon these officers, as it will have occasion to do, to come here and disclose contracts, vouchers, disclose the record in any question under investigation, they will be disclosing information to the body that has in its hands the power to insist upon a correct showing of facts. Hence there will be removed all tendency to withhold information or evade a statement of facts. If you destroy this provision of the bill you destroy a large portion of the benefits of an independent accounting system.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I do.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman heard the statement of the gentleman from South Carolina, where this bill says, in lines 22 and 23, page 7, that his removal shall be for no other cause and in no other manner. Now, the Constitution provides the manner of impeachment. What does the gentleman think of the constitutionality of this provision that he can not be removed in the constitutional way?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments, one proposing to strike out all of line 17, except the last two words, and another amendment to strike out all after the word "office," in line 22, and the word "manner," in line 23. That will remove that objection and clear the way absolutely, so far as any question concerning impeachment is concerned. Then we will have it upon clear ground.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the pending amendment, in my opinion, would destroy one of the most desirable and meritorious features of this bill. The comptroller general is not expected or intended to have any official relation with the President of the United States in so far as auditing accounts are concerned; and for my part, if there had been any way under the Constitution whereby we could have provided for his appointment by Congress I would have favored it. The comptroller general is expected to audit the accounts and the expenditures made by the various departments, whereas under the present system the spending departments of the Government audit their own accounts. Now, the comptroller general, when he audits those accounts, will be responsible to the body which makes the appropriation and not to the spending departments of the Government. He not only audits the accounts, but he passes upon the expenditures and construes the statutes passed by Congress relative to appropriations. So, I say, if we now undertook to permit the President of the United States to remove this official at his will and pleasure we would destroy the very object and very purpose of the committee in making this recommendation to the House. This bill provides that the comptroller general shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and then he can only be removed by a concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress. This makes him responsible to Congress and not to the President. He is subject to the will of Congress and every committee in furnishing it information. He is expected to advise Congress as to improvements that may be made in the matter of expenditures.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If we do not make this department or bureau independent of the executive departments of the Government why not let the law stay as it is now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Missouri is clearly correct in that statement. Under the present law the Comptroller of the Treasury construes appropriation statutes, and under a recent departmental order he has charge of the auditing of the various expenditures; but if we are going to leave this official responsible to the President and not to Congress then there is no reason whatever for passing this particular provision, so I hope this amendment will not be adopted. Now, it has been suggested that we are undertaking by law to repeal a part of the Constitution relative to impeachment. Why, of course, we do not undertake to deny the right of impeachment guaranteed by the Constitution; but, as has been suggested, this concurrent resolution simply provides a readier and quicker way of getting rid of an incompetent and inefficient official by simply providing that a majority of both Houses may

pass a resolution and dispose of him. The right of impeachment still exists, and we could not disturb it if we would.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. BLACK. Does not the gentleman think that the language "has been inefficient or guilty of neglect of duty or malfeasance in office" is really surplussage, for when any future session of Congress adopts a simple resolution removing this official that Congress could do so, because that in effect would be a repeal of the requirement? In other words, Congress having the power to create the office would have the power to remove the official without alleging any cause, and it seems to me that it should just be a matter of removal at any time by concurrent resolution.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That may be true, Mr. Chairman, but it was the idea of the committee in making this recommendation to remove this official as far as we could from politics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask for one minute more.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The idea in adopting this provision was to take this official as far as possible out of politics and not make him subject to change of political administrations, and therefore we have expressly provided that he shall not be removed except in case of inefficiency or for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office. It will be persuasive and, I think, controlling, and it can not be changed by future Congresses except by a bill or joint resolution, which would require the approval of the President. I hope the amendment which has been offered will be voted down.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section close at the end of 10 minutes. I understand the gentleman from South Carolina has another amendment——

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir; my amendment is being discussed in connection with this.

Mr. GOOD. I will see that the gentleman gets time on his amendment.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I will make it 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as I construe the language of this section the Congress will be practically without any way by which the comptroller general or his assistant may be removed before he reaches the age of 70 years. I do not know whether a future Congress will be so afraid of itself that it would not like to have some right of removal with regard to these officials. But the power should be retained, and if they do not want it they will not be bound to exercise it. However, it seems to me that this Congress ought not to attempt to tie the hands of those who are to come after us by fastening officials of this sort upon the Government practically for life, or, at least, without any practical method by which the Congress may get rid of him.

Now, let us see how this statute will operate. It does not provide that the Congress may remove the comptroller general or his assistant at will. But the act limits the way in which he may be removed. One of the causes is "inefficiency," another is "neglect of duty," and the other is "malfeasance in office"; and the act provides specifically that neither the comptroller general nor his assistant shall be removed for any other cause.

Now, I take it that the purpose of this act is to put men in these positions who will use their brains and energies in the effort to inaugurate and maintain economy in the expenditures of the various departments of the Government. Well, my friends, the question of "malfeasance in office" would not have any relation to a man's tendency toward economy or extravagance. The same is true as to making "neglect of duty" the cause of removal and the same as to "inefficiency." A man might be ever so efficient according to any legal interpretation of the term, but he might be one of those men like our beloved friend Mr. CANNON mentioned a day or two ago. He might be a man with a vision, and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois said that a man with a vision is generally a visionary. He might be ever so efficient, but at the same time be one of those men who has no idea of practical economy in the matter of spending money for the public welfare. But yet when he gets in, what can the Congress do except to let him stay or bring him up here, after notice and hearings, and give him a trial on the question of whether or not he has been "inefficient" or "neglected his duty" or been "guilty of malfeasance" in office? He might be the most liberal-minded man in regard to the expenditures of money that was ever connected with the Government, but Congress would have no remedy, and he would be in office for life.

Mr. CLEARY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I will.

Mr. CLEARY. Does the President appoint any other official besides this whom he does not have the power to remove?

Mr. STEAGALL. The judges.

Mr. CLEARY. Regarding the matter of Congress being the judge of his capacity as to his malfeasance in office, do you not believe that if there was a hostile Congress they would easily charge these things, whether he was guilty or not, if they were fighting the President?

Mr. STEAGALL. That would be easily charged; but under this act he would have a right to be heard, and it would involve a regular trial before both Houses of Congress, and the Lord only knows how long it would take under the provisions of this act before they would ever be able to get rid of him. They do not retain the power to discharge or remove because of failure to economize, yet the enforcement of economy is the controlling purpose of this act. And if it passes—which I hope it will not, especially with the life-tenure provision which it now carries—certainly the Congress ought to strike out the hampering provisions of the act and retain the right to deal with these officials in case of failure on their part to take proper steps to enforce reforms and economy. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], if adopted, would give the President of the United States power in his discretion to remove this officer—the proposed comptroller general—whenever he believed the interests of the Government required it. The gentleman from Tennessee, my distinguished friend Mr. BYRNS, says that that power ought not to be given to the President, because it is the purpose by the provisions of this bill to eliminate entirely from the control of the President of the United States anything in reference to this high and exalted position and the distinguished person who may be appointed to discharge its duties.

Now, gentlemen, the President of the United States takes a solemn oath, when he enters upon the discharge of his duties, to support the Constitution and to execute the laws of the land. The gentleman from Tennessee says that this officer under this bill would have the right to construe the laws, to make recommendations in reference to them, and to submit proposed matters of legislation relating to the receipts and disbursements of public funds and audit the accounts. The President of the United States is the servant of the people of this country. No matter how high a position a man may hold in this Republic, he is still the servant of the people and responsible to the people, and ought to be, because it is through the ballots of the people that he is placed in the position he occupies. [Applause.] Then when the President of these United States, in obedience to the call of the people expressed by their ballots, assumes the duties of his high and exalted position, the greatest office in the world, he is still responsible to them, and he is the head of this Government and is charged with the execution of the laws and with the enforcement of the Constitution.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that now the Comptroller of the Treasury construes the statutes with reference to appropriations, and that there is no appeal whatever from his decision?

Mr. CANDLER. Yes; and the President of the United States has the right, in his discretion, to remove him. And I contend he ought to have a right to remove this officer if he fails to discharge the duties of his office acceptably to the President—the executive head of this Government who appoints him and is responsible for him.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It transfers the right of removal from the President to the Congress, the body that makes the appropriation, and we are charged with the responsibility to see that his duties are carried out.

Mr. CANDLER. Yes; and by doing so, instead of taking the position out of politics, it puts it in the hotbed of politics. If this amendment of the gentleman from Missouri is adopted, it will not only give the President the right to remove this officer, but the provision of the bill will also remain which gives the Congress the right to remove him by concurrent resolution, if they see proper to do so, and that will be a double security that he will be required to perform his duties faithfully and effi-

ciently and in the interest of the people and for the good of the country. We all know what difficulty there would be to secure his removal by the Congress of the United States, by joint action of both Houses. We know the difficulty always encountered in removing a Federal judge. The chairman of the committee [Mr. GOOD] states that this provision in reference to the tenure of office of this officer is taken from the statute authorizing the appointment of United States judges, fixing their tenure of office, and providing for their retirement. I have seen since I have been a Member of Congress the serious difficulty there is in removing a judge of the United States court, regardless of what his conduct may have been, and very few have ever been removed in the history of this Republic. And just as it is very difficult to remove a United States judge, it would be very much more intricate and difficult to remove this officer by the joint action of the two Houses of Congress. In the case of an effort to remove a United States judge the House of Representatives prefers articles of impeachment, and the Senate of the United States tries the case as a jury, and by their votes determine his guilt or innocence and whether he shall be removed or not. Under this bill you give the right to this officer to have a trial before both Houses of Congress, their verdict to be rendered and enforced by concurrent resolution, to be passed by both the House and the Senate, and in such a case you would have 435 jurors in this House and 96 jurors in the Senate, and to have a hearing and trial and decision by them would be a never-ending proceeding, saturated with politics, in all probability, of the most partisan character. You who have seen election cases tried here know something of the politics and bitterness which would get into a trial of a comptroller general if one was ever tried by Congress in an effort to remove him. You might get a comptroller general who was or might become inimical to the President or unreasonable and bitter toward his administration or who was corrupt or very extravagant and wasteful.

Even the President or anybody else sometimes makes mistakes in the appointment of officers, and if you should get that character of a man in this office he might so construe or administer the laws or be so extravagant or corrupt or unreasonable in his recommendations or become so partisan himself as to bring discredit on the President of the United States, who had sworn to execute the law and uphold the Constitution; and if you fail to adopt this amendment then you would say to the President under such a condition, "Your hands are tied hard and fast, and you can not take any action in reference to an officer of that kind, and you can not remove him, although you are responsible for him." You do not want to put any man who is big enough for the people to elect President in that kind of a situation, do you?

Then, again, the theory of this Government is opposed absolutely to a life tenure of office, and I am opposed to it. I am opposed to United States judges having a life tenure of office. [Applause.] I think it would be better to bring them closer to their responsibility to the people by giving them a reasonable tenure of office rather than a life tenure. If they faithfully and efficiently and with justice administered the duties of their office they could, and no doubt would, be reappointed, or if it could be left to the people they could be reelected. I believe the best government is a government by and of the people, and therefore I believe all officers ought to come before the people, as we come before them, at the end of a definite period of time and receive their approval or disapproval, for at last, in the final analysis, it is to the people in a Republic like ours that all the officers of the Government are and should be responsible. [Applause.] So much for that. Now, permit me just a few words as to the bill generally. You Members with whom I daily so pleasantly associate know that during my service as a Member here I have stood for economy. It is believed this bill will bring about economy—save money for the people. Therefore I shall vote for it on its final passage.

What we need to-day is real economy, economy in governmental affairs and economy in the business world and economy in the private affairs of the citizen. If strict economy was observed in Government, in business, and private affairs, it would contribute much to remedy the extravagant tendencies of the present times, which are at least to some extent responsible for the oft-repeated cry about the high cost of living. The cost of living is high, and it ought to be and I hope can and will be reduced; but the cost of "high living" is extravagantly high, and if these extravagances of "high living" could and would be eliminated that would tend considerably to reduce the "high cost of living." It is time to begin not only to preach but to practice economy in Government and economy in everyday life. In and out of Congress we hear appeals for economy in Government expenses. There is room for it. War-time expenditures were often on an extravagant basis because results had to be obtained regardless of the cost. All of us, Democrats and Republicans, voted for those appropriations, and both political parties are responsible for them. We did not have time to fully investigate. Our country, the security of our institutions, and the sanctity and protection of our homes were at stake. We could not know what amount of money was absolutely necessary, and we all voted for a plenty so as to be on the safe side and to be sure to furnish enough to meet every necessity required to win the war, and we won it. That money is spent and gone.

It will do no good to criticize and grumble and complain about it. That will not get any of the money back into the Treasury. Therefore the frequent effort of our Republican friends to criticize and blame the Democratic administration for expenditures of war times for which they voted will do no good and get none of the money back. The congressional junketing here and overseas, investigating for partisan and political purposes, will not get any money back. It only increases expenditures by the useless waste of many thousands of dollars more, thereby adding that much more to the cost incident to the war. We had as well quit looking backward and courageously meet the problems now before us. Let us as rapidly as possible get back to normal conditions, repeal all unnecessary laws, and reduce expenses. I am an old-fashioned, unfrilled Democrat. I do not believe any more taxes ought to be collected from the people than are necessary to pay the expenses of the Government economically administered. I want to see taxes reduced now just as soon as possible. You can not reduce taxes, however, unless you reduce expenditures, and you can not reduce expenditures unless you practice strict economy. What is needed in order that we may economize is a standardized, businesslike method of making appropriations. When appropriations are made, know in advance that the money is available to pay them; and, if it is not, know at least where it is to come from to meet the expenditures when authorized. This budget bill under consideration proposes a method by which an effort, at least, is to be made to do business according to business methods, and I shall vote for it. [Applause.]

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

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to two points very briefly. The statement has been made that nobody knows what the powers of the comptroller general are. They are very definitely stated in sections 10 and 13 of this act. Section 10 declares—

> That all powers and duties now conferred or imposed by law upon the Comptroller of the Treasury or upon the Auditor for the Treasury Department, the Auditor for the War Department, the Auditor for the Interior Department, the Auditor for the Navy Department, the Auditor for the State and Other Departments, or the Auditor for the Post Office Department shall, so far as not inconsistent with this act, be vested in and imposed upon the accounting department and be exercised without direction from any other officer, and the balances certified by the comptroller general shall be final and conclusive upon the executive branch of the Government.

Section 13 provides, in addition—

> That the comptroller general shall investigate, at the seat of government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public funds, and shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report in writing of the work of the accounting department.

That section covers additions to his powers beyond the powers now held by the Comptroller of the Treasury. His powers are very definite.

Now, as to the question of his removal by the President. The whole purpose of creating an accounting department outside of the Treasury Department, where the accounting department is now, is that we may have an independent audit, that the audit shall be made by an officer who shall not be subject to one of the spending agencies whose account he audits. The President as the Chief Executive has control of the administrative work and gives orders to the administrative officers. The Congress makes the appropriations which are spent by these administrative agents of the Government. The report of the comptroller general should be made to the power which makes the appropriations. The Constitution makes the House of Representatives particularly the originating power. We have control of the purse, and the Executive has no control of any money except moneys appropriated by Congress. The report should be made to the appropriating power; and the auditing power, it seems to me, with its judicial functions considered especially, should be as independent of the executive power as are other officers exercising judicial functions. The President of the United States has no right to remove a Justice of the Supreme Court or any other judge. Why should he have the right to remove the man who exercises judicial functions in interpreting the appropriating acts of Congress? The control should lie with

the appropriating power, and the passage of the amendment now pending would divide that control, would give the President power to remove and at the same time it would retain in Congress the power to remove.

Now, as to the question of impeachment.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he leaves that point?

Mr. TEMPLE. Just for a question.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Will this law do away with these offices of auditors of the various departments?

Mr. TEMPLE. It will transfer them, so that they will go with the accounting department and be removed from the Treasury Department.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. In all the departments, including the Post Office Department?

Mr. TEMPLE. None of these auditors is in any department excepting the Treasury Department. The Auditor for the War Department and the Auditor for the Navy Department are not connected with the War and Navy Departments. They are connected with the Treasury Department only. So with the other auditors. They are not auditors in the department for which they audit. They are in the Treasury Department.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. The bill contemplates the transfer of those?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes; taking them along with the comptroller general.

Now, as to the question of impeachment. That question never would arise. Congress, being able to remove the comptroller general by concurrent resolution, would never deny to itself the power to remove him by impeachment. If we can do it by a majority vote, Congress would not put up against that plan the plan of removing him by a two-thirds vote. There would be no quarrel within Congress on that point, although I do think that the gentleman's amendment would do absolutely no harm to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 13, noes 60.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers. The gentleman from Missouri has just stepped out of the Hall.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas demands tellers.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is withdrawn.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEVENSON: Page 7, line 23, after the word "manner," strike out the period and insert the words "except by impeachment."

Mr. GOOD. There is a period after the word "impeachment"?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOOD. I accept the amendment.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to make any extended remarks on this amendment, but a good deal of criticism has been directed to the amendment by some of my colleagues here. There is no question but that Congress can create an office and create a method of removal from the office in pursuance of the provisions of the Constitution, but it can not create a method different from constitutional methods and say there shall be no other. That is the reason why I am offering this amendment.

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

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: Page 7, line 17, strike out all of line 17 down to the word "may."

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adopted, with those previously adopted, would leave the comptroller general in the same status that he has now, holding a continuing commission, running at the pleasure of the authority that might remove him from office. This covers the matter completely, so far as amendments may be concerned, to perpetuate this condition and leave the transfer on that basis. I have nothing further to add. I shall be glad to have a vote.

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

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: Page 7, line 17, after the word "office," strike out "during good behavior" and insert "for a term of six years," and strike out all the rest of the language in lines 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, in common with everyone who has given any study to our system of appropriations, I favor the inauguration of some budgetary system; but in that favor I would not create a body which could—

Bestride the narrow world like a Colossus.

Nor would I increase unduly the officers who hold their positions during their natural lives. As a general proposition I am opposed to creating any more positions to be held during good behavior, which is nearly always equivalent to saying during their natural lives, and then having them come in under some retirement bill, so that we not alone may have a system no more efficient than if elective or appointed for a term, but pay the officials, when they get to be a certain age, because they have become inefficient.

The amendment I have in mind changes the term "during good behavior" to the language "for a term of six years," it being my idea that these positions of comptroller general and assistant comptroller general of the budgetary system could be carried into best effect not by appointing somebody for life but for this period of six years. It has occurred to me that possibly we should get the best results from the chief magistracy of the Nation by making the term six years and providing that the President should be ineligible for reelection. But I am opposed to the creation of additional offices such as this for a life tenure, when the period of six years is certainly ample and sufficient to give this budgetary system the benefit of that which is the best in a man's make-up.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that we are creating a new position and thereby increasing the number of offices?

Mr. GARD. I did not say anything about that. I said I was opposed to the creation of new positions with life tenure. That is the idea I tried to convey to the gentleman.

Now, we all know that in the history of the great Appropriations Committee of the House a man whose memory we all hold in high esteem, the late Mr. Courts, held the clerkship of that committee for many years. And there would not be the slightest intention, I am sure, to take away the splendid service of the gentleman who has succeeded him. But these things go along because men prove their worth and do not continue because we invest the positions with a life tenure. When we say that the comptroller general and assistant comptroller general shall hold their positions for six years it seems to me we do what it is desirable to do. We take them out of politics. We give them a fixed and definite term. If they are good and efficient public servants the President of the United States—any President who has the best interests of the country at heart—may reappoint them.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARD. Surely.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. In making this a life-tenure office, do you not remove the strongest incentive that an appointee has to be efficient and faithful and fully effective as a public servant?

Mr. GARD. I think so. I think the more life-tenure positions we make the poorer will be our public service.

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

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that either of these amendments ought to prevail. I believe you must give a tenure to this office that will invite men of ability to accept it. The proposition offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] to appoint the comptroller general for a period of six years without the right of removal, it seems to me can not be defended from any standpoint. By the creation of this department it is intended to make it thoroughly independent of the executive departments. The gentleman's amendment if adopted absolutely reverses the whole plan of the bill and instead of having a budgetary system with a comptroller general to audit and control the accounts of the Government fearlessly and to do his work efficiently, we substitute for that a man who would hold his office not because of his ability but because of his political service.

That is the plan we are trying to get away from, and that has been the evil in our present plan. Unless you throw around the comptroller general all the safeguards that will make him absolutely independent and make those whom he appoints independent and fearless, I fear we will find the same condition existing that inheres in the present system; that is, that your auditors and the comptroller general dare not criticize an executive official. They can not become independent in action. The provision here is that the comptroller general shall hold his office during good behavior. That provision was placed in the Constitution of the United States so far as it related to judicial positions under the United States. This position is in many respects similar to those judicial positions. It is semi-judicial, and we should throw around it all the safeguards that the Constitution guarantees to Federal judges; that is, that they shall hold their office during good behavior. Place that provision in the law and the comptroller general can hew to the mark. He can pass upon requests for appropriations in a fearless manner, just as a Federal judge passes upon questions of law that come before him.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Did not the committee contemplate that the comptroller general might not only be brought into conflict with the executive department and with the executive branches of the Government, but sometimes with one side or the other of the aisle in Congress, and possibly both sides, in the impartial discharge of his duties?

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely. That department ought to be independent and fearless to criticize wrong expenditures of money wherever it finds them. It ought to criticize inefficiency in every executive department where inefficiency exists, and one of the troubles with our present system is that the auditors dare not criticize. If they criticize, their political heads will come off.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the provisions of the bill have been pretty clearly thought out along that line, and so far as the tenure of office is concerned it ought to remain as the committee has reported it.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 9 ayes and 49 noes.

So the substitute to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 8 ayes and 43 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 10, strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert the figures "$7,500."

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 4 ayes and 47 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 22, after the word "office," insert "or of any crime or conduct involving moral turpitude."

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment only adds to the causes for removal, crime, and that conduct known generally as involving moral turpitude. I am in favor of the bill and in favor of the budget. I think it means a saving to the country of millions of dollars. It means economy in administration. This amendment provides that if the comptroller general or his assistant is guilty of a crime or conduct inimical or hostile to the best interests of the Government a concurrent resolution of Congress would reach and remove him. I understand the chairman of the committee has no objection to it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the amendment would accomplish any good or not. I do not see how it would do any harm. I have no objection to it.

Mr. BRIGGS. The need for legislation of this character has long been apparent to those who have given thoughtful consideration to the best method of reducing waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in the administration of the Government. It is probably too much to hope that all loss from these causes can be entirely eliminated, but it is unquestionably true that it is possible for vast sums of money to be recklessly and extravagantly expended under the old, inadequate systems and which, under the budget plan, can be saved the taxpayers of the country. Both Democratic and Republican Parties have recognized the necessity for the budget and have both declared in their national platforms in favor of legislation providing for the same. The President has recommended it, and the public generally favor it. It is in response to this demand of the people and to the evident necessity for the creation of a proper system of checks and balances if economies demanded and required are to be effected that both the Democrats and Republicans of the House have advocated and united in the support of this bill.

The present measure, which has been unanimously reported out of the committee, contains the vital elements of a true budget plan; that is, it provides:

1. For the creation of a bureau of the budget in the office of the President.

2. Makes it the duty of such bureau to assist the President in the performance of the powers conferred upon him by the act.

3. Directs that the bureau shall also make a careful investigation of all provisions of law dealing in any way with the preparation and transmission to Congress of estimates and the preparation and submission to Congress of financial data of any character in order to determine what changes should be made in such provisions of law, to the end that all requirements in respect to the reporting to Congress of financial data and estimates shall be brought together in one place, coordinated, revised, and brought into harmony with an alternative budget which the President is also required to submit to Congress. The result of such investigation shall be embodied in a report or reports to the President, who may transmit to Congress such report or reports, or any part thereof, with such recommendations regarding the action which in his opinion should be taken upon the matters conveyed by such report.

4. That on a date to be fixed by the President the heads of the several executive departments shall annually submit to the President their estimates of the needs of such departments.

5. On the first day of each regular session after the calendar year 1919 a document, to be known as the budget, shall be transmitted by the President to Congress, which document shall contain:

(a) Balanced statements of the revenues and expenditures of the Government for the preceding fiscal year, and of the resources and liabilities of the Treasury at the close of the year.

(b) His estimates of the revenues and expenditures of the Government for the current fiscal year, and of the resources and liabilities of the Treasury at the close of the year.

(c) His estimates of the revenues and expenditure needs of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year, and how, in his opinion, these needs should be met. The President shall also transmit with such budget such further data regarding the financial affairs of the Government and such recommendations as he may deem proper.

6. An alternative budget is also required to be submitted by the President in substantially the same form as the budget.

7. That after June 30, 1920, no estimate or request for any appropriation, and no recommendation as to how the revenue needs of the Government should be met, shall be submitted to Congress by any officer of the executive branch of the Government, except the President, unless at the request of either House of Congress.

8. The bill further provides for an accounting department, which shall be an establishment of the Government independent of the executive department and under the control and direction of the comptroller general of the United States. The office of the Comptroller of the Treasury is abolished and all such employees transferred to the office of the comptroller general. It is provided that this official shall hold office during good behavior, but may be removed at any time by concurrent resolution of Congress, after notice and hearing, when, in its judgment, the comptroller general or his assistant has been inefficient or guilty of neglect of duty or of malfeasance in office or, with the amendment which I have offered, of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude, as well as by impeachment. This practically gives the comptroller general the same independence and immunity from partisan political control as is now enjoyed by the employees of the Government in civil service, and will enable him to discharge the duties of his office without fear or favor in spite of incurring the displeasure in powerful quarters of those whose policies or desires for expenditures are limited by the restraints which he, under the law, must impose.

But notwithstanding the opportunity accorded to the comptroller general to exercise fearlessly and fully the power vested in him to supervise the expenditures of the Government, he is yet made answerable to Congress for failure to discharge his duties or for a wrongful exercise of any of his powers, as well as for an inefficient exercise of those powers and duties; and by the amendment which I have offered it is further provided that Congress may by a concurrent resolution remove him if he should become guilty of any felony or of any conduct involving moral turpitude.

There might arise instances of unfitness not serious enough to be classed as a felony, but which would be within the meaning of the language "conduct involving moral turpitude."

9. The comptroller general is vested with all the powers and duties now imposed by law upon the Comptroller of the Treasury or upon the auditors for the different executive departments, and the offices of such last-named officials are abolished.

It is also provided that the comptroller general shall investigate all matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public funds and shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report in writing of the work of the accounting department, containing recommendations concerning the legislation he may deem necessary to facilitate the prompt and accurate rendition and settlement of accounts and concerning such other matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public money as he may think advisable.

He is also granted the right to examine any books or other papers of any department or other Government agency.

Such, in substance, are the provisions of the bill.

Through its operation thus is:

1. A centralized responsibility imposed upon the Chief Executive of the Nation for the conduct of the administrative branch of the Government.

2. A statement furnished in complete form of all the revenues and expenditures for the preceding year, with also those for the current year and for the ensuing year, with a further statement of the resources and liabilities of the Treasury at the close of each such year.

3. And through the audit, investigation, supervision, and recommendations of the comptroller general, it ought to be possible to clearly present to Congress just in what branches of the Government duplication of work and effort, as well as waste and extravagance, exist, and the best methods of eliminating same.

Moreover, Congress will be more fully advised of the income of the Government, as well as of its needs, and will thereby be better enabled than it has ever been before to adjust the two and reduce taxation and expenditure where it can be done, avoiding in a great measure, if not completely, the deficiency appropriations which have for so long been the custom and practice in our Government.

At the present time the national debt of the United States amounts to the stupendous sum of approximately $25,000,000,000. A staggering debt, indeed, but not so great comparatively as the war debts of other countries who do not have the national wealth of $230,000,000,000 possessed by this Nation. But the debt is heavy enough, and so great that to pay the interest alone on it requires the enormous sum of more than $1,000,000,000.

It has been computed that for the period from April, 1917, when the United States entered the war, to April, 1919, a period of 25 months, the war cost this country about $22,000,000,000, or at the rate of $1,000,000 an hour, and making, on the average, a charge of $200 a person for the 110,000,000 people in the United States. This cost does not include the great sums given the Red Cross and other war-work agencies.

In addition, nearly $10,000,000,000 was loaned the allied nations. When this amount will be repaid no one now can say.

The war has practically ended, but war costs have not. Not only the people in their daily farming, industrial, and home life feel it, but the Government also is having to pay substantially the same relatively high costs for what it is compelled to have and do, and therefore, like the people, finds for the most part that the dollar now which it spends will scarcely go half as far as it did previous to the beginning of the war. This condition in turn has been reflected not only in the costs of materials, but in the necessities of employees of the Government, who are constantly presenting and urging upon Congress the need of increased salaries and wages to meet the alarming advance in the cost of living.

So that the appropriations for the conduct and operation of the Government are necessarily greater than they used to be for only the same return which it used to be possible to obtain for so much less.

Congress is making the greatest effort to check and reduce that cost, and has already adopted the most stringent measures to punish hoarders and profiteers, whose greed rises supreme above the welfare and, in some cases, to the very right to existence of their fellow countrymen. Such acts have been made offenses punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary, and if grand juries and petit juries will indict and convict these profiteers some substantial relief from the practices of these offenders may speedily be afforded.

The continuance of the cost of the war, however, is not alone centered in the high cost of living, but must be recognized and further borne in the provision that must be made for the soldiers, sailors, and marines who gave and risked their lives that their countrymen and this Republic might continue to live and give to all mankind the example and security of a free people under the greatest constitutional and most enduring form of government. Already war-risk insurance, compensation, vocational education, and allowances to the soldiers, sailors, and marines and their dependents require the appropriation of many millions of dollars.

Notwithstanding a tremendous cutting down of appropriations for the current year and a reduction in appropriations of billions of dollars by reason of the signing of the armistice and the saving of vast amounts appropriated for carrying on the war, there is required for this year alone, according to the estimates of the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, over ten and a half billion dollars, with only total revenues of about seven billion and a quarter with which to meet them. In other words, it appears necessary to raise in some way more than three billion and a half dollars addditional to meet the current requirements, unless they can be reduced in some way which has not yet been made apparent.

The war, of course, required tremendous expenditures, but it was won, and the price of victory will be ungrudgingly paid by the American people. It can not, however, but be felt for a long, long time. Congress should, however, make every effort to dispense with unnecessary expenditures and avail itself of every agency which will not only save the people from further burdens and taxation, but, wherever possible, contribute to the reduction of those that exist. This the budget system in some measure promises to accomplish; therefore its establishment should and will no doubt be welcomed by every taxpayer in the land.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That all powers and duties now conferred or imposed by law upon the Comptroller of the Treasury or upon the Auditor for the Treasury Department, the Auditor for the War Department, the Auditor for the Interior Department, the Auditor for the Navy Department, the Auditor for the State and Other Departments, or the Auditor for the Post Office Department shall, so far as not inconsistent with this act, be vested in and imposed upon the accounting department and be exercised without direction from any other officer, and the balances certified by the comptroller general shall be final and conclusive upon the executive branch of the Government. The revision by the comptroller general of settlements made by the six auditors referred to in this section shall be discontinued, except as to settlements made before July 1, 1920.

Section 236 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 236. All claims and demands whatever by the United States or against them, and all accounts whatever in which the United States are concerned, either as debtors or creditors, shall be settled and adjusted in the accounting department."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill. While I am not as sanguine about saving millions of dollars, or any very large sum, as some gentlemen who have spoken, yet I believe it will effect economy in some directions, do away with some abuses, and fix to some extent the responsibility for expenditures.

There has been, I think, more misunderstanding with reference to a budget system in the country at large than with reference to any other question that has been before Congress. That is largely due to the extensive propaganda that has been carried on endeavoring to show that Congress was not doing its duty, and had no system of supervising accounts in this Government worth mentioning. Most of the writers and many of the witnesses that came before the committee which prepared the bill, as will be shown by the hearings, seem to have the idea that the British system is highly successful and highly popular. As a matter of fact, it is neither successful nor is it popular in England. The system which now prevails in this country at the present time, with whatever defects it may have, is vastly better than the system that prevails in Great Britain, and it is so acknowledged.

In this connection I want to correct another prevailing belief, and that is that the budget system is a cure for all the financial evils that affect our Government. It is not. It will palliate those evils. It will tend to prevent waste, but it will not strike at the greatest source of expenditures.

The expenditures of a government depend principally upon its policies and the methods by which those policies are carried out. With neither of these questions does a budget deal, except incidentally, and it touches the efficiency of government management remotely if at all. For example, the expenses of our Army and Navy depend principally upon the policy which we adopt as to whether we will have a great Army and a great Navy or only one of moderate size. They also depend on whether the Army and Navy affairs are carried on efficiently and without waste. For example, we have great numbers of automobiles and automobile trucks rusting away and being ruined because the Government has taken no steps to sell them; in fact, has refused to sell them, although it has admitted that it never will use them. So also we have a large number of vessels in the Navy being operated which ought to be junked in the same manner as England junked 150 vessels in her navy, and made a great saving thereby. But the budget system does not touch a matter of this kind. The expenses of the Agricultural Department depend largely as to whether it shall have an army of agents in various parts of the country for various purposes or whether, on the other hand, its operations shall be restricted. With such matters the budget has nothing to do. In fact, the wildest extravagance may prevail under the best budget system, and some budget plans will, as I shall hereafter show, rather tend to increase expenses than to reduce them. A large number of States have adopted a budget system, but those who have adopted a budget system are not conspicuous for economy, as a rule, and some of them are noted for the extent of their expenditures. In some of these States it has been brought about in the same manner as much of our Federal governmental expense has been caused, namely, by a multiplication of boards and commissions, which brought about a multiplication of officials and clerks. We have at Washington far more clerks than is necessary. In some departments I am satisfied that the number could be reduced one-third if the management of these departments was conducted with any degree of efficiency. But this will not be corrected by the adoption of a budget system, as is abundantly shown by the experience of such countries as England.

I want to return for a moment to the much-heralded and much-approved budget system of England. A large number of writers on this subject, and especially the author of one book that has been much quoted, regard this system as a model. Many of the witnesses that appeared before the Budget Committee seemed to have the same opinion, thereby showing their utter ignorance of the subject upon which they thought themselves competent to give Congress advice. Yet the London Times has described this system as the "road to ruin" and the English papers are filled with articles on the extravagance of the Government under its budget system. Public indignation in England has risen to such an extent that the Government has been compelled to abandon some of its extravagant schemes and policies in order to quiet the universal clamor against its extravagance. The Government, in fact, under the English budget system, makes no pretense of matching its expenditures with its revenues; and the London Economist has said that its course would "ultimately land the country in insolvency."

What has caused the failure of the English system and what is it that the English people now want? The fact is that under the English system the budget is made up by the ministry. It has one good feature about it, and that is that it prescribes a limit to the expenditures, but unfortunately this limitation does not rest upon the ministry that prepares the budget, and consequently it may be as extravagant as it wishes without any check, for, as a matter of actual practice, Parliament can not reduce the expenditures below the amount of the budget prepared by the ministry. The various items of the budget are not gone over by separate committees which work upon them for months as in this country. The details are not scrutinized by special committees, and there is no open discussion worthy of the name of the budget, for the reason that the details are never considered in Parliament as they are in our Congress, where the appropriation bills are read paragraph by paragraph, discussed, and amended after the special committees have done their best to perfect them. Under the method adopted in England the items are not first subjected to the scrutiny of special committees, and under their form of government a refusal to approve the budget would mean the fall of the ministry, necessitating either the formation of a new ministry or a dissolution of Parliament and a new election. The result has been that in the last 25 years there has not been any material change in the budget made in Parliament, and to use the words of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], Parliament has become merely a rubber stamp by which approval might be given to the budget. At the same time not a single budget has ever been submitted but what contained items of expenditure which in some cases, particularly in the last year, involved immense sums which never would have been approved if examined by a proper committee, and never could have secured the approval of Parliament if a vote could be had thereon based upon the merits of the proposition alone. As a consequence, a select committee, which was appointed by Parliament for the purpose of budget reform in England, and the most eminent writers in that country who have considered the subject, are universally in favor of adopting the leading features of the American system, believing that their adoption would, without any doubt, greatly reduce the expenditures of Great Britain.

An extensive propaganda has been carried on in this country for the purpose of making the people at large believe that Congress was chargeable with the extravagance which has prevailed in our governmental affairs, and, unfortunately, this propaganda has been very successful. Nothing could be further from the real fact. Congress is constantly engaged in a struggle with the various departments to keep down expenses. Every department chief, no matter what his politics, desires to extend the activities of his department and to multiply the number of his subordinates. He considers his particular department as one of the most important and necessary of all the various divisions of our Government operations, and to a certain extent this is creditable to him, but it invariably results in increased demands upon the Public Treasury, and often in an increased personnel for which there is no necessity. The estimates brought in by the various heads of the departments as necessary for their operation are invariably greatly reduced by Congress. It is often said that larger estimates are brought in than is necessary, because the department heads feel that Congress will reduce them anyway. It is true, although contrary to public belief, that the usual tendency of Congress is toward economy, but the department heads always have a full opportunity to show through their experts just what they need, and are never satisfied with what is given them. They appeal from the decision of the House to the Senate, where, as a rule, they get the appropriations raised, although not to the extent that they desire. In many instances, as every Member of Congress knows, they have instituted a propaganda over the country in support of provisions which would allow them to engage in new activities and new expenditures, and have even gone so far as to attempt to build up a "back fire" among the people at home against Congressmen who were not inclined to grant what they wished. The long and short of the whole matter is that a budget framed by the spending departments, which in this country constitute the administration, will always be extravagant, and the extravagance of our present Government is largely owing to the fact that although Congress has endeavored to keep the expenditures down, the insistence of the departments and the administration has had its weight and effect.

At this point I wish to call your attention to one feature which I deem a weakness in the present bill. I would have much preferred that this budget should have been framed by Congress in the first instance and not by any budget bureau, as constituted by the bill, which I very much fear would be too much under the influence of the various heads of the departments and the administration in general. If in fact it should be controlled by them, the result will not make for economy but

for the reverse. It will be observed that the officers and heads of this system are to be appointed by the President in the first instance. True, the auditor created by this bill may be removed by Congress only, and to that extent he is independent of the administration, but there is a similar officer under the English system with equally extensive powers and it has been found that after all he is simply an accounting officer and does not undertake to do more than to pass upon the legality of the expenditures. I am unable to see how he will be in a position to do more. He is not given any authority to investigate, and although he may have under this bill the authority to criticize, I doubt very much his being able to definitely ascertain and prove the facts upon which such criticism should be based.

But while this bill does not in this respect meet my approval, I shall vote for it on account of its having been supported by the unanimous report of the Budget Committee, and I am willing to take it and look to the future for evidence of how it will work out. If it works well, the system will be preserved, but the committee which brought it before us practically concedes that it needs other legislation to supplement it in order to give the budget system the effect desired.

As a supplement to this bill the Budget Committee has reported a resolution which is intended to effectuate and carry out its objects. This resolution, I anticipate, will meet with more opposition than the bill which we are now considering. While it is not now before the House, it is worth while to give it some attention in advance, for unless the provisions of the present bill are supplemented by further action of Congress it will not, in my opinion, have any great effect.

This resolution provides for one single appropriating committee to take the place of all the appropriating committees which we now have, so far as their power to make appropriations is concerned. In my judgment the resolution ought not to be adopted without modifications. I do not believe it is possible for one appropriating committee to perform all the duties which are now performed by the 10 great committees which now make appropriations. I can not understand where or how they will get time to discuss estimates in detail or to master completely the various subjects that would be brought before it. I do not know how it could obtain the knowledge in detail which the members of these several committees now have with reference to the activities of the departments with which they are respectively concerned, and I am very sure that it would have no opportunity in the multitude of matters that would come before it to institute the inquiries and carry on the investigations necessary to obtain the information which such a committee ought to have to properly perform its duties. I think, however, that with an amendment to this resolution it might be made acceptable to the House and used with great benefit. When it is brought up for action thereon I shall offer an amendment providing in substance that instead of this large committee being in charge of all of the details of the appropriations it shall be simply an allocating and limiting committee with reference to the appropriations.

Its functions will be to fix the total amount which may be expended for all governmental purposes during the fiscal year and to allot the proportion thereof which may be appropriated by each committee. It would, in short, be a congressional budget committee, which revised the estimates of the budget bureau, both for the whole Government and for the separate departments. The details as to how these several amounts allocated to each committee should be expended would be left to the various appropriating committees, as now, who would be, in my judgment, better prepared and unquestionably would have far more time to devote to the details than if this one committee undertook to perform all this work. For the purpose of performing its work this budget committee of the House—for I would have it a budget committee and not an appropriating committee—would have before it all of the estimates and information furnished by the budget bureau, so that it could act quickly. Its failure, however, to act quickly would not prevent the appropriating committees from going on with their work in the usual manner.

This plan would have all of the benefits proposed by this resolution as it now stands, and it would have the immeasurable advantages of having every detail of the appropriation scanned in a manner which would be quite impossible if this duty was undertaken by a single committee, with still further opportunity for reductions in the appropriations, if possible.

The resolution providing for the appointment of a committee of 35 members to make all appropriations presents a far-reaching measure. It takes away from those who have hitherto spent months and in many cases years in familiarizing themselves with every phase of our appropriations in the past their most important powers, and all that would be left to them would be the power to authorize appropriations, not knowing whether they would be granted. The real determination of the policies of Congress would rest with this great appropriating committee, which would finally determine whether the appropriations authorized should be made.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is it not true that the committees familiar with the subject matters would authorize all of the appropriations and that the appropriations would be made by the appropriating committee, and the only power taken would be merely the matter of appropriations? Nothing could be appropriated unless authorized for the War Department, the Indian Department, the Navy Department, or any other department.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the appropriating committee is to be simply a ratifying committee, approving the authorizations which are made, then I see no advantages in it. It would accomplish nothing but to go through a form. If, on the other hand, it prunes and selects the appropriations, the authorizations are mere suggestions.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Authorization could be made for a specific work, but it would be for the appropriating committee to say how much should be appropriated.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then who would know best which was the proper amount, the committee who studied it and authorized it or the other committee that showed no familiarity at all with the subject?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would say it is the committee that is made up of specialists who have studied with reference to the work of a particular department, men who have been familiar with that work for years, who have made continuous study of it ever since they have been in Congress and knew every detail.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If, however, this large appropriation committee was composed of representatives from the appropriating committees of the House as now constituted, would it not meet the gentleman's objection?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; it would not meet my objection, because if the work was carried on as the gentleman seems to expect, it would then put the work relating to a particular department in the hands of 2 or 3 instead of 21, as the committees are now constituted, because this big committee would necessarily be divided into subcommittees. There would be two or three who would fix the appropriations; the same for the Indian Affairs; the same for the Department of Agriculture and all of the other departments; instead of a full committee as now constituted.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I do not understand that the change in the rules calls for the appointment of a certain designated number from the committees, and it occurred to me that the rule should so provide.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think that would be necessary in any event, and that it would be necessary to subdivide this big appropriating committee, so that there would be as many subcommittees as there are now appropriating.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that there are some large committees to-day who do not have the power of appropriation. Take the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for example. Their power has not been curtailed, it seems to me, to any great extent beyond the powers of committees that do have appropriating authority.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is hardly necessary that that committee should have appropriating powers, as they deal with comparatively little connected with financial matters, except possibly to make up the deficit from the Government's running of the railroads.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the war-risk insurance act was reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and that carried a large appropriation, larger than the whole appropriation for the Indian affairs.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the House has generally agreed that the war-risk insurance never ought to have been given to that committee. The Committee on Interstate Commerce is a great committee, with a distinguished chairman, but it has too much to do, it is overworked, and at times unavoidably delays the business of the House.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Be that as it may, the power of the Interstate Commerce Committee has not been curtailed because it did not have appropriating power.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is curtailed, but in that particular case it would not make any difference, because any sum authorized to be expended by the War Risk must be expended and must be appropriated, but if this big committee is only to make absolutely necessary appropriations, it would not matter so much.

This appropriating committee, if limited as I propose, would not interfere with the several appropriating committees taking up in detail all of these measures and fixing the limit of expense. It would revise the budget system as it came from the director of the budget. It would determine how much the Government should expend in a single year as a total.

Mr. HASTINGS. I entirely agree, but I want to ask the gentleman, if it will not interfere with him, to discuss what these other 400 Members of Congress would do at the short session of Congress, when all the time during that session of Congress is consumed in making appropriations? What would the other 400 Members be doing?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They would wait mostly, although they would have some duties.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is no general legislation at that session, as everybody knows.

Mr. TILSON. At the present time there are only about 147 Members on these appropriating committees, to begin with. What do all the other members of the committee do? Are not the ordinary Members around them doing just as much work as anybody else? Now, why is it claimed we reduce these 147 men to complete impotence when we have a much larger number of men who have not been on such committees at all, who are very influential Members of this House and are doing good work all the time?

Mr. BLANTON. Where are they to-day?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not yield to the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Oklahoma, of course, did not speak in a literal sense of the meaning that these Members would have absolutely nothing to do, and there is a larger number on the appropriating committees than stated by the gentleman from Connecticut. They would have work to do, but not much, under the circumstances. Those on the other committees never do have the same amount of work. Did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] desire me to yield?

Mr. CANNON. I just want to ask a question. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the most important committee of this House, which requires an immense deal of work and constant study to report legislation to bring revenues into the Treasury. What would my friend say to a proposition that there should be several committees called by slightly different names, instead of the Committee on Ways and Means, one to deal with revenues to come from customs, another from direct taxes, and so on and so on? That would give all something to do.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, the gentleman is suggesting a proposition that nobody seems seriously to contemplate. The Ways and Means Committee, it is true, has a great amount of work on its hands, but it is unavoidable and its work can not be divided, because this committee in passing on one revenue bill must know how much all our other revenue acts would produce. If left to different committees, the total would be too much or too little. Besides, the methods of raising our revenues are so interwoven that each has a bearing on the other and they can not be separated. I could easily cite many examples. I would say also that the Ways and Means, while its work never ends, is concerned directly with the work of only one department—the Treasury. This proposed committee would deal with all departments and should be familiar with every detail in relation to them. Yet these appropriating committees as now constituted are, for the most part, considered so important and as requiring so much time from a Member who belongs to one of them that he is not permitted to be a member of any other committee.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that what I have said will not be taken as a criticism of the work of the Budget Committee. I have intended rather to assist them in their labors. The committee and its chairman are entitled to great credit for the work which they have done, and I hope that what I have said will not be taken as detracting in the least from the credit to which they are entitled. I have not entered this discussion for the purpose of criticism but rather in the hope that I might assist the committee and the House in the formation of this most important measure. If the modification which I have proposed is adopted it will, in my opinion, not only accomplish all that would be accomplished by the resolution as now drawn but would be likely to result in greater saving than the plan as now presented. The Appropriations Committee as now constituted is overworked. Its distinguished chairman, who introduced this bill, and many of the members of that committee are compelled to work night and day during the greater portion of the session. Yet their duties are only a small part of what would be cast upon this one big appropriating committee which is proposed, and it would be simply an impossibility for such a committee to give proper consideration to all of the thousands of items of our appropriation bills which now are divided among so many committees. The result would often be that not knowing and not having time to ascertain whether an appropriation, for example, for military or naval purposes could properly be reduced, it would be compelled to adopt the estimate furnished by the department, whereas the Military or Naval Committee, as the case might be, being familiar with every detail pertaining to the appropriation, is not obliged to accept the reasoning or conclusions which are presented by the departmental officials. I hope not only the Budget Committee but the whole House will give careful consideration to this modification proposed.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STEAGALL: Page 8, beginning in line 10, strike out all of section 10.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the committee unnecessarily. I had intended to offer this amendment to the preceding section but was out of the Hall for a moment when that section was voted on. If my amendment is adopted, which I hardly anticipate, it is my purpose then to move to strike out the remaining sections and the section just adopted, leaving only the last section of the bill, which should be renumbered. I do this because I for one am opposed to the life-tenure proposition involved in the creation of this office of comptroller general, and I am also opposed to authorizing the head of any department to employ as many people as he sees fit and fix their salaries without let or hindrance from the Congress, the President, or anybody else.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, from the nature of the amendments offered to this budget bill and the tone of the criticism of it, it seems to me that a few remarks under the heading of "Lest we forget" would be in order at this time. It seems to me that some of our good Democratic friends and Republican friends also ought to hark back to the last time we asked the people of the United States to elect a President of the United States. Let me refresh the memory of my Democratic friends by reading a plank in the last Democratic national platform for 1916, as follows:

ECONOMY AND THE BUDGET.

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 by its membership, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication in the public service as much as possible avoided. We favor this as a practical step toward a budget system.

Let me also read a paragraph from President Wilson's address to Congress at the opening of our session on the first Monday in December, 1917——

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman permit a statement?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. In just a moment. The President appealed to Congress in this language:

And I beg that the Members of the House of Representatives will permit me to express the opinion that it will be impossible to deal in any but a very wasteful and extravagant fashion with the enormous appropriations of the public money 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 far as possible avoided.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman permit an interruption now?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. In just a moment. I want to put in one more quotation on this subject. Now, while the Republican national platform of that year—1916—contained a good deal of what might be called—well, I will not call it bunk——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Good reading matter.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me call my Republican friends' attention to a plank in their last national platform, because if it were not meant in good faith this is a good time for the country to know it. The language is as follows:

ECONOMY AND A NATIONAL BUDGET.

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 its people Government service call for the severest condemnation of the wasteful appropriations of this Democratic administration and of its shameless raid on the Treasury and of its opposition 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—

[Applause on the Republican side.]

to which we pledge our support and which we hold to be necessary to effect any real reform in the administration of national finances.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, we are putting the recommendations of the Republican national platform into execution now.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman permit an interruption now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I ask for two minutes' extension.

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

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is becoming interesting as a historian. I should not be surprised some time if he should possibly make reference to the Constitution of the United States or the Bible and possibly the Ten Commandments.

Do we understand the gentleman to say that the Republican platform was all bunk?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; I did not say it was all bunk. But I do say if they do not carry out this provision in good faith that part of it at least would be.

Mr. STEAGALL. I understood the gentleman to say so, and I want him to produce the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] to prove that the Democratic platform is all bunk, and then I wish to suggest that neither platform nor any platform of any party that ever held a convention ever declared for life tenure in office, or for any department of this Government having the right to appoint as many employees as it pleased.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I desire to say that the Select Committee on the Budget has heard some of the most able and distinguished people of the United States on this subject. There is not a line in this bill that has not had exhaustive consideration. And we have gone into this matter as intelligently, conscientiously, and thoroughly as any committee could. We have examined the systems of other countries and of our various State and city systems and the works of the most distinguished writers on the subject, and have come to the unanimous conclusion that these provisions, as embraced in this bill, are not only proper but necessary in order to carry out in good faith our party platform promises to the American people, and in order that we may honestly enact the pledges upon which we were elected to this Congress two years ago last fall and again last fall. Now, when our country is confronted with the frightful and appalling debt of over $26,000,000,000; when there is the most imperative need for economy in every direction; when every farseeing and patriotic citizen in this country is warning the country and Congress against waste and extravagance, and appealing for a retrenchment of expenditures in every possible way, I know that this Congress is not going to repudiate our promises to our country or to our constituents. In this dire financial situation of our Nation, I know this House will keep the faith and pass this bill substantially in the form in which the committee has brought it before the House.

Any Member of either this House or of the Senate who votes or works against this measure not only violates his party's platform but I prophesy that he will have a mighty hard time ever explaining his actions and that he will have occasion to regret it as long as he lives, and I am going to try to see that every Member of this House goes on record by a roll-call vote on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. OSBORNE: Page 9, line 4, strike out the word "them" and insert the word "it"; page 9, line 5, strike out the word "are" and insert the word "is"; page 9, line 5, strike out the word "debtors" and insert the word "debtor"; page 9, line 6, strike out the word "creditors" and insert the word "creditor."

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, this section reads as follows:

SEC. 236. All claims and demands whatever by the United States or against them, and all accounts whatever in which the United States are concerned, either as debtors or creditors, shall be settled and adjusted in the accounting department.

My amendment goes not only to the grammatical construction but to the fact. "United States" is singular and not plural. This matter was settled long ago, not only by the rules of grammar but by the rules of war. We fought four years to establish the fact that the United States is one country and not a collection of municipalities.

I submit my amendment for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from California and to the committee that our committee had nothing to do with the formulation of the language in this paragraph. The section is in all respects the present law except as we struck out the word "Treasury" in line 6 and put in the word "accounting." We have not attempted to change the language in a single particular, and when the gentleman says that we should use the word "is" instead of the word "are," and that "United States" is singular instead of plural, I call his attention to section 2 of Article III of the Constitution of the United States, where it would seem that the framers of the Constitution had about the same notion as the framers of the law which we have followed. Section 2 provides:

The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority.

Now, we use the word "them" here just as the framers of the Constitution used the word "their."

Mr. OSBORNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OSBORNE. Is it not a fact that the Constitution in that regard was amended between 1861 and 1865?

Mr. GOOD. That provision has never been amended.

Mr. OSBORNE. It has been amended in fact.

Mr. GOOD. That provision stands as the framers of the Constitution made it.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield? Are we not better to-day than they were?

Mr. GOOD. Well, they were pretty good. The framers of the Constitution were men of ripe scholarship; many of them had graduated in the best colleges of America, and a great many of them—31 I believe it was—had graduated from the large universities of the Old World, and they were trained in the school of statesmanship. And I have never yet, as far as I am personally concerned, been willing to quarrel with their grammar, and I am not now.

Mr. CANNON. Then the gentleman does not think that hypercriticism has any place?

Mr. OSBORNE. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield further?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. OSBORNE. Does not the gentleman think that in a matter of this kind, if there was an error in the first place, it should be changed in enacting a new section, and that the United States is, in fact, a Nation, and should not be designated as "them" or be mentioned in the plural form? I think so.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman from California that the Congress that enacted this legislation followed the language in the Constitution. They referred here to the United States as "them," and, of course, if we use that, we must also use the plural all the way through.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on this amendment?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do. I wish to ask the gentleman a question as to what claims and demands this section relates to. It says:

All claims and demands whatever * * * shall be settled and adjusted in the accounting department.

Mr. GOOD. Of course, that has been construed a great many times by the comptroller. Those are claims and demands for the payment for which an appropriation has been made. Of course, it would have no relation to a claim or demand that necessarily had to go to the Court of Claims. It is only those that are authorized by law and for which an appropriation has been made and which can be settled under the decision of the comptroller to determine.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Of course, the Congress itself passes upon claims and demands against the Government and often authorizes their payment. It would seem that this language as it stands would authorize the accounting department to determine the question of the legal or equitable liability of the Government in some cases.

Mr. GOOD. That judicial construction has never been given by the comptroller, and this language has been on the statute books for a long time; a similar provision was carried in the law as far back as 1817. Practically that language has been on

the statute books, and all we are changing now is to strike out the word "Treasury" and insert the word "accounting" instead.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The construction may have been given, but certainly the language would justify another construction. Some other comptroller or some other official might change the construction.

Mr. GOOD. We accepted that for 100 years and more. It has been on the statute books that long, and it has received judicial construction and a department construction, and all we are here attempting to do is to confer that power which the Treasury Department now has to settle claims of this character on the accounting department.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Well, I think in this bill some changes for the better have been made, and in the very framing of this bill the committee has properly disregarded precedents and departed from old customs. It seems to me the committee should have gone a little further and corrected the ambiguity and the patent mistakes in the law. I say that in connection with the amendment suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. OSBORNE]. I think he is entirely right in suggesting the change of those words to make them singular instead of plural, and I would suggest some change in this section, so that no other construction but the one that has been given will be possible.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the accounting officers have authority under the law to state two classes of accounts; one for which a lapsed appropriation has previously existed; the other a liability which had arisen under specific statute authorizing, for instance, the appointment of an officer, but no appropriation having been made therefor.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But this section says "all claims and demands whatever."

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. That is within the range of the accounting system. That would be the construction there.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana and Mr. DOWELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana desire recognition?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes. I move to strike out the last word of the amendment.

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

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think this budget bill is wise legislation. I think it follows along the lines of economy. In discussing the question of economy yesterday a statement was made on the floor criticizing in a mild way, but nevertheless criticizing, the demands of the bituminous coal miners for an increase in wages. I hold no brief for the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. Chairman, but I want to make a very brief statement about the underlying causes of the present dispute between the bituminous miners and operators.

In April, 1916, through their representatives the organized miners and the operators entered into a two-year contract. The wages paid labor in other industries soon went beyond the wages agreed upon in 1916, and the operators began to pay bonuses in order to attract labor to their mines and to keep up the output. The situation growing out of the payment of bonuses became so acute and unsatisfactory that the operators themselves were glad to make some arrangement by which the 1916 contract could be supplemented by a provision permitting the payment of a sufficient wage to attract labor. Hence in March, 1917, a supplementary agreement was entered into by which all contract miners were paid 10 cents per ton additional. Under this supplemental contract the machine men were advanced from 52 cents to 62 cents per ton, the men engaged in pick work were advanced from 64 cents to 74 cents per ton, and the day men were advanced from $2.98 to $3.60 per day. This contract continued in effect until November 1, 1917.

In October, 1917, the coal market was under the control of the Fuel Administration. The operators desired an increase in the price of their coal. The general wage level had rapidly risen, and Dr. H. A. Garfield, then Fuel Administrator, brought about an agreement by which the miners, effective November 1, 1917, had their wages advanced and the operators were permitted to advance the price of coal. This so-called Washington agreement made this advance: Contract miners were given 10 cents per ton additional. Thus machine men were increased from 62 cents to 72 cents per ton, pick men were increased from 74 cents to 84 cents per ton, and day men were increased so that their day wages amounted to $5 per day. Since then no further advance in wages has been made.

It will thus be seen that the total increase since April 1, 1916, more than a year before our entrance into the war, was only 20 cents per ton, or 29 per cent for pick men and 38.4 per cent for machine miners and that the day men have not been advanced beyond $5 per day, although in percentage that amounts to 68 per cent increase; the day men only include about 27 per cent of the total employees.

It is interesting in connection with these figures to know that while the advanced increase of labor was less than 44 per cent that the advanced retail sale price of coal was more than 110 per cent.

This Washington agreement contains this clause:

> This agreement is subject to and will become effective only on the condition that the selling price of coal shall be advanced by the United States Government sufficient to cover the increased cost in the different districts affected and will take effect on the first day of the pay period following the order advancing such increased prices.

The whole tenor of this Washington contract is that the coal miners should receive their proportion of the increased revenue obtained by the coal operator for the sale of his coal.

Many months ago Dr. Garfield deemed the war sufficiently over that he abandoned all restrictions upon the selling price of coal and disbanded the Fuel Administration and retired to private life. The coal operators are no longer bound by any war restrictions, and I am reliably informed that free coal is frequently sold at $2.75 per ton at the mouth of the mine and sometimes brings $4 per ton. This is in sharp contrast to the $2.35 per ton fixed at the time the Washington agreement was entered into.

The fourth clause of the Washington agreement provides that the mine workers' representatives agreed that the present contract be extended during the continuation of the war and not to exceed two years from April 1, 1918.

Actual hostilities ceased on November 11, 1918, and practically all of the bureaus organized during the war have long ago been disbanded, including the Fuel Administration. It certainly can not be contended that this agreement was meant to last until the war should technically be terminated by the exchange of peace treaties. If such be the case, it could be contended that it not only means that peace be concluded with Germany, but that it should continue until we made peace with Austria.

The United Mine Workers of America have steadfastly and faithfully observed the provisions of this contract and have waited until almost a year after the close of hostilities before asking an increase and long after the operators have ceased being hampered by governmental control.

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

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I am sorry I can not. In a Terre Haute, Ind., newspaper of last week I find an advertisement by a coal operator for men to do pick work. In the same paper is an advertisement for plasterers at $1 per hour, and an advertisement for men to work at a creosoting plant for $5 to $8 per day.

It must be remembered that coal miners frequently only get to work two or three days per week, and in computing their wages this must be taken into consideration. If this is done, it is clear to the unbiased mind that the day laborer in the coal mine is not paid a wage commensurate with the carpenter, the plasterer, bricklayer, railroad engineer, shipworker, and many laborers in other industries.

He is engaged in a dangerous occupation. For over a quarter of a century the United Mine Workers of America have, by means of collective bargaining with the coal operators, made amicable agreements for the production of coal, fair and beneficial alike to the operators, miners, and the public.

The machinery for adjusting disputes, including the present one, is still intact. In the past they have bargained and compromised and used a good supply of common sense on both sides. I am not undertaking to say that all the demands of the miners should be granted, but I have recited the above facts in order to show that it is quite within the range of practicability for an adjustment to be made of the present controversy. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

Mr. GOOD. There is an amendment pending. Let us perfect the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, while there may be some difference of opinion as to the grammatical construction of this sentence, there ought to be no difference of opinion as to what the committee has done in placing this section in the law they are asking us to enact. The committee simply quote from the old law a paragraph for the purpose of changing a word and making that law harmonize with the budget bill which we are considering. In quoting it they ought to have quoted it as it was on the statute books. They are simply seeking to amend it to make it harmonize with the present legislation, and the question of the grammatical construction of the paragraph is not, and ought not to be, before the House.

Besides, this paragraph is taken out of its context for the purpose of making this amendment. Hence in only reading it we do not get the best idea of what it means. But when we read that paragraph in its place, which is in the legislation designed to create the Treasury Department and to regulate accounting, it is easily understood then what is meant by "all claims against the Government," made by the Government or against the Government, shall be settled in this department. It is simply a part of the mechanism by which accounts in the Treasury Department shall be settled, so that in the consideration of this measure we ought not to concern ourselves with the grammatical construction of the sentence but let us perfect it in order to make it harmonize with the scope and purpose of this bill.

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

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOWELL. What is the necessity for inserting an accounting department instead of the Treasury Department?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Why, the very purpose of this bill is to create an accounting department that shall be independent of all the executive departments of the Government. If these accounts are to be settled in the Treasury Department, it would maintain the old régime, whereas striking out the word "Treasury" and inserting the word "Accounting" would bring this law into harmony with the budget scheme.

Mr. DOWELL. But in this amendment do you not add to the accounting department another duty, aside from accounting? As I understand it, under the budget system you are establishing an accounting department that has for its purpose the accounting of all accounts of all the departments of the Government. In this you put the duty upon the accounting department of settling claims both for and against the United States, entirely a different duty. Who has the accounting of that department after it has been passed upon by the accounting department? Could it not be done by the Treasury Department as well as by the auditing department, to check it up?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. No. If the gentleman will refer to section 10 of this proposed measure, he will find the provision there, as follows:

All powers and duties now conferred or imposed by law upon the Comptroller of the Treasury or upon the Auditor for the Treasury Department—

Shall be exercised, and so forth.

Mr. DOWELL. I understand that.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Now, you want to make this old law harmonious with that. Hence, you strike out the word "Treasury" and relieve them from this accounting and auditing, and put it where it belongs, in this general auditing department created under this budget bill.

Mr. GOOD. And the Comptroller of the Treasury is the man who has been functioning with regard to this provision of the statute all along.

Mr. DOWELL. That is true; but it is all done in the name of the Treasurer, and can it not be done in the same manner with this accounting department? And is there any difference now from the old system of the Treasurer making these settlements both for and against the Government, when they have the accounting department here to determine the exact amount of it? And is there any difference now in the plan, under this new controlling system and under the old?

Mr. GOOD. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. I move to strike out the last three words of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas). That would be an amendment in the third degree. The gentleman can get in on the next section. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. OSBORNE].

Mr. OSBORNE. I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amendment by Mr. OSBORNE: Page 9, line 4, strike out the word "them" and insert the word "it"; page 9, line 5, strike out the word "are" and insert the word "is"; page 9, line 5, strike out the word "debtors" and insert the word "debtor"; page 9, line 6, strike out the word "creditors" and insert the word "creditor."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. That the offices of the six auditors enumerated in section 10 shall be abolished, to take effect July 1, 1920, but the then incumbents of those offices shall be transferred, at their present salaries, to become officers of the accounting department. All other officers and employees of these offices shall become officers and employees in the accounting department at their grades and salaries on July 1, 1920. All books, records, documents, papers, furniture, office equipment, and other property of these offices shall become the property of the accounting department. The accounting department shall occupy the rooms now occupied by the office of the Comptroller of the Treasury and the six auditors referred to in section 10 until otherwise provided.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. I do this, however, to discuss another subject.

If I understood the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS], he was speaking in favor of the contention of the miners who are now threatening a Nation-wide strike on November 1. If I understood the first contention that was made by these men in their demands upon their employers, it was to decrease the hours of the workday, so that the work day should consist of only six hours. If that should be granted it would of itself decrease the production 25 per cent.

I understand further that the next contention was that the work week should be five days instead of six; in other words, that in working a week and receiving pay for a week, the men should work only five days, and should have two days off out of the week. If that had been granted by their employers, it of itself would have decreased the output and the production another 16⅔ per cent, making a total decrease in production of 41⅔ per cent. These contentions are expected to take effect, and if not granted the strike is to ensue, on the 1st day of November, when the cold weather has set in from one side of this country to the other.

Mr. DOWELL. I raise the point of order that the gentleman is not talking upon the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, if the gentleman does not want to permit me to answer the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS], he has a right to hold me down to the pro forma amendment, but I hope he will permit me to speak on this subject for a few minutes.

Mr. DOWELL. I insist on the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman surely is not in favor of having women and little children freeze to death in this country during December, January, and February.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is clearly out of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I will try to hold myself within the scope of the pro forma amendment. This particular section, Mr. Chairman, is embraced within a new piece of legislation before the House proposed to reduce the expenses of the Government. If the committee are warranted in their assertion, it will save expense to this Government. I want to say that the first thing we must consider in saving expense to this Government is instead of decreasing production to increase production. That has been the trouble with this country, and that has been the trouble with Congress all along, that we have sat here in our seats supinely, month after month, and have permitted the production of the country to be decreased all the time, instead of taking steps, instead of lending our voices to a proposition that would bring about the maximum production in this country. You can not bring about maximum production by decreasing the hours of the workday from eight to six, and you can not bring about maximum production in this country by decreasing the work week from six days to five days.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: Page 9, line 11, after the word "at," strike out the words "their present," and after the word "salaries," in line 11, insert "of $4,000 each," so that as amended it will read:

"SEC. 11. That the offices of the six auditors enumerated in section 10 shall be abolished, to take effect July 1, 1920, but the then incumbents of those offices shall be transferred, at salaries of $4,000 each, to become officers of the accounting department."

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, four of the auditors at present receive $4,000 per annum. Two of them receive $5,000 per annum. Under the act of 1894 their salaries were uniform, and under the law prior to that time uniform salaries prevailed. Political exigency brought about an increase of the salary of the Auditor for the War Department $1,000 a year some years ago, so that since that time that auditor has been receiving $5,000. A like political exigency and personal favoritism brought about an increase of the salary of the Auditor for the Post Office Department from $4,000 to $5,000.

My amendment proposes to restore the uniform rule that had prevailed during the greater portion of the history of the country, and to make these salaries all alike at $4,000 per annum.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 12. That the comptroller general shall appoint, remove, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees in the department as may from time to time be provided for by Congress, and perform all other duties of a head of an independent Government establishment. All such appointments, except to positions carrying a salary of $5,000 a year, shall be made from lists of eligibles furnished by the Civil Service Commission and in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations. No person appointed by the comptroller general shall be paid a salary in excess of $5,000 a year, and not more than three persons appointed by him shall be paid a salary at that rate. Until March 5, 1921, no person who at the time of the passage of this act holds office as one of the six auditors referred to in section 10, and who in pursuance of section 11 is transferred to the accounting department, shall be removed from office or have his compensation reduced, except for cause. All officers and employees of the department, whether transferred to the department in pursuance of section 11 or appointed by the comptroller general, shall perform such duties as may be assigned to them by the comptroller general. The comptroller general shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for carrying on the work of the department.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 21, after the word "appoint," insert the word "and"; after the word "remove," in line 22, strike out the words "and fix the compensation of."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to prevent the comptroller general from fixing the salaries of the officers and employees in his department. I do not know why we Members of Congress should shift this function to the comptroller general. We do know that this power has been abused for years, and especially during the last two years. We find in one department of the Government where ordinary men of $1,200 a year capacity have been paid salaries by the Secretary of Labor ranging up to $10,000 a year.

Let me bring one illustration from another department to your attention. There is no man in this House who thinks more than I do of the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Sherley. There is no man in this House who has rendered more valuable work for his country as chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations than that gentleman from Kentucky. He did it on a salary of $7,500 a year. He sought in the last election to be permitted to continue that valuable service for his country on a salary of only $7,500 a year. If he had been reelected he would be in this House to-day rendering the same kind of valuable services to his country for only $7,500 a year.

And yet as soon as he went out of office he was placed immediately by Director General Hines in the railroad office down here and paid a salary of $25,000 a year. I want to say that we can not depend on our heads of departments to use good judgment in fixing salaries of officers and employees in their departments. If the distinguished and able gentleman from Kentucky, whom we all love, admire, and respect, was willing of his own accord, voluntarily, to offer his services to the Government for the coming two years at $7,500 a year—the very best service there was in him—why should he be paid for rendering no better service—because no man could render better service than Swagar Sherley rendered in the House last year—if he was willing to render the best service of which a man is capable for the coming two years at $7,500, why should he be paid out of the people's Treasury $25,000? Why should he be paid twice the salary of a Cabinet officer? No reason except that we failed to do our duty in retaining our proper function to fix salaries.

I want to say to my good friends on the other side of the aisle that if you mean what you say, that you want to retrench expenses, if you were sincere in your promise to the people that you would retrench and see that the expenses of the Government were decreased, why will you put into a measure you have brought in a provision leaving it in the comptroller general's power to fix salaries of his own employees and officers in his department?

I know there is a provision in the bill to the extent of fixing a maximum limit on it, but there is still power to fix the compensation, a function which this Congress should exercise, and only the Congress.

I want to say that the time should be here when we should quit passing the buck; we ought to assume the responsibilities of our own positions; and as one Member of Congress I am not yet ready to turn the power and responsibility that is in this Congress over to the head of some department. I hope this provision will be stricken out, though I am hoping in vain, as I realize that on same I will vote in a hopeless minority of probably one.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the argument of the gentleman from Texas in support of his amendment, I wish to state in opposition to it that the law already makes it impossible for the comptroller general to exercise any considerable range of discretion in fixing the salaries of clerks and employees in these offices. Nearly all the clerks and employees in these offices now have fixed statutory salaries. There is, perhaps, a very small number under the charge of the Auditor for the Post Office Department, in relation to a minor character of work, that do not have a fixed statutory salary. That is small, however, and hardly worthy of consideration.

After the transfer is made, as proposed in this bill, the statutory salaries will remain and the appropriations stand for those salaries. The comptroller will have the same authority and power then that the head of a department has now to promote from the lower grades in the office to higher statutory salaries, and he will have no power unless Congress abolishes the law fixing statutory salaries and give a lump sum, which I am very sure it will not do. The idea that there is danger here of a wrong exercise of power is misplaced because of the fact that the statutory salaries exist.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I will yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. VAILE. If salaries are fixed by statute, why is it necessary here to provide in this act, line 22, that the comptroller general shall appoint, remove, and fix a compensation of such officers and employees, and so forth?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. He may appoint to the statutory salaries; he may promote a clerk from $1,200 to $1,400 or $1,500, and he can fix the salary within those limits when he does so. But unless Congress should give him a lump-sum appropriation, out of which he could fix salaries at his own discretion, he will not be able to exercise the power. He does not now have the appropriation to do anything of the kind.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 1 aye and 59 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 13. That the comptroller general shall investigate, at the seat of government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public funds, and shall make to Congress, at the beginning of each regular session, a report in writing of the work of the accounting department, containing recommendations concerning the legislation he may deem necessary to facilitate the prompt and accurate rendition and settlement of accounts and concerning such other matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public funds as he may think advisable. He shall make such investigations and reports as shall be ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures. The comptroller general shall also, at the request of any such committee, direct assistants from his office to furnish the committee such aid and information as the committee may request.

All departments, bureaus, boards, commissions, offices, agencies, or other establishments of the Government, except the legislative branch and the Supreme Court, shall furnish to the comptroller general such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business of their respective offices as he may from time to time require of them; and the comptroller general, or any of his assistants or employees when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to exmaine any books, documents, papers, or records of any such department, bureau, board, commission, office, agency, or other establishment. The authority contained in this paragraph shall not be applicable to expenditures made under the provisions of section 291 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Page 11, line 11, after the period in line 11, add "the comptroller general shall specially report to the House every expenditure or contract made by any head of a department in any year in excess of the appropriation to such department and in violation of law."

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to effectuate the very purpose and object of a budget system. A budget system is intended to have the Government of the United States live carefully and economically within its estimated revenues. We have a law requiring that no department head shall exceed the appropriation made to the department in any of the expenditures of the department or in the making of contracts that would go beyond the appropriations. It is made an offense to do so. No one seems to pay much attention to it, however. Of course, during the war period we all passed it by without question, because the terrible exigency that confronted us required such treatment, and in every case of extreme condition like that the same treatment would in all probability be accorded. It does seem to me, however, there ought to be a requirement on the part of the comptroller general to lay before Congress every infraction of this existing law, so that Congress may take notice of it and act upon it or pass it by, as it deems proper.

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

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Surely.

Mr. GARD. I am in thorough accord with the purpose of the gentleman's amendment. I call his attention to his amendment. It provides that the comptroller general shall make this report to the House. Does not the gentleman mean that he shall report to the Congress?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Yes; the criticism is well taken. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to insert, instead of the word "House," the word "Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the modification will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the purpose of the gentleman's amendment, but am wondering whether or not it would interfere with a practice the Congress has permitted some heads of departments, to divert money from one appropriation to another. In the framing of the bill for the Department of Agriculture it is usual to permit the Secretary under some conditions to divert 10 per cent of one fund to another use in his line of work. If the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] should be adopted, would not such provisions be impossible? If it were made unlawful for the Secretary to exceed under any circumstances the amount of money appropriated for a particular use, would it not make impossible the giving of authority to divert a portion of one appropriation to another use?

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Is not a transfer required to be authorized before it can be made from one department to another?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. This is not a transfer from one department to another, but from one purpose to another in the same department, and appropriation bills themselves permit such transfer. My inquiry is, Would this amendment if adopted make such legislation as we have many times enacted be permitted?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Would not the same reason and objection apply to that, and, therefore, that would not be an expenditure in excess of the appropriation and in violation of law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It would be in excess of the appropriation. The gentleman is aware that many of the appropriation bills are prepared by paragraphs, each one setting out a particular line of work to be carried on by the department, and the amount of money available for that particular purpose is stated in the paragraph. There are many of those, and the total amount carried by the bill is the footing of the amounts of the different paragraphs. Some of the appropriation bills carry authority to the Secretary under certain circumstances to take from one appropriation 10 per cent of its amount and use it for some other purpose. That is permitted by law. His use of money in that way would not be contrary to law, but it would be a use of money in excess of the appropriation made for the particular purpose. Under a narrow interpretation of the amendment offered by the gentleman, might not the Secretary find himself unable to take advantage of that ordinary provision?

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I do not believe that construction would be placed upon it. After all, it is all done by authority of law. By authority of law the Secretary is permitted to transfer from one appropriation an amount not more than 10 per cent for some other service in his department.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is in excess of the amount of money appropriated for that purpose forbidden by the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GOOD. It is not when you take the whole law together—that he could not only use the exact sum but 10 per cent of another sum for that purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Was not that done only for duration of the war and in one department?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. No; the Agricultural bills have carried that provision for a longer period than the gentleman thinks.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. It is only in the Agricultural Department that it does apply.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I know of it in that department.

Mr. GOOD. It also obtains in the Reclamation Service.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported as modified?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment as modified.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 11, after the period, in line 11, add:
"The comptroller general shall specially report to the Congress every expenditure or contract made by any head of a department in any year in excess of the appropriation to such department and in violation of law."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I can not believe that the construction referred to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] would be applied to this amendment. I think there is good in the amendment and I am inclined to accept it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I do not see any objection to the amendment offered, and I think it ought to be agreed to.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUCE: Page 10, line 22, strike out the first "and" and insert after the word "disbursement" the words "and application"; page 11, line 3, strike out the word "and"; and in line 4, after the word "disbursement," insert the words "and application."

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of a group of amendments I submit for the attention of the committee in the hope that if the measure as now written does not accomplish its purpose fully these amendments will contribute something thereto. I want to add my name to those recorded as expressing gratitude to the committee for the great service it has rendered to the Congress and to the Nation. The report of the hearings, to which I have devoted much time, strikes me as the most valuable contribution to political science that has of late come from any press, and I want to put into the RECORD this statement in order that students of political science may have their attention directed to it and may profit by the great mass of information and suggestion which it contains. Also, I want to express my personal gratitude to the gentlemen of the committee for bringing out so clearly in their questions and statements in those hearings the defense of Congress against the multifarious assaults of uninformed critics. It would be well worth the while of the House to have this defense segregated from the rest of the volume and by some skillful writer put into readable form. This judgment, I think, may assure the gentlemen of the committee of my complete sympathy with what they have attempted to accomplish. But after earnest study, after reading their bill again and again, I fail to find that they anywhere have expressed in it what they gave us to understand was its purpose. They told us that in here creating two new agencies, one a bureau of the budget and the other a comptroller general, they desired to secure study and criticism of the operations of government which would accrue to the common advantage. Let me cite for example the words of their chairman in his own report:

The comptroller could and would be expected to criticize extravagance, duplication, and inefficiency in executive departments.

We want the comptroller to do that. We are passing this law in order that he shall do that, but there is not one word in the bill which tells him to do that. There is not one word in the bill

which tells the budget bureau to do that. It may be that I am treading on dangerous ground, that there is some practical reason why this bill was written without anywhere giving a concrete and specific definition of the duties of these officers. Fools rush in where angels fear to tread, and possibly I am approaching something that the committee has considered and perhaps not thought wise to put into the bill. If its members will show me anywhere in it a clear statement of what these officers are to do in the way of criticism I will gladly withdraw my suggestions of amendment, suggestions offered not in hostility but for the purpose of illuminating what seem to me should be the very heart and center of this measure. Sir, the other day I referred on the floor of this House to my Sabine farm, and if my friend the chairman of the committee would go down there with me I would take him through the portals of my barn and would show him hanging on the wall a hoe and rake, a stub scythe—the same one I stuck in the hornet's nest—a pruning knife and pruning shears, and all the other instruments for getting rid of wasteful growth. Then if he were a candidate for work on my farm, what would you think if I turned my back on him and went out of the door without saying another word? An employer under those circumstances, after showing those instruments of work, would say, "Now go to it."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUCE. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes additional.

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

Mr. LUCE. My desire is that we shall get into this bill a declaration to those men "to go to it," to exercise criticism. In his speech on this bill, a most admirable speech, which I hope will get into general circulation, the chairman stated:

> Men will be employed as auditors who will owe their positions to their training and ability and who do not secure their positions as reward for political services. They will be fearless in their examinations—

And so forth.

Yet nowhere does the bill itself say they are to be fearless in their examinations, or, indeed, that they are to make any examinations at all for critical purposes. In the course of the hearings a member of the committee [Mr. GARNER] said:

> I agree with you that that is what ought to be had. There should be in the executive branch of the Government some adverse agency to scrutinize every estimate that is made, with discretion to recommend to the President that the estimates be cut down.

There is not in the bill a single intimation that the bureau of the budget is to make any such recommendation. Everything to the effect that these things are to be done is a matter of inference and implication.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I do.

Mr. JUUL. I would ask the gentleman if he does not think section 13 covers the subject matter, where, in line 20, it states:

> That the comptroller general shall investigate at the seat of Government or elsewhere all matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public funds, and shall make the Congress, at the beginning of each regular session—

And so forth.

Mr. LUCE. I think that is entirely by indirection. There is nowhere any statement that he is to apply the results of his investigations. Let me point out further. This section begins by providing that the comptroller general is to investigate all matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public funds. From time immemorial the word "disbursement" has in the popular significance implied a restriction to the paying out of money, a purely ministerial function with no exercise of judgment. I am reminded of the anecdote of the schoolboy who was writing an examination paper on physiology. He was told to state what he knew about brains, and he said, "Brains are the most precious part of the human anatomy, and therefore we ought to be exceedingly sparing in their use." [Laughter.]

The trouble with this section is that it does not require the use of brains in the way of exercising the critical faculty.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman must have overlooked the fact that we are taking over the duties of the comptroller and auditor's offices, under which they are operating to-day, and there is a law defining the duties of the comptroller and auditor already in existence, and there is no necessity for repeating it in this bill.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, in the hearings on this subject there was frequent quotation from authorities upon the English system, and all the inference is that this system before you was borrowed from and modeled upon the English system.

Mr. MADDEN. That is not true, though. We did not model it on anything except the facts in the case.

Mr. LUCE. May I before going further—because I do not wish to take the time of the House uselessly—ask the chairman of the committee if it is his intention that the comptroller general shall criticize?

Mr. GOOD. It certainly is.

Mr. LUCE. That is just what the English comptroller general does. It is insured that he shall criticize. He is not a mere ministerial officer. As Mr. Collins told the committee, he inquires into questions of legality, regularity, extravagance. He is the critic and he represents the House of Commons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked by the gentleman from Texas that the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I had read from Mr. Collins's statement that in England the comptroller general is the critic; that is to say, the faultfinder, the man looking for trouble; but in this bill, according to the intimation of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], it is not clear that he is to be a critic. The gentleman from Illinois says you are taking over certain functions that are now provided by law. Those functions have never been considered as including criticism. Are we to say that the gentleman from Iowa is right or the gentleman from Illinois is right? Is this official to criticize or not to criticize? And when you put a man in that position and he looks to the law for his guidance, where would he find any instruction that he is to criticize?

I speak advisedly in this matter, because experience in my own State fortifies me. Some years ago we provided a finance commission in the city of Boston. It stands outside of the city government. It is a censorious body, which makes its whole duty to find fault with what is done in administering the public affairs of the city of Boston. It worked so well that we created a similar body for the State of Massachusetts. At first that did not function usefully, and then we replaced it with a supervisor of administration, who now excellently performs the duties of a censor. It is his business to find fault, and he, with a large corps of assistants, spends the whole year in studying the departments in order to find fault and tell where money can be saved.

Now, that is what these gentlemen have assured us they meant to do, so far as we may follow the words of the chairman of the committee, and I accept his judgment in the matter. But I point out to you that this has not been done. For instantly the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes a statement raising a doubt as to whether we have conferred such duties on this official.

All I am asking is, if you mean to authorize this man to criticize, to study, and investigate for the purpose of securing economy, that the committee shall, if they do not approve my way of directing it, suggest some way of their own, so that no man when he goes into that office can rely upon the statute and say, "This law imposed on me but a purely ministerial function, made me a human adding machine, and my only duty is to total up the figures that are laid before me and to transmit them to the Congress."

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

Mr. LUCE. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. However valuable the gentleman's suggestions may be, do they not come too late, for after a measure is reported here to the Committee of the Whole House by one of the committees, is it not a good deal like the law of the Medes and Persians—unchangeable?

Mr. LUCE. Should I to-day or ever submit to this House a proposal that does not commend itself to a majority of the House and to at least a part of the committee, I shall feel that I have made a mistake and shall waive my own judgment. If I can not prove to the committee that the addition of a few words of injunction will make it clear beyond any question that they mean to create a censoring office, then I will withdraw these amendments and ask no further attention to them.

The first of these amendments contemplates adding to the present phraseology "receipt and disbursement," the word "application," so that we shall say that the comptroller general shall investigate the receipt and disbursement—that is, the ministerial act of paying out the money—and shall also investigate the application of the funds; in other words, make it clear to him that he is to examine how these funds are used. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the gentleman's remarks with great interest, because I have a very high opinion of his ability and judgment. If by adding the words we are strengthening the arm of the comptroller general to make a more thorough examination, to search into an expenditure, and see whether or not money is being paid out in violation of law or uselessly expended, then I would have no objection, of course, to the adoption of the amendment. I am not real sure that I have any objection as it is. But let us see whether or not it really strengthens the provision in that respect. The law provides, Revised Statutes, section 3678:

All sums appropriated for the various branches of expenditure in the public service shall be applied solely to the objects for which they are respectively made, and for no other.

No executive has the power under that provision of the law to spend a single dollar of appropriation except for the purposes for which the appropriation is made. Now, keeping that provision in mind, let us read the provision found in section 13 of the bill:

That the comptroller general shall investigate, at the seat of government or elsewhere, all matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of public funds, and shall make to Congress—

And so forth.

Now, the gentleman would insert the words "and application," so that it will read, "The comptroller general shall investigate at the seat of government or elsewhere all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds." I want to submit to the gentleman that the investigation of all matters relating to the receipt and disbursement of the public funds includes any application that shall be made of them.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Suppose the disbursements have been made in California, in Texas, and everywhere else. Are we to have an army of people to go down there or out there and see that the work was done? Is that what the gentleman means?

Mr. GOOD. No. The gentleman does not have reference to that particularly. It is the contention of the gentleman by this amendment simply, as I understand it, to give the comptroller more power in the way of criticizing expenditures that have been made. It is his point that the words we have employed, giving the comptroller the power to investigate matters relating to the receipt and disbursement, does not in itself imply the power to criticize and to make an investigation as a foundation for criticism.

Now, in referring to the dictionary I find the definition best fitted to the word "application" used here is "specific use," and I take it that is what the gentleman has in mind in offering the amendment here; that the comptroller general shall not only investigate the receipts and expenditures, but the specific use for which the expenditures have been made. That brings us again back to this section of the Revised Statutes that I read, that "sums appropriated for the various branches of expenditure in the public service shall be applied solely to the object for which they are respectively made, and no other"; and the comptroller general would not be worth his salt if he believed that moneys were used for a specific use not provided for in the appropriation and did not report it to Congress and hold that an expenditure under it could not be made at all. If he failed to do it he would be removable from office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to offer another amendment?

Mr. LUCE. Yes. I have several amendments relating to the same subject.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUCE: Page 11, line 4, insert after the word "advisable" a new sentence as follows: "In such regular report or in special reports at any time when Congress is in session he shall make recommendations looking to greater economy or efficiency in public expenditure."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire recognition?

Mr. LUCE. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Even if every one of these amendments shall be voted down, I trust a service will have been rendered by putting into the RECORD a statement by gentlemen representing the committee regarding their purpose, in order that reference may be made to it in the performance of the duties of this new office, so that it may be very clear what the committee intended.

If you look at the bill you will find that its first section requires a report in writing with recommendations concerning legislation that the comptroller general may deem necessary to facilitate a proper and accurate rendition and settlement of accounts, and concerning such other matters relative to the receipt and disbursement of the public funds as he may think advisable. The critical function on the part of the comptroller is wholly covered by the words "such other matters," leaving it entirely to his own judgment as to whether he shall recommend in matters of economy and efficiency or not. It may be that the words "such other matters" adequately meet the exigency, but if they do not meet the exigency I respectfully suggest that the explanatory sentence which I have proposed will throw light upon what Congress expects from this law.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment again reported, if the Chair please.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

The amendment was again read.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

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

Th Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUCE: Page 11, line 9, after the word "committee," insert the words "or the bureau of the budget." Page 11, line 10, after the word "committee," insert the words "or bureau." Page 11, line 11, after the word "committee," insert the words "or bureau."

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, as the bill now stands, I can discover no connection between the bureau of the budget and the comptroller general. Apparently the comptroller general is to deal directly with Congress, and there is nowhere that I can discover any provision that the ideas or discoveries of the comptroller general shall be put at the command of the bureau of the budget in order that the President may be assisted in shaping his recommendations. This complete separation of these two branches may not have been intended by the committee. If no fundamental objection presents itself for putting the comptroller general's office at the service of the bureau of the budget, I trust the committee will consent that the bureau of the budget may profit by the investigations, observations, studies, and criticisms of the comptroller general; and until I learn whether or not that seems objectionable to the chairman I will not comment further on the proposal.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, it was the opinion, I think, of everyone who appeared before the committee that the ideal system of Government finance, so far as appropriations and expenditures go, embraces two distinct and separate functions. In the first place, it is the duty of the office that pays out the money to make an estimate of what its requirements will be. Congress acts upon that estimate. Then comes this separate and distinct office, semijudicial in character, which determines whether or not expenditures made are legal, and then audit the account. That department is intended as a check against extravagance. That department is intended to have a reflex influence upon the bureau of the budget. The bureau will know at all times that that department is watching it, and that for every appropriation that is made there will have to be a legitimate use.

Now, the gentleman's amendment brings in a new element. It would tie up these two separate things together. I do not believe there should be the closest relations between the two departments. I have found that when a man goes into a lawsuit it is just as well not to tell the opposite side what your testimony is before it is submitted to the jury. And so, in presenting the matter of the budget the President ought to be required at all times to present only a budget that he can justify, knowing that if he does not present a budget that he can justify in every particular Congress will attack it and that Congress will require the bureau of the budget to show how the expenditure of money asked for is necessary. It seems to me that with these checks and balances against estimates and

expenditures Congress will be placed in a position to judge as to the necessity for expenditures at all times. The amendment would give the Executive a power over the audit and control that it is not the intention or theory of the bill that the Executive shall have at all. If it is to be the office of criticism, of course it should be friendly criticism, intelligent criticism, but it ought not to be a mock trial. It ought to be upon real and substantial facts that are developed, and only in that way will it function in a healthy and economical manner, in my opinion.

Mr. LUCE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. LUCE. We are getting just what I am seeking, a record of what the committee means. Now, let us put a concrete proposition. Supposing the comptroller general ascertains that in some one of these buildings down here, in some department, 100 employees are at work where 50 could do the job. Under his program nothing is to be done about that until report is made to Congress. Does the gentleman see any objection to informing the bureau of the budget of that fact, in order that the President may prune his estimates accordingly?

Mr. GOOD. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the appropriation has already been made, and the next estimate will be pruned, because the comptroller general will call the attention of Congress to the matter in his report, and the comptroller general will go before the committee having jurisdiction of that appropriation and will point out the fact that there is an expenditure that is useless and worthless and that ought to be eliminated.

Mr. LUCE. But, Mr. Chairman, the report of the comptroller general is to come in here on the day that Congress opens, while the budget must be prepared weeks in advance. What is the objection to allowing the bureau of the budget to learn of the waste and extravagances and the opportunities for retrenchment that have come to the knowledge of the comptroller general?

Mr. GOOD. The bureau of the budget will learn that fact.

Mr. LUCE. How?

Mr. GOOD. Just a few examples of the kind that the gentleman has called attention to, when they are exploded on the floor of the House or by the report of the comptroller general, will make the bureau of the budget more efficient, and unless you have that power to enforce efficiency I do not believe you will get efficiency. Besides, the fiscal year will only have about six months to run after the report of the comptroller is made.

Mr. LUCE. May I ask one question more?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. LUCE. Do I understand that you contemplate that the bureau of the budget shall be a criticizing body?

Mr. GOOD. No; the bureau of the budget is the body that initiates the estimates. It may be that it will criticize certain departments and expenditures to the President, but not so far as its published reports or public criticism are concerned. I do not see how that can be its function.

Mr. LUCE. The gentleman brings it out very clearly that the bureau of the budget is not to criticize. The comptroller general is to criticize, but the criticisms made by the comptroller general are not to be put at the command of the bureau of the budget, and therefore will not affect the estimates laid before them, but are to be retained for the information of Congress.

Mr. GOOD. Of course, if the bureau of the budget is worth anything at all, it will have to indulge in a great deal of criticism that goes to the President at all times, but the bureau of the budget does not make reports, except a request for appropriations through the President. That is not a criticism, but a request for the appropriation of money, and in that request for appropriation there is no place for criticism, because the President will submit what he thinks is an ideal plan and an estimate of appropriation for only those things that are absolutely necessary.

Mr. KITCHIN. I suggest that under the provision on page 3 the bureau of the budget, the director and the assistant can confer and consult with or get any information they desire from the comptroller general, and the comptroller general will have to give it to them.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, that did not escape my attention; but if the gentleman will read subsection (b) he will find that the power of the bureau of the budget in that particular is restricted to the operation of the department itself. He may investigate the way the comptroller general is doing the work.

Mr. KITCHIN. He must investigate and give any information concerning it which he has.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman show me that point?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think the gentleman will see it for himself if he will read it.

Mr. LUCE. I have read it, but I do not see what the gentleman says.

Mr. KITCHIN. It says:

(b) All departments, bureaus, boards, commissions, offices, agencies, or other establishments of the Government, except the legislative branch and the Supreme Court, shall furnish to the President such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organizations, financial transactions, and methods of business of their respective offices as he may from time to time require of them.

Could not the President require of the comptroller general any information regarding his duties? And if he finds that there are 100 offices down here that should be dispensed with, can not the President get that information from him, and would he not give that information to the President, and then could not the President authorize the bureau of the budget to check all of that information? The succeeding lines say:

And the director of the bureau of the budget, or any of his assistants or employees, when duly authorized by the President shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any such department, bureau, board, commission, office, agency, or other establishment.

Mr. LUCE. My own study of the section does not lead me to the conclusion that they can do what the gentleman thinks they can do.

Mr. KITCHIN. Could they not do it?

Mr. LUCE. I do not believe it can be honestly twisted to that purpose.

Mr. KITCHIN. Whether that is the purpose or not, under that language could they not get any information from the comptroller general that he had, and would it not be for the President to call upon the comptroller general or for the director of the budget to call on the comptroller general for any information that he had, and would it not be the duty of the comptroller general under that language to give it to them?

Mr. LUCE. If that was done, the comptroller general would do the very thing that the gentleman from Iowa says he does not want done. We can not have in both fish and fowl. It must be one thing or the other.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am trying to show the gentleman what the act says he must do. I think the gentleman will find that language, if he reads it very carefully, covers his proposition.

Mr. LUCE. I have read it several times.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment, because I think it would be in harmony with section 3, but I do not think it is necessary while section 3 remains in the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say by my answer that I would not have the comptroller advance any decision when requested. He does that every day and will continue to do it. The proposition of the gentleman is that the comptroller general shall, at the request of the bureau of the budget, send all his force there, if necessary, to direct assistants, to furnish it with information at any time. I think that would disorganize the comptroller's office.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the bureau of the budget is simply a clerical force placed at the disposal of the President of the United States to furnish him with information as to how he shall make up the estimates for expenditures to be required for the conduct of the Government for any given year. There is no reason why the clerical force of the President for that purpose should be authorized to require the Comptroller and the Auditor of the Treasury to furnish it with information. The purpose of the clerical force of the President is to acquire what information it can by study of the departments. I apprehend that it will be the purpose of such a bureau as is to be furnished to the President to require of every bureau in the Government every particle of information that can be obtained to tell what the needs of the bureau may be.

On the other hand, it will be the function of the comptroller and auditor to supply the Congress, that is to be the critic of the administrative branch of the Government under this law, with such information as will enable it to intelligently criticize the acts of the administration.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The President could at any time get the information.

Mr. MADDEN. Undoubtedly he could get it without asking for it, because section 3 of the bill provides amply for furnishing such information as is provided for in the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There is no disposition on the part of the committee to prevent the administrative branch of the Government from getting

information. But the purpose is to separate the comptroller and auditor from the executive branch of the Government and leave it free as an instrumentality through which the legislative branch of the Government can get information which it has not been able to get heretofore, and thus leave the people's representatives to criticize any waste or extravagance of the administration by whomever it may be presided over.

And so I say that the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] is not only unnecessary, but I think it will be unwise to adopt it. It is unnecessary because the law already contemplates that the information shall be furnished by the comptroller and auditor in section 3, but it would be unwise to adopt it because it ties the executive and the legislative hand and foot through the comptroller and the auditor, and that is exactly what we want to avoid.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, line 11, after the word "request," insert a new sentence, as follows: "On a date to be fixed by the President he shall annually make a report to the bureau of the budget pointing out where appropriations may be reduced without injury to the public service, or where expenditure may be incurred for the sake of ultimate gain in economy or efficiency."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. Is it not true that the committee has already adopted an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] at this place?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not remember whether the language is the same, but the Chair's recollection is that the amendments are very similar.

Mr. GARD. The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts should follow the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to have his amendment submitted, although it is almost in the same language. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to press his amendment?

Mr. LUCE. I do, Mr. Chairman. I desire to press the amendment in order that I may still further insure that the Congress contemplates doing the thing which it was advised not to do by the specialists who appeared before the committee. Mr. Collins pointed out to the committee that the first of the three weaknesses of the British audit system is that the comptroller does not report contemporaneously with the discovery of irregularity. The attempt to separate the comptroller general from the bureau of budget is strictly contrary to the experience of England. It also is directly contrary to what was recommended to the committee by Gov. Lowden, of Illinois, who appeared before the committee and pointed out the value of the Illinois system. It is contrary to the experience of Massachusetts. It seems to me unfortunate that the committee should thus hamper the attempt to put at the command of the Executive as well as of Congress all the benefits of studies, investigations, and criticisms. Of course I expect that the amendment will be rejected, but in order that at some future occasion we may look back upon this amendment and determine which of us was right I present the amendment, still wishing that the committee would permit the President to know regularly and promptly all the discoveries and opinions of the comptroller general.

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

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman, I think, forgets or overlooks the fact that the comptroller general is required to make his report to Congress. The President has that report, and the bureau of the budget has that report.

Mr. LUCE. Pardon me, but does the President have it before he puts in his budget?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no. He has it at the same time that the President puts in his report.

Mr. LUCE. Then how does that help him make up his budget?

Mr. GOOD. The President is supposed to have a competent force to make up his budget. If we are going to take a part of this office to help the President make up his budget, I greatly fear that we are going to confuse the two, and instead of having the checks and balances we have been talking about, we will have neither a check nor a balance. I can not see the value of the gentleman's suggestion, nor do I see where the provisions of the bill in this instance are in conflict with suggestions made by a single person who appeared before the committee.

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

Mr. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. Does not the existing law provide that the Comptroller of the Treasury shall make preliminary rulings whenever a question of that sort is brought to his attention, and does not this bill provide that the power now held by the Comptroller of the Treasury shall be conferred upon the comptroller general of the United States?

Mr. LUCE. I have not so read the bill. If that is the case, I shall be glad to have it go into the RECORD.

Mr. TEMPLE. It is in the existing law, which section 10 provides shall continue in the powers of the comptroller general.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I shall vote for the pending bill because I believe in a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts. Budget systems have been instituted in at least 42 of our several States, and always with the most salutary results. It is the business way of doing the business of both the State and the Federal Government.

This legislation is one of the most important pieces of constructive legislation presented to Congress in the last quarter of a century, and the committee is to be congratulated upon the splendid bill it has presented for consideration. It is not, of course, a perfect bill, but lays the foundation for a constructive policy in national legislation that will mean much for the future welfare of our great Nation—a policy that will mean larger economy and greater efficiency. The taxpayers of our country are looking to Congress for relief in our enormous tax burdens which have evolved as a result of our Great World War. We must meet every emergency and every legitimate need, but must eliminate all waste and extravagance in every bureau and department of our Government. Bureaus and departments instituted to aid the Great War program and no longer needed should be quickly eliminated. The budget system as outlined in this bill will, in my judgment, help to fix the responsibility of our estimates and give to Congress a clearer conception of the real needs of our Government, and to meet these needs with an intelligent appreciation of our real duty. Our national expenses have increased with leaps and bounds until now they are simply enormous. We are told by reliable statisticians that the aggregate expenses of our Government from the days of the Declaration of Independence to the opening of the Great World War was approximately $26,000,000,000, while Mr. GOOD, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has just stated on the floor of the House that the expenses of the Government for the fiscal year of 1920 will probably be between five and six billions of dollars. Such an enormous expense placed upon the taxpayers of our country demands that it be instituted and carried out along the lines of the most approved business methods, and it is well known that every well-organized business concern to-day is run on the budget system. It clearly outlines its needs and makes a thorough estimate of what its income would be, and arranges the lines of activities accordingly. While it is true that a government will not be able to hew the lines as closely as business concerns, and we do not anticipate that it will, yet in a large sense the Government ought to have a clear conception of what its resources are and what its legitimate needs are, and then apply in an intelligent way the ways and means to provide for that need. The American public demands of Congress that it shall do its business along business lines, and a budget system is the one long step in this direction.

Let us, therefore, not only institute the budget system, but let us curtail expenses wherever possible without decreasing too much our efficiency. Indeed, let the American people feel that Congress is sympathetic with the tremendous burdens that they are now carrying in the taxing line. As I understand this bill, it does not in any way depreciate the importance or efficiency of the several committees in determining the various appropriations for governmental needs, but rather emphasizes the obtaining of the very best possible estimate from responsible sources for the determination of their legislation, and would therefore help these various committees in their difficult deliberations and final determination of the facts. This bill, as I understand it, will help to remove the large amount of duplication which is now so apparent in the activities of our Government. There is no question to-day but what the Government is taxing itself millions of dollars in duplication of work and efforts which should be promptly removed, and which no doubt would be removed to a very large degree through a system such as this bill would institute. This one element alone would be sufficient justification for passing this bill unanimously by Congress.

The independent audits provided for in this bill are, in my judgment, of tremendous importance, and are a distinct advance in the determination of our expenditures, and to ascertain cor-

rectly how our large appropriations should be expended, and will help us to eliminate the tremendous waste and extravagance which are so liable to creep in under a system of expenditures such as our Government has had in the past. As a whole, it is a piece of legislation which the country has demanded and which our Government needs, and which the people will appreciate, and which our Congress in years to come can be proud that it has this day initiated. It should have the unanimous support of the House and be speedily enacted into law. [Applause.]

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9783) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes, 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 bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the amendments will be put en grosse. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Texas opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not opposed to the principles of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman who is opposed to the bill desire to offer a motion to recommit? If not, the Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit the bill to the Select Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment: On page 7, line 17, after the word "office," insert the words "for six years," and on page 8, strike out lines 1 to 7, inclusive, and on page 9, line 21, after the word "appoint," strike out the comma and insert the word "and," and on line 22, page 9, after the word "remove," strike out the comma and the words "and fix the compensation of."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to recommit the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division, and pending that I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair is of opinion that there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 21, nays 258, answered "present" 2, not voting 150, as follows:

YEAS—21.

Almon	Collier	McDuffie	Steagall
Bankhead	Dickinson, Mo.	McKeown	Upshaw
Blackmon	Gard	Oliver	Wingo
Blanton	Hardy, Tex.	Parrish	
Caraway	Huddleston	Quin	
Clark, Mo.	Jones, Tex.	Rubey	

NAYS—258.

Alexander	Bell	Browne	Carter
Anderson	Benham	Browning	Casey
Andrews, Md.	Benson	Buchanan	Chindblom
Andrews, Nebr.	Black	Burroughs	Christopherson
Anthony	Bland, Mo.	Butler	Classon
Ashbrook	Bland, Va.	Byrnes, S. C.	Cleary
Aswell	Boles	Byrns, Tenn.	Coady
Ayres	Bowers	Caldwell	Connally
Babka	Box	Campbell, Kans.	Cooper
Baer	Briggs	Campbell, Pa.	Crago
Barbour	Brooks, Ill.	Cannon	Crisp
Bee	Brooks, Pa.	Carss	Crowther
Currie, Mich.	Howard	Minahan, N. J.	Smith, Ill.
Curry, Calif.	Hudspeth	Monahan, Wis.	Smith, Mich.
Dale	Hulings	Mondell	Smithwick
Dallinger	Hull, Iowa	Mooney	Stedman
Darrow	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Ohio	Steele
Davis, Minn.	Humphreys	Morgan	Steenerson
Davis, Tenn.	Hutchinson	Mudd	Stephens, Ohio
Denison	Igoe	Murphy	Stevenson
Dickinson, Iowa	Jacoway	Neely	Stiness
Dominick	James	Nelson, Mo.	Strong, Kans.
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson, Wis.	Strong, Pa.
Dowell	Johnson, Wash.	Newton, Minn.	Summers, Wash.
Dunbar	Jones, Pa.	Nichols, Mich.	Sumners, Tex.
Dupré	Juul	Nolan	Sweet
Dyer	Kearns	O'Connell	Taylor, Colo.
Echols	Keller	O'Connor	Taylor, Tenn.
Edmonds	Kelly, Pa.	Oldfield	Temple
Elliott	Kettner	Olney	Thompson
Elston	King	Osborne	Tillman
Emerson	Kinkaid	Overstreet	Tilson
Evans, Nebr.	Kitchin	Paige	Timberlake
Evans, Nev.	Kleczka	Park	Tinkham
Fairfield	Knutson	Phelan	Towner
Ferris	Kraus	Platt	Vaile
Fess	Lampert	Purnell	Vare
Fisher	Lanham	Radcliffe	Venable
Fitzgerald	Lankford	Rainey, Ala.	Vestal
Focht	Larsen	Raker	Vinson
Fordney	Layton	Ramseyer	Voigt
Foster	Lazaro	Randall, Calif.	Volstead
Freeman	Lea, Calif.	Randall, Wis.	Walsh
French	Lehlbach	Reavis	Ward
Gallagher	Linthicum	Reber	Wason
Glynn	Lonergan	Reed, W. Va.	Watkins
Good	Longworth	Rhodes	Watson, Pa.
Graham, Pa.	Luce	Ricketts	Watson, Va.
Green, Iowa.	Lufkin	Riddick	Weaver
Greene, Mass.	Luhring	Rogers	Webb
Greene, Vt.	McArthur	Romjue	Webster
Griest	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rouse	Welty
Hadley	McPherson	Rowe	Whaley
Hardy, Colo.	MacGregor	Rucker	White, Kans.
Hastings	Madden	Sanders, Ind.	White, Me.
Hawley	Magee	Sanders, N. Y.	Williams
Hayden	Major	Sanford	Wilson, La.
Hays	Mansfield	Scott	Wilson, Pa.
Hernandez	Mapes	Sears	Woods, Va.
Hersey	Mason	Sherwood	Woodyard
Hersman	Mays	Shreve	Wright
Hickey	Mead	Sinclair	Young, N. Dak.
Hoch	Merritt	Sinnott	Young, Tex.
Holland	Michener	Slemp	
Houghton	Miller	Smith, Idaho	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Candler	Frear

NOT VOTING—150.

Ackerman	Gallivan	Lee, Ga.	Reed, N. Y.
Bacharach	Gandy	Lesher	Riordan
Barkley	Ganly	Little	Robinson, N C.
Begg	Garland	McAndrews	Robsion, Ky.
Bland, Ind.	Garner	McClintic	Rodenberg
Booher	Garrett	McCulloch	Rose
Brand	Godwin, N. C.	McFadden	Rowan
Brinson	Goldfogle	McGlennon	Sabath
Britten	Goodall	McKenzie	Sanders, La.
Brumbaugh	Goodwin, Ark.	McKiniry	Saunders, Va.
Burdick	Goodykoontz	McKinley	Schall
Burke	Gould	McLane	Scully
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sells
Carew	Griffin	MacCrate	Siegel
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Maher	Sims
Cole	Hamilton	Mann, Ill.	Sisson
Copley	Harrison	Mann, S. C.	Small
Costello	Haskell	Martin	Smith, N. Y.
Cramton	Haugen	Montague	Snell
Cullen	Heflin	Moon	Snyder
Davey	Hicks	Moore, Pa.	Stephens, Miss.
Dempsey	Hill	Moore, Va.	Sullivan
Dent	Husted	Moores, Ind.	Swope
Dewalt	Ireland	Morin	Taylor, Ark.
Donovan	Jefferis	Mott	Thomas
Dooling	Johnson, Ky.	Newton, Mo.	Tincher
Doremus	Johnson, Miss.	Nicholls, S. C.	Treadway
Drane	Johnston, N. Y.	Ogden	Walters
Dunn	Kahn	Padgett	Welling
Eagan	Kelley, Mich.	Parker	Wheeler
Eagle	Kendall	Pell	Wilson, Ill.
Ellsworth	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	Winslow
Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Porter	Wise
Evans, Mont.	Kiess	Pou	Wood, Ind.
Fields	Kincheloe	Rainey, H. T.	Yates
Flood	Kreider	Rainey, J. W.	Zihlman
Fuller, Ill.	LaGuardia	Ramsey	
Fuller, Mass.	Langley	Rayburn	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky with Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. TINCHER with Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi.

Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. ACKERMAN with Mr. MCLANE.

Mr. WHEELER with Mr. DRANE.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. MOON.
Mr. FREAR with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.
Mr. GOODYKOONTZ with Mr. RAYBURN.
Mr. MOTT with Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. EVANS of Montana.
Mr. OGDEN with Mr. EAGAN.
Mr. PARKER with Mr. EAGLE.
Mr. PORTER with Mr. DOREMUS.
Mr. KIESS with Mr. LEE of Georgia.
Mr. KREIDER with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
Mr. LAGUARDIA with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.
Mr. LITTLE with Mr. HEFLIN.
Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. HARRISON.
Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. HAMILL.
Mr. GOULD with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. PELL.
Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. PADGETT.
Mr. HASKELL with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.
Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. GRIFFIN.
Mr. ZIHLMAN with Mr. BARKLEY.
Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. MONTAGUE.
Mr. HICKS with Mr. MARTIN.
Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. DOOLING.
Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. WELLING.
Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. DONOVAN.
Mr. ROSE with Mr. DEWALT.
Mr. SCHALL with Mr. DAVEY.
Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.
Mr. SELLS with Mr. CULLEN.
Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
Mr. BURDICK with Mr. SULLIVAN.
Mr. BURKE with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. COLE with Mr. SISSON.
Mr. HUSTED with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.
Mr. IRELAND with Mr. MAHER.
Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Nebraska with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
Mr. MACCRATE with Mr. GARRETT.
Mr. COPLEY with Mr. SIMS.
Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. MCKINIRY.
Mr. KENDALL with Mr. MCGLENNON.
Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. MCCLINTIC.
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. GANLY.
Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. GANDY.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. MCANDREWS.
Mr. SWOPE with Mr. CAREW.
Mr. DUNN with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. SABATH.
Mr. FULLER of Illinois with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. GARLAND with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. RIORDAN.
Mr. WALTERS with Mr. CANTRILL.
Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. BRINSON.
Mr. YATES with Mr. BRAND.
Mr. MORIN with Mr. GALLIVAN.
Mr. BEGG with Mr. WISE.
General:
Mr. SNYDER with Mr. GARNER.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "no," unless I am paired.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is paired.

Mr. FREAR. Then I desire to answer "present."

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I am paired on this vote and therefore I answered "present" on the roll call. Mr. Speaker, permit me further to say that I am authorized by Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY to say that he would vote for this budget bill if he were present. He is away at home on account of a death.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present, and the Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 285, nays 3, not voting 143, as follows:

YEAS—285.

Alexander	Andrews, Nebr.	Ayres	Barbour
Almon	Anthony	Babka	Bee
Anderson	Ashbrook	Baer	Bell
Andrews, Md.	Aswell	Bankhead	Benham
Benson	Fess	Luhring	Sanders, Ind.
Black	Fisher	McAndrews	Sanders, La.
Bland, Ind.	Fitzgerald	McArthur	Sanders, N. Y.
Bland, Mo.	Focht	McCulloch	Sanford
Bland, Va.	Fordney	McDuffie	Scott
Blanton	Foster	McKenzie	Sears
Boies	Frear	McKeown	Sherwood
Bowers	French	McLaughlin, Mich.	Shreve
Box	Gallagher	McPherson	Sinclair
Briggs	Gard	MacGregor	Sinnott
Brooks, Ill.	Glynn	Madden	Slemp
Brooks, Pa.	Good	Magee	Smith, Idaho
Browne	Goodall	Major	Smith, Ill.
Browning	Graham, Pa.	Mann, S. C.	Smith, Mich.
Brumbaugh	Green, Iowa	Mansfield	Smithwick
Buchanan	Greene, Mass.	Mapes	Stedman
Burroughs	Greene, Vt.	Martin	Steele
Butler	Griest	Mason	Steenerson
Byrnes, S. C.	Hadley	Mays	Stephens, Ohio
Byrns, Tenn.	Hardy, Colo.	Mead	Stevenson
Caldwell	Hardy, Tex.	Merritt	Stiness
Campbell, Kans.	Hastings	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Campbell, Pa.	Hawley	Miller	Strong, Pa.
Candler	Hayden	Minahan, N. J.	Summers, Wash.
Cannon	Hays	Monahan, Wis.	Sumners, Tex.
Caraway	Hernandez	Mondell	Sweet
Carss	Hersman	Mooney	Taylor, Colo.
Carter	Hickey	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Casey	Hoch	Morgan	Temple
Chindblom	Holland	Mudd	Thompson
Christopherson	Houghton	Murphy	Tillman
Clark, Mo.	Howard	Neely	Tilson
Classon	Huddleston	Nelson, Mo.	Timberlake
Cleary	Hudspeth	Nelson, Wis.	Tinkham
Coady	Hulings	Newton, Minn.	Towner
Collier	Hull, Iowa	Nichols, Mich.	Upshaw
Connally	Hull, Tenn.	Nolan	Vaile
Cooper	Humphreys	O'Connell	Vare
Crago	Hutchinson	O'Connor	Venable
Crisp	Igoe	Oldfield	Vestal
Crowther	Jacoway	Oliver	Vinson
Currie, Mich.	James	Olney	Voigt
Curry, Calif.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Osborne	Volstead
Dale	Johnson, Wash.	Overstreet	Walsh
Dallinger	Jones, Pa.	Paige	Ward
Darrow	Jones, Tex.	Park	Wason
Davey	Juul	Parrish	Watkins
Davis, Minn.	Kearns	Phelan	Watson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Keller	Platt	Watson, Va.
Denison	Kelly, Pa.	Purnell	Weaver
Dickinson, Mo.	Kettner	Quin	Webb
Dickinson, Iowa	Kitchin	Radcliffe	Webster
Dominick	Kleczka	Rainey, Ala.	Welty
Doremus	Knutson	Raker	Whaley
Doughton	Kraus	Ramseyer	White, Kans.
Dowell	Lampert	Randall, Calif.	White, Me.
Dunbar	Lanham	Randall, Wis.	Williams
Dupré	Lankford	Reavis	Wilson, La.
Dyer	Larsen	Reber	Wilson, Pa.
Echols	Layton	Reed, W. Va.	Wingo
Edmonds	Lazaro	Rhodes	Woods, Va.
Elliott	Lea, Calif.	Ricketts	Woodyard
Elston	Lehlbach	Rogers	Wright
Emerson	Linthicum	Romjue	Young, N. Dak.
Evans, Nebr.	Lonergan	Rouse	Young, Tex.
Evans, Nev.	Longworth	Rowe	
Fairfield	Luce	Rubey	
Ferris	Lufkin	Rucker	

NAYS—3.

Blackmon	Moon	Steagall

NOT VOTING—143.

Ackerman	Gandy	Kreider	Riddick
Bacharach	Ganly	LaGuardia	Riordan
Barkley	Garland	Langley	Robinson, N. C.
Begg	Garner	Lee, Ga.	Robsion, Ky.
Booher	Garrett	Lesher	Rodenberg
Brand	Godwin, N. C.	Little	Rose
Brinson	Goldfogle	McClintic	Rowan
Britten	Goodwin, Ark.	McFadden	Sabath
Burdick	Goodykoontz	McGlennon	Saunders, Va.
Burke	Gould	McKiniry	Schall
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	McKinley	Scully
Carew	Griffin	McLane	Sells
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Siegel
Cole	Hamilton	MacCrate	Sims
Copley	Harrison	Maher	Sisson
Costello	Haskell	Mann, Ill.	Small
Cramton	Haugen	Montague	Smith, N. Y.
Cullen	Heflin	Moore, Pa.	Snell
Dempsey	Hersey	Moore, Va.	Snyder
Dent	Hicks	Moores, Ind.	Stephens, Miss.
Dewalt	Hill	Morin	Sullivan
Donovan	Husted	Mott	Swope
Dooling	Ireland	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Drane	Jefferis	Nicholls, S. C.	Thomas
Dunn	Johnson, Ky.	Ogden	Tincher
Eagan	Johnson, Miss.	Padgett	Treadway
Eagle	Johnston, N. Y.	Parker	Walters
Ellsworth	Kahn	Pell	Welling
Esch	Kelley, Mich.	Peters	Wheeler
Evans, Mont.	Kendall	Porter	Wilson, Ill.
Fields	Kennedy, Iowa	Pou	Winslow
Flood	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, H. T.	Wise
Freeman	Kiess	Rainey, J. W.	Wood, Ind.
Fuller, Ill.	Kincheloe	Ramsey	Yates
Fuller, Mass.	King	Rayburn	Zihlman
Gallivan	Kinkaid	Reed, N. Y.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BURKE with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. COLE with Mr. SISSON.
Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.
Mr. KENDALL with Mr. MCGLENNON.
Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. MCCLINTIC.
Mr. KIESS with Mr. LEE of Georgia.
Mr. KREIDER with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
Mr. LAGUARDIA with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.
Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. THOMAS.
Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. SMALL.
Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky with Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina.
Mr. GARLAND with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.
Mr. GOODYKOONTZ with Mr. RAYBURN.
Mr. GOULD with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. PELL.
Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. PADGETT.
Mr. HASKELL with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.
Mr. MORIN with Mr. GALLIVAN.
Mr. MOTT with Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. EVANS of Montana.
Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. FIELDS.
Mr. LITTLE with Mr. HEFLIN.
Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. HAMILL.
Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. MONTAGUE.
Mr. HICKS with Mr. MARTIN.
Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Nebraska with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
Mr. MACCRATE with Mr. GARRETT.
Mr. OGDEN with Mr. EAGAN.
Mr. PARKER with Mr. EAGLE.
Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. DOOLING.
Mr. TINCHER with Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi.
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. GANLY.
Mr. IRELAND with Mr. MAHER.
Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. MCKINIRY.
Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. GANDY.
Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. BOOHER.
Mr. ACKERMAN with Mr. MCLANE.
Mr. WHEELER with Mr. DRANE.
Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. DONOVAN.
Mr. ROSE with Mr. DEWALT.
Mr. SELLS with Mr. CULLEN.
Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
Mr. SWOPE with Mr. CAREW.
Mr. WALTERS with Mr. CANTRILL.
Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. BRINSON.
Mr. YATES with Mr. BRAND.
Mr. ZIHLMAN with Mr. BARKLEY.
Mr. SNELL with Mr. WELLING.
Mr. HUSTED with Mr. RIORDAN.
Mr. JEFFERIS with Mr. HARRISON.
Mr. KING with Mr. GRIFFIN.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.
Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
Mr. SNYDER with Mr. GARNER.
Mr. BEGG with Mr. WISE.
Mr. COPLEY with Mr. SIMS.
Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. BURDICK with Mr. SULLIVAN.
Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.
Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. SABATH.
Mr. FULLER of Illinois with Mr. ROWAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. GOODWIN, is sick, and in his behalf I ask leave of absence for him for the day on account of illness. I am authorized to state that if he were present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that Representative SNYDER, of New York, is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would have voted for the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have three legislative days in which to insert their own remarks on the budget system in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have three legislative days in which to insert their remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. The request is that they may insert their own remarks——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On the bill?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. That they may insert their own remarks on the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by publishing a letter that I have received from a major in the Army containing valuable information, as I view it, in regard to war-risk insurance.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter from an officer in the Army relative to war-risk insurance. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Arkansas Methodist, of Little Rock, Ark., edited by Dr. A. C. Miller, in regard to Americanism.

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

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file the minority views from the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the bill (H. R. 9822) authorizing a conference on international communication.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to file minority views of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the bill (H. R. 9822) authorizing a conference on international communication. Is there objection?

Mr. ROGERS. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman if he is filing that this afternoon?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; right now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD for the information of the Members, because there is some doubt if we can get the printed report back by to-morrow, and the bill may come up to-morrow.

Mr. ROGERS. I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, October 22, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill to provide for the payment of the bonus and travel pay to enlisted men of the naval service who have been or may hereafter be discharged for the purpose of reenlisting therein, as provided for the Regular Army in the act of September 29, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 268), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. COADY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3190) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pocomoke River at Pocomoke City, Md., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 392), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 352) for the immediate consideration of the House committee substitute for S. 2775, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 393), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MERRITT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9850) granting the consent of Congress to the board of county commissioners of the county of Hartford, in the State of Connecticut, to construct a bridge across the Connecticut River between Windsor Locks and East Windsor, at Warehouse Point, in said county and State, reported the same without amend-

ment, accompanied by a report (No. 394), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONTAGUE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3159) to authorize the State road department of the State of Florida to construct and maintain a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River near Caryville, Fla., approximately 170 feet south of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad bridge, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 395), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 336) directing the Secretary of War to report to the House of Representatives the amount of sugar in the possession of the War Department, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 396), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SINNOTT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2775) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 398), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) relating to the induction of registrants who applied and who were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction without fault of their own was not completed, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 399), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8272) to restore Harry Graham, captain of Infantry, to his former position on lineal list of captains of Infantry, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 397), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9815) granting a pension to Hulda Flatt, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MINAHAN of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 10064) to increase the limit of cost of the public building to be erected at East Orange, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 10065) authorizing the superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to adjust certain claims; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10066) to prevent certain aliens from availing themselves of the provisions of the law relating to the disposition of the unappropriated public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MINAHAN of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 10067) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of East Orange, N. J., three German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10068) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newark, N. J., five German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10069) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Orange, N. J., three German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 10070) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Buffalo, N. Y., three German cannon or fieldpiece with their accompaniments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10071) to provide revenue and encourage domestic industries by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 10072) to provide for the punishment of officers of United States courts wrongfully converting moneys coming into their possession, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 10073) to amend section 177 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 10074) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the municipal court of the District of Columbia and to regulate appeals from the judgments of said court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10075) to fix the mileage to be paid officers of the Army, active and retired, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, contract surgeons, expert accountant of the Inspector General's Department, and others connected with the Army, and also providing for reimbursement for actual expenses of travel and a flat per diem in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Resolution (H. Res. 352) for the immediate consideration of House committee substitute for Senate bill 2775; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAPES: Resolution (H. Res. 353) to increase the salary of the superintendent of the press gallery $400 per annum; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 10076) granting an increase of pension to Martin McDermott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10077) granting a pension to Eli Hayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10078) granting an increase of pension to William A. Beer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 10079) granting a pension to Mary Busher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 10080) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cornell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 10081) for the relief of Rose S. Emke; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10082) for the relief of Rose H. Knell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10083) granting an increase of pension to Jay Cobb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10084) granting an increase of pension to David Sedore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 10085) for the relief of Joe T. White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 10086) granting a pension to Mary A. Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 10087) granting a pension to Otis H. Shurtliff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 10088) granting a pension to Isaac M. Stroud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 10089) granting an increase of pension to William S. Rowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 10090) granting a pension to Albert M. Kuppel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10091) granting a pension to Bridget J. Snody; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10092) granting a pension to Christina Pabst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10093) granting a pension to Oscar W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10094) granting a pension to Margaret A. Kinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10095) granting a pension to Mary L. Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10096) granting a pension to Edith H. Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10097) granting an increase of pension to Peter Kankiewicz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MINAHAN of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 10098) granting a pension to Mary M. Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10099) granting an increase of pension to Charles Leathers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 10100) granting a pension to Elizabeth Van Pelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 10101) granting a pension to Mary E. Gould; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 10102) for the relief of A. H. Holloway; to the Committee on Claims.

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 Grand Army of the Republic, favoring an additional appropriation of a sum not exceeding $50,000 to be added to the $32,000 unexpended surplus fund reappropriated by act of Congress approved July 11, 1919, for the erection and completion of the national memorial archway at Vicksburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of S. B. Peart, J. B. Errecart, and Western Sheep Co., of Stockton, Calif., and A. L. Beal, of San Francisco, Calif., favoring the protection of the sheep industry in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Lompoc Valley Bank and the Lompoc Valley Chamber of Commerce, of Lompoc, Calif., in favor of an adequate tariff on foreign-grown beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of Michael Davitt Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, requesting Congress of the United States to recognize the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of National Editorial Association, protesting against the repeal of the zone postage law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Roxbury Council, No. 123, Knights of Columbus, of Boston, Mass., protesting against the delay and lack of attention shown by the Government in its handling of the cases of many of its disabled soldiers who have been discharged from service with promises of compensation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Industrial Traffic Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Cummins bill (S. 2906); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, protesting against many of the provisions of the Senate subcommittee bill (S. 2906); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEAD: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New York, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the so-called Siegel bill (H. R. 8315); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Letter from the Pasadena Ice Co., of Pasadena, Calif., protesting against the bill introduced by Representative SIEGEL providing that the cost mark be placed on all merchandise when offered for sale; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, letter from the California Sugar & White Pine Co., of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the bill introduced by Representative SIEGEL known as the cost-mark bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, letter from the California Sugar & White Pine Co., of San Francisco, protesting against a bill introduced by Representative JEFFERIS which prohibits the exporting of lumber from the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: Petition of J. L. Short and other residents of Brazil, Ind., favoring the passage of House bill 8157, known as Plumb plan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *October 22, 1919.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we look to Thee for Thy guidance to-day. We pray for the grace of patriotism—a patriotism founded upon regard for Thy law and reverence for Thy name and a supreme concern for Thy will. We pray that our Nation, established in righteousness, may continue to accomplish the will of God and may receive from day to day the blessing and direction of the great God of righteousness and truth. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 1st instant, a statement regarding foreign marketing work of the Bureau of Markets, which was ordered to lie on the table and 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 a bill (H. R. 9783) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a resolution of the letter carriers of Emporia, Kans., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

Resolution adopted by the Rural Letter Carriers' Association of the fourth congressional district at their meeting held in Emporia September 1, 1919.

EMPORIA, KANS., *September 1, 1919.*

DEAR SIRS: We, the rural letter carriers of the fourth congressional district of the State of Kansas, now in session, beg leave to have you make this statement in Congress: "That the rural letter carriers are subjected to such an increased cost of living and equipment and upkeep of same that we are in dire need of immediate help, and must have it if we are to be able to keep up with the present cost, and that we ought to have at least 40 per cent increase on the salary now received."

T. D. LITTLE,
C. C. PHELPS,
A. W. REED,
Committee.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution from Old Hickory (Thirtieth Division) Association, favoring immediate ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany.

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

OLD HICKORY (THIRTIETH DIVISION) ASSOCIATION.

Resolution favoring immediate ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Whereas it was the high honor of the Thirtieth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, to play an important part in bringing the long and terrible war with Germany and her allies to a successful close; and

Whereas we believe it is necessary to the future peace and welfare of the United States and of the world that the treaty of peace with Germany, including the league of nations covenant, be ratified by the United States without further delay, leaving all imperfections or imagined errors therein to be corrected hereafter by the use of the adequate machinery provided therein for that purpose: Be it

Resolved, First, that it is the sentiment of this association that the treaty of peace with Germany, including the league of nations covenant, should be immediately ratified in its present form without amendment or reservation, and the Senate of the United States is respectfully urged to do its part to that end, in order that the spiritual and material blessings of peace may once more be restored to the world, in order that the danger of future wars may be lessened and in order that we as a nation may live up to the high purposes for which we entered the war and for which so many members of our division gave their lives upon the battle fields of France and Belgium.

Second, that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the United States Senators from North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, and copies be given to the press.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of the Retail Grocers and Butchers' Association, of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to decrease the high cost of living, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN presented a petition of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, of Newark, N. J., praying for the passage of Senate Resolution 189 for the protection of the colored race, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Michigan Baptist Ministers' Association, of Flint, Mich., and a petition of the Association of Congregational Churches, of Saginaw, Mich., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the city council of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for Federal regulation of the manufacture and distribution of sugar, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.