

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey in furtherance of a national system of highways in cooperation with the various States of the Union; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14199) granting an increase of pension to George W. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 14200) granting a pension to August Koeser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 14201) granting an increase of pension to Clara Larish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14202) granting a pension to Ellen Jefferson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 14203) granting a pension to Benjamin E. Mosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 14204) for the relief of the heirs of William August Ahrend, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 14205) granting an increase of pension to Mary Polo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14206) granting a pension to Charles Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

3826. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Institute of American Meat Packers, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the baseless charges of profiteering made against the small packers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3827. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of a mass meeting of workers at Virginia, Minn., favoring the immediate release of all political prisoners and favoring the printing of papers in foreign languages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3828. By Mr. CASEY: Petition of Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion, in connection with the bonus, signed by Anthony Visoski and 86 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3829. Also, three petitions by the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion, in connection with a \$500 bonus for ex-service men, signed by Mike Shugkys and 75 others; Evan J. Williams and 96 others; Harry Winters and 90 others, all residents of Luzerne County, eleventh congressional district, Pa.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3830. By Mr. CRAGO: Petition of shoe retailers of Connellsville, Uniontown, and Brownsville, Pa., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Federal branding legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3831. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Bakers' Union, Local 163, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 171 and Senate bill 1233; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3832. Also, petition of New York Produce Exchange and the William E. Blaisdell Post 328, American Legion, of New York, opposing the bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3833. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, La Crosse, Wis., favoring early report of Joint Commission on Postal Salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3834. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of La Crosse, Wis., in connection with location of a fish hatchery at that city; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3835. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, favoring suffrage and representation in Congress for citizens of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3836. Also, petition of East St. Louis (Ill.) Lumber Co. and H. F. Drobisch, of Peoria, Ill., opposing delay or postponement of the zone postal rates going into effect; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3837. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of J. B. Noyes, of Boston, Mass., favoring early report of the Joint Commission on Postal Salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3838. Also, petition of J. B. Murray and others urging early and favorable report by postal commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3839. Also, petition of president of American Federation of Labor, in connection with House bill 12775; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3840. Also, petition of Addison C. Getchell & Son, of Boston, Mass., protesting against proposed tax on advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3841. By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of Wade Hampton Chapter, No. 1658, United Daughters of the Confederacy, relative to the omission of Lee and Jackson from the memorial columns of the Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

3842. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York and the New York Produce Exchange, of New York, protesting against the passage of the bonus bill and the proposed method of taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3843. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion of the United States of America, urging favorable consideration of House bill 10375, providing a bonus of \$500 for all who served in the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3844. Also, papers to accompany H. R. 14183, granting an increase of pension to Matilda E. Ames; to the Committee on Pensions.

3845. By Mr. MCGLENNON: Petition of five branches of Friends of Irish Freedom, in connection with the recognition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3846. Also, petition of Council of the town of Kearny, N. J., in connection with postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3847. Also, petition of two church clubs of Montclair, N. J., favoring loan for relief of central Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3848. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of Typothetæ of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against proposed tax on advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3849. Also, petition of Wolanski Post, No. 707, American Legion, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring fourfold bonus plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3850. By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: Petition of Wilfred G. Albert and Miss Ottilie Blumenthal, Republican committee women, both of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the manner in which the St. Louis post office is being conducted; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3851. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Robert Gair Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of House bill 13874; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3852. Also, petition of Corporal John Ruoff Post, No. 632, American Legion, Ozone Park and Woodhaven, Long Island, favoring bonus for soldiers, and William E. Blaisdell Post, No. 238, American Legion, and sundry other citizens, opposing the bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3853. By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of 250 members of Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion, Los Angeles, Calif., in favor of House bill 10373; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3854. By Mr. RAKER: Two petitions favoring passage of House bill 1112; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3855. Also, petition of T. F. Perry, post commander, American Legion Post, of Colfax, Calif., and the Private Soldiers' and Sailors' Legion of the United States, in connection with the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3856. Also, petition of Commercial Club of Independence, Calif., urging that the Lee Vining Creek Falls on the Tioga Road leading into Yosemite Valley be preserved in all their present scenic beauty; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SENATE.

MONDAY, May 24, 1920.

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

Almighty God, we thank Thee for a religious experience that gives to us broadness of mind, purity of intent and purpose, an ever-enlarging sympathy, and love, and hope. Herein Thou dost set us free from the domination of the passing circumstance of life. Thou dost give to us visions of the larger life that touch upon the great issues of life eternal. Draw us near to Thyself. Give us ever the light of Thy presence upon our pathway. May our hearts be constantly in attune with the Divine. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, May 21, 1920, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALLING THE ROLL.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Edge	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Fernald	McNary	Smith, Md.
Borah	Harding	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Henderson	New	Smoot
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Sterling
Comer	Kellogg	Nugent	Thomas
Culberson	King	Page	Townsend
Curtis	Lenroot	Robinson	Underwood
Dial	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren

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

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. HALE, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. KEYES, Mr. KNOX, Mr. NELSON, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. WADSWORTH, and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts answered to their names when called.

Mr. SPENCER. May I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] are engaged in business of the Senate in committee?

Mr. WALSH of Montana, Mr. GAY, Mr. STANLEY, Mr. TRAMMELL, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. MYERS, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, and Mr. WATSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] are absent on official business.

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

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 12626. An act for the relief of certain persons to whom, or their predecessors, patents were issued to public lands along the Snake River in the State of Idaho under an erroneous survey made in 1883;

S. J. Res. 189. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the accounting officers of the Treasury to allow credit to the disbursing clerk of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in certain cases; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring that a state of war exists between the United States and Germany, and the joint resolution of December 7, 1917, declaring that a state of war exists between the United States and the Austro-Hungarian Government.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—UTAH-IDAHO SUGAR CO.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to present a question that has particular reference to myself. I will say to Senators that it will not take more than 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Utah will proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we all recognize the extreme sugar shortage in the United States as well as in all the world, and the serious consequences following such a shortage; and no one can object to any action that can be taken to control or regulate the lawful distribution of the same, but when any department of our Government undertakes to secure the defeat or the election of a United States Senator through an investigation of the affairs of a sugar company it is time that such a contemptible practice be called to the attention of the public.

I am positive the honest people of this country will not approve of any such rotten politics. This very thing is taking place in the State of Utah, and to prove this statement I have but to recite what has in the past and is taking place to-day.

In the first place, I wish to go back some months when this unthinkable proposition was first brought to my attention by Gen. Richard W. Young, during his visit to Washington as the attorney of the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. He was here to learn, if possible, if there was any truth in the rumor that the Federal Trade Commission was going to make an investigation of the affairs of the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co.; and if so, upon what basis and for what reason. Think of my surprise when he told me that he had no doubt the investigation would be made some time before the next election, and among other causes assigned

was the one that it would help to defeat me for reelection. I could not see how any investigation could possibly affect me, for I have never been an officer of the company; I have nothing to do with its management; I have never done anything for the company that I would not willingly have done for any other business organization in the United States; that I own but 440 shares of the capital stock of the company, valued even to-day at \$9 per share, and the same came to me through the purchase at public sale of about 76 shares of the stock once owned by my father's estate, and the balance of my present holdings came to me by my subscribing \$1,500 to build a sugar factory at Dewey, Idaho, which proved a failure and was dismantled and removed to Utah by the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co., after which I received stock in the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. for my stock invested in the sugar factory at Dewey, Idaho; that I never bought a share of the stock other than the 76 shares already mentioned; that I have never sold a share of the stock of the company in my life; and that the dividend I receive from the company is \$22 per month.

So, under these conditions I paid no more attention to the matter until yesterday, when I received information of a telegram that had been sent from Salt Lake City by one George E. Sanders to Attorney H. W. Beer, of the Federal Trade Commission, at Rigby, Idaho, to which I will call the Senate's attention later. Senators will remember that last December I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Attorney General had fixed the price at which the producers of beet sugar could sell their sugar at 10½ cents per pound, while at the same time he allowed the cane-sugar producers of Louisiana to sell their sugar at 17 cents per pound.

The beginning of this year the sugar situation became alarming. The President had refused, upon the advice of Dr. Taussig and against the advice of the other members of the Sugar Equalization Board, to purchase the Cuban crop at 5½ cents for Cuban raws, and shortly following that decision wild speculation in Cuban sugars began and prices advanced rapidly. The beet-sugar producers considered the situation intolerable, and the officers of the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. decided to request that I take up the question with the Attorney General, and following is the part, and the only part, that I have taken in which the price of sugar was involved.

On January 7 I received a telegram signed by officials of the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. reading as follows:

Please see Attorney General and secure modification of his telegram dated October 18, wherein he said, in brief: "The Department of Justice will treat as an unjust charge any price in excess of the United States Equalization Board's basis for beet-sugar sales and consider such a charge a violation of section 4 of the Lever food-control act." Competitors here have sold sugars at prices ranging from 14 to 20 cents, and are competing with us for next season's beets in same fields, and we, under threat of prosecution, are maintaining Government's price of ten-fifty. Is this fair, reasonable, right, or just? Government has allowed Michigan beet to be sold at 12 cents without prosecution, and Louisiana situation is well known. To fix price for one factory or locality on basis of cost means favoring the inefficient and slothful and penalizing the thrifty and prudent. Can not the Department of Justice recognize world's market price, somewhere near 14 or 15 cents New York, and instruct district attorney here to institute proceedings only if we sell above such figure? Situation intolerable, and our directors feel that conditions warrant and justify a price in excess of a ten-fifty price. Couldn't you get district attorney here instructed to institute proceedings only if we sell above 14 cents? Parties here from East bidding for our sugar at 20 cents f. o. b. factory. Have information that thousands of tons are being sold by refiners in New York at 15 cents and above.

Immediately upon receipt of the telegram I took the subject matter up with the Attorney General's office. The Attorney General advised me that he was not familiar with the details of the sugar situation, but would instruct Mr. Garvan to come to my office the following morning for the purpose of holding a conference on the question of the future price of beet sugar. I then answered the telegram as follows:

Attorney General has instructed Mr. Garvan to hold conference with me this afternoon on question of price of sugar. Presented your telegram to the Attorney General, and he did not see his way clear under the law to pass upon the question with the information he has at hand. Will report result of conference as soon as possible.

Mr. Garvan failed to come to my office on the 9th, but the Attorney General sent Mr. A. H. Riley, of the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, to see me on the morning of January 10. After a two hours' conference with Mr. Riley I sent the following telegram:

Held two hours' conference with Riley, sugar man, Department of Justice. Believe he will recommend to Attorney General Monday to allow beet sugar to be sold on basis of 12 cents, increase of 1½ cents per pound. Will advise me Monday and I will telegraph you results.

On January 12 I sent the following telegram:

Riley and Garvan prefer to wait until Wednesday to consult Attorney General, who is out of town, before deciding on subject matter of your telegram relative to sugar prices.

On January 14 I received the following night lettergram:

We thank you very much for your splendid work on sugar matter. This morning American Sugar Refining Co. announces price 15 cents New York, and this afternoon C and H make same price San Francisco. In normal times these two concerns virtually make sugar market for United States based on Cuban and Hawaiian raw sugars, respectively. Doubtless you have presented to Department of Justice the impracticability of ultimate consumer receiving benefit of ten and a half price in Utah when sugar is bringing 15 to 20 cents retail in eastern markets. From information received through our brokers we are convinced that little or no sugar is reaching the consumer based on a ten and a half price, hence the ridiculousness of a situation that compels one or two companies in Colorado and Utah to continue selling sugar on such a basis. As an example of the unbearable condition here speculators are buying our sugars in five and ten bag lots, assembling same into carloads, shipping to Chicago, where they net six or seven dollars per bag profit, and should we attempt control situation by withholding sugars from market would likely be charged with hoarding as we were in Northwest recently. Since previous telegram, Gunnison, Rigby, and other producers, who have accepted higher prices than Government allowed for sugars, are bidding \$12 for beets in our fields, while we can not afford to go higher than \$10 account having sold our sugar on 10½-cent basis. Telegraph us something definite tomorrow if possible. Our directors feel situation intolerable.

After the receipt of the above telegram and a conference with Mr. Riley I sent a telegram, dated January 15, as follows:

Wire me immediately number of tons of beet sugar that can be shipped East within 30 days from all factories in Colorado and Utah, Idaho, Montana, or factories controlled by sugar companies within those States providing price paid is on 12-cent basis.

To that telegram I received the following answer:

Fifty-five million one hundred thousand pounds all companies allotment to March 1, based on 12 cents seaboard basis, but none of this to be shipped east of Chicago, as we are obliged to take care of our trade in our eastern territory on monthly allotments.

Shortly after the receipt of this telegram I held another conference with Mr. Riley, following which I sent, on January 16, the following telegram:

Am directed to notify you that sugar companies named in my telegram, dated January 15, may ship 55,100,000 pounds beet sugar between January 17 and March 1, at 12 cents seaboard basis, but none of it to be shipped east of Chicago. Each shipment with amount, name of purchaser, and destination to be sent daily by letter direct to A. W. Riley, Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. Please make best possible distribution. Letter will follow.

I received in answer to this telegram on January 17 a wire as follows:

We wish to express to you our thanks for the quick action you have secured in relation to sugar matters. As a consequence the different sugar companies have practically arrived at the conclusion that they will announce a \$12 price per ton for beets in 1920. Inasmuch as New York and San Francisco basic price 15 cents, why is it Government continues to try to hold down price of beet sugar, in which farmers of all these States so greatly interested?

After consultation with Mr. Riley on January 19 I sent the following telegram:

Read your telegram January 17 to Riley, Department of Justice, and he thinks if all beet sugar now on hand is sold at 12 cents announcement should be made that companies will pay \$12 per ton for 1920 beets. If sugar is sold at 15 cents, undue profits would follow and would lead to prosecution under existing law.

I wired the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. on January 20, after receiving a telephone message from Mr. Riley, as follows:

Reported to Department of Justice you have withdrawn sugar from sale. Wire facts in case.

I received an answer to that telegram January 24 reading as follows:

Report of our withdrawal from market absolutely untrue. More than 40,000 bags now rolling to eastern territory, and in addition have invoiced 158,000 bags so far this month. Total amount of new sugar shipped 670,000 bags out of this season's production, or more than 50 per cent of total sugar produced to date, as compared with less than 35 per cent sold same date last year.

On January 17 I received a telegram from Mr. W. L. Petrikin, of the Great Western Sugar Co., Denver, Colo., as follows:

In conformity with your telegram to Nibley, dated January 16, regarding distribution of sugar to March 1, it is our intention to cooperate to full extent, and we will immediately arrange to distribute as early as possible the quantity reported on 12-cent seaboard basis.

On January 19 I directed a letter to Mr. Petrikin, in which I inserted a copy of my telegram of January 19 to the manager of the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co.

This is the full and true account of every action of mine in connection with the price at which sugar was to be sold. I read every telegram I received and every telegram I sent on this subject to Mr. Riley, of the Department of Justice, and every one of them met his approval.

From the Salt Lake City daily papers I learned that recently the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. has advanced the price of beet sugar to the market price of sugar at New York and San Francisco, and the only reasons assigned for so doing that I am aware of are announced by the company in advertisements in the Salt Lake papers. Following is an extract from one of the advertisements received by me this day:

The business of this company is to manufacture and sell sugar. It has been in business for almost 30 years. Its commodity until the beginning of the war was always sold at the market price, based on sup-

ply and demand. Prices sometimes have been up and sometimes have been down. Many years have been lean years from a profit standpoint. Others have been profitable. The company's sales for the fiscal year ending February 28, 1920, amounted to 1,756,834 bags, on which it made a profit of \$1.02 per bag. There is not a fair price committee in the land that has named as low a price for the wholesaler or retailer. Even the Attorney General of the United States in his latest statement says that the retailer is entitled to a margin of \$2 per bag for handling sugar. From the standpoint of fair play, isn't the manufacturer of sugar entitled to as much profit as the middleman who distributes his goods?

The Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. has always been fair with the people of Utah. During the past six months it has sacrificed a lot of money in order to retain sufficient sugar for home consumption. Had it not done so, sugar to-day might have been selling in Utah at 30 to 32 cents wholesale and from 33 to 35 cents retail, as it is in scores of cities in the land. During the past year it has distributed in this intermountain country more than 600,000 bags of sugar, or nearly one-half of its entire production. In ordinary times it has never been able to sell in this market more than 15 per cent of its output, which demonstrates beyond question of cavil that in spite of all the Government's efforts thousands and thousands of bags of sugar have been picked up at the prevailing low price in Utah and shipped to eastern markets, where the manipulators have enjoyed a profit of from \$5 to \$10 per bag. Failure of the Government to prevent this sort of profiteering made the recent advance necessary in order to stop the drain on intermountain sugar supplies. Hence the advance in price to the prevailing eastern and western wholesale market. The Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. has been charged by the Department of Justice with profiteering, and yet this company has never exacted one penny more than the prevailing market price, which is and always has been established by New York, New Orleans, and San Francisco markets.

I am not defending the action of the company nor am I responsible in any way for the advanced price of sugar, nor am I complaining of the Federal Trade Commission making an investigation of the affairs of the company; but I do object to the program and object to the investigation as outlined in the following telegram to one George E. Sanders, an ordinary financial crook, so demonstrated in his swindling deal in promoting a paper sugar factory at Hamilton, Mont., from Attorney W. H. Beer, of the Federal Trade Commission, who has the investigation of the company in charge, and Sanders's answer to the same:

RIGBY, 13, 1920.

GEORGE SANDERS,

Care of Dr. Snow, 60 First Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah:

Expect to close; leaving here Saturday. What do you intend to do regarding Medford and Grants Pass proposed hearing? Wire me collect.

BEER,

Federal Trade Commissioner.

(Gov. rates, 23222 Fed. Trade Comm.)

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, May 13, 1920.

HENRY W. BEER,

Special Counsel, Federal Trade Commission,

Rigby, Idaho:

Do not know what to advise you about proposed hearing at Grants Pass. Think you ought to have about three weeks from now. One of your investigators should be there a week in advance lining up witnesses. Do not be in too big hurry to finish your case, as public sentiment is fast changing and almost entirely for Government prosecution. Sugar magnates anxious for you to get through. Palmer should keep you on job. If you keep a going for two months, it will cost SMOOT his Senate seat. Better kill some time with Washington authority. Ogden to-morrow.

G. E. SANDERS.

9059, May 14, 1920.

Mr. President, this is the program, and I shall wait and see whether it meets with the approval of the members of the Federal Trade Commission or has received the sanction of the Attorney General. It begins to look to me as if Gen. Richard W. Young knew what he was talking about when shortly before his death he informed me what he heard was to take place in connection with an investigation of the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. Gen. Young was one of the leading Democrats, if not the leading Democrat, in my State. Shame upon officials of a department of the Government if they have lent themselves to such action! I think I know the people of Utah well enough to know that this sort of politics will never be countenanced, and if the officials of Washington are acting in this matter upon the advice of politicians of the State of Utah their action will not assist in any way in my defeat or their success.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat.

The Senator has referred to this man Sanders in somewhat emphatic terms. Will the Senator inform me whether his record is such that it should have been known to the authorities employing him for this work?

Mr. SMOOT. Why, Mr. President, I can not conceive that it would not be known. It is known by everybody in Utah. It is known by everybody who has suffered from his speculations. That is the most modest term by which I can characterize his activities.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is to the interest of the public service that the Senator should have made this statement on the floor. While I am not in political sympathy with the Senator, I fully share his condemnation of the use of any public official agency either to promote or to prevent the reelection of any man in public life, if that has been done.

JOINT POSTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to and correct a statement made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] on Saturday in regard to the work of the Joint Commission on Postal Salaries—a statement which I did not hear and of which I did not know until my attention was called on yesterday afternoon to the statement as found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to say, Mr. President, that the statement is misleading, to say the least, and in some respects quite contrary to the facts.

The Senator from Tennessee—and I regret that he is not present—begins his statement with the following announcement on page 7480 of the RECORD:

Mr. President, to-day the Joint Postal Commission completed its labors, and work has now begun in the preparation of a report and a bill.

That statement is prematurely made. The commission had not at the time the statement was made nor has it yet quite concluded its labors. There are at least two schedules of salaries yet to be finally passed upon by the commission. It is hoped, of course, that yet this week the commission may be able to make its report to both Houses of Congress, and that the report will be unanimous, but there are still some slight differences of opinion between members of the commission in regard to some of these salaries, especially the two schedules to which I refer, and no vote has yet been taken upon any schedule but that is open to reconsideration by the commission before the final report is made.

Mr. President, I have nothing to say in regard to what the steering committee should do in including the postal salary matter in its program, save that I can hardly see reason for the implied criticism of the committee by the Senator from Tennessee for not including in its program something that has not yet been reported to the Senate, especially when there is yet some uncertainty as to the time when the report will be made.

But, Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee did not quite stop with the announcement that the commission is engaged in the preparation of a report and a bill. On page 7480, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Spencer] asked the following question:

And do I understand from the Senator from Tennessee that the commission, of which he is a member, has not yet reported?

To which the Senator from Tennessee made the following response:

It has not yet reported, but its report is ready.

Mr. President, after the commission has concluded its work and agreed upon a schedule of salaries for the various classes of postal employees, it will require a few days, at least, of hard work, of most intensive work, to prepare such a report as should be submitted to the two Houses of Congress.

This is a matter of great importance and I call attention to it, Mr. President, in order that no unjust or improper inference may follow from the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee in regard to this report.

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

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the Senator if it is the expectation of the commission that the report will be presented to Congress in time for action before the recess on June 5?

Mr. STERLING. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that it is the expectation and the strong hope that the report will be presented to the Senate and to the House during the present week. I want to say, further, that when presented I hope we may have the cooperation of the steering committee, as well as of the Senators generally, in the speedy consideration of the report.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the subject to which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Sterling] has just called the attention of the Senate justifies a reference to a nation-wide and apparently thoroughly organized and apparently effective propaganda now being conducted in favor of this proposed measure.

I presume mine is the common experience of every Senator. My mail is loaded to the guards with letters, telegrams, petitions, requests, and entreaties from all sorts and conditions of people—black, white, Jews, gentiles, Americans, foreigners, everybody—organizations, social and industrial, the constituents of the American Federation of Labor being particularly active in the campaign.

I present to the view of the Senate a full-page advertisement taken from yesterday's New York Times, and purporting to be reprinted from the May 27 issue of the Literary Digest, and am informed that similar editorials are appearing all over the country, which indicates that these gentlemen, so anxious for relief from Congress, must have large funds somehow, some-

where, in order to meet the enormous cost of this sort of advertisement.

These gentlemen may need, and greatly need, relief from the United States Treasury. The commission in all probability will ascertain that fact; but I am reaching a point where my interest is aroused by these continuing and repeated organized demands upon the Treasury of the United States, and I shall therefore demand a full consideration of the report of the committee report, in view of the matters to which I have just called attention.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, just a word in reference to some observations made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Thomas], wherein he assumes that all of the letters we are receiving with reference to the increase of pay of postal employees are inspired propaganda upon the part of the postal employees. I am very certain that is not true, and if the Senator from Colorado should visit his own State, as I visited mine for a few days two or three weeks ago, I am very sure that he would find, as I found, that the great business and commercial interests, the heavy patrons of the Postal Service, are interested in this increase, not primarily as a matter of justice to post-office employees, but because they believe that the entire postal system, bad as it is now, will be utterly broken down through wholesale resignations from the service, and that the employees will seek more profitable employment elsewhere unless Congress very speedily takes action, giving them such recompense as will make it to their interest to remain in the service rather than to leave.

So, I am very sure that the hundreds of letters we are now receiving constantly from the business interests of the country, asking for action, are not inspired by the employees, but are inspired by the self-interest of the writers of the letters.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am, of course, aware of the fact that many business interests are identifying themselves with this movement, and no doubt for the reasons, among others, which have just been stated by the Senator from Wisconsin; but of course they know, they must know, that increase of salaries has been a policy of the Congress for the last four or five years, which increases, instead of improving, have had little effect upon the efficiency of the service, for the very good reason that prices move upward out of proportion to these increases, thus leading to new demands; and such, in my judgment, will be the result of this increase if it shall be made.

I do not want the Senator to understand that I will oppose a favorable consideration of this measure. I do say, however, that in view of what seems to be an abnormal activity in behalf of it, we should give it full consideration before disposing of it.

I confess, Mr. President, that the service is not efficient at present. That is largely true of many other branches of the public service. But it will continue so until normal conditions are resumed all over the country. I can well understand—indeed, I applaud—the man in any branch of the public service who, having opportunity for private employment, wants to avail himself of it. I do not know of any greater misfortune that could overtake a friend or a relative of mine than his entry into permanent service for the Government. He may be able to make some slight advance in life; he may secure a promotion here or there; his compensation may be increased somewhat, perhaps materially, but he has placed himself in a rut; he has a certain routine of duty; he ceases to be self-reliant as the years pass; his energy and his enterprise are sapped by the dull and dry round of official life, and therefore many, perhaps a majority, of those who have spent half of their active lives in the public service, realize, and realize more fully than myself, because theirs is the experience, that the principal good fortune coming to a public employee is an opportunity to engage in the activities of private life. If I have any friends in the service—and I think I have quite a number—I would say to them that now is the opportunity to leave this dull, hidebound, chrysalis condition and expand themselves in private activities, for there, and there only, can their full ambitions have opportunity for realization.

SIGNAL CORPS SCHOOL—CAMP ALFRED VAIL, N. J. (S. DOC. NO. 278).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$1,500,000 required by the War Department for beginning construction of the Signal Corps School at Camp Alfred Vail, N. J., being for the fiscal year 1921, which, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3897) to amend section 16 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, Mr. EDMONDS, Mr. ROWE, Mr. HARDY of Texas, and Mr. LAZARO managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) authorizing use of Army transports by teams, individuals, and their equipment representing the United States in Olympic games and international competitions, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13500) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended, to establish an Hawaiian homes commission, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2789) for the consolidation of forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SINNOTT, Mr. SMITH of Idaho, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12272) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, further insists on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93 to the bill; agrees to the further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. LEE of Georgia managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

UNITED STATES PILGRIM TERCENTENARY COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By the enactment of a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass., there has been created what is known as a commission to be known as the United States Pilgrim Tercentenary Commission, and the President of the Senate is, by the terms of said joint resolution, authorized to appoint four Senators as members of that commission.

In accordance with the authority thus vested in me, I appoint as members of the said commission the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present an order adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of the State of Massachusetts relative to the official recognition of the powers of the right of the Jewish people to a national existence in Palestine, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1920.

An order relative to the official recognition by the powers of the right of the Jewish people to a national existence in Palestine.

Ordered, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives greets with profound satisfaction the official recognition by the powers of the right of the Jewish people to a national existence in Palestine, and that it deeply rejoices to see the national liberation of the children of Israel, who will once more shed luster on our civilization; that it hails the Jewish national restoration to the ancestral soil as a triumph of justice for which all mankind should be grateful; that it urges the Government of the United States of America to use its best endeavors to facilitate the speedy development of Palestine into a Jewish national homeland, for only on its own soil can the Jewish people live its own life and make, as it has made in the past, its characteristic and specific contribution to the spiritual treasure of humanity; and be it further

Ordered, That copies of this order be forwarded by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth, and to the Zionist organization of America.

In the house of representatives, adopted May 5, 1920.

A true copy. Attest:

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the American Women's Emergency Committee of New York City, N. Y., favoring the reestablishment of trade relations with Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of Local Union No. 470, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Ship Builders, of Marysville, Kans., praying for the parole of Federal prisoners, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Lamoreux Local Union, No. 1961, Farmers' Educational Cooperative Society, of Stafford County, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to reimburse farmers for losses sustained when the Government fixed the price of wheat, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Gleaners Class of the Meadow Brook Church of the Brethren, of Westminster, Md., and a petition of sundry citizens of Glendale, Ariz., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for physical education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PHELAN presented a memorial of the Los Angeles Audubon Society of California, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation authorizing the granting of certain irrigation easements in the Yellow Stone National Park, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. ROBINSON presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 4414) granting a pension to Georgia E. McKimney, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 1255) authorizing the Texas Co. to bring suit against the United States, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4400) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1869, as amended (Rept. No. 631); and

A bill (S. 4310) to amend an act entitled "The New Mexico enabling act" (Rept. No. 630).

Mr. TRAMMELL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3031) to appropriate \$1,189.35 for the relief of Southern Iron & Metal Co., Jacksonville, Fla., for salvage material consisting of submarine cable purchased from the War Department, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 625) thereon.

ROCK RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. EDGE. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4431) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Rock River in Lee County, Ill., at or near the city of Dixon, in said county, and I submit a report (No. 629) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Illinois Central Railroad Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rock River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the city of Dixon, in Lee County, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER BRIDGES.

Mr. EDGE. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4427) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Columbus, in the State of Georgia, to construct a bridge across the Chattahoochee River, and I submit a report (No. 628) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of Columbus, in the State of Georgia, and its successors and assigns, to construct or rebuild, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Chattahoochee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near and between and connecting Fourteenth Street, in said city of Columbus, in the county of Muscogee, in said State of Georgia, and Broad Street, in the town of Phoenix, in the county of Lee and State of Alabama, and the town of Girard, in the county of Russell and State of Alabama, and being the same points between which said city of Columbus, Ga., now maintains a bridge, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

Mr. EDGE. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 4402) granting the consent of Congress to Troup County, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Chattahoochee River near West Point, Ga., and I submit a report (No. 626) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

The amendments were, on page 1, line 3, to strike out the words "consent of Congress" and insert the word "authority," in line 4 to strike out "and Chambers County, Ala.," and, in lines 7, 8, and 9, to strike out the words "the cities of West Point, Ga., and Lanett, Ala., on the boundary line between Georgia and Alabama," and insert "and between and connecting Montgomery and Perry Streets in the city of West Point, in the county of Troup, in the State of Georgia, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authority is hereby granted to Troup County, Ga., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Chattahoochee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near and between and connecting Montgomery and Perry Streets, in the city of West Point, in the county of Troup, in the State of Georgia, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing Troup County, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Chattahoochee River near West Point, Ga."

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

Mr. EDGE. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4411) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Pembina, N. Dak., and Kittson, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak., and I submit a report (No. 627) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the counties of Pembina, N. Dak., and Kittson, Minn., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River of the North at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4437) for the relief of Max B. Baldenburg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4438) for the relief of Fred A. Davey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4439) to regulate the sale of bonds, stocks, and other evidences of interest in or indebtedness of corporations or associations in interstate commerce, and to amend an act

approved October 15, 1914, entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to turn over to the county commissioners of Dickinson County, Kans., a suitable amount of pontoon equipment for temporary use across the Smoky Hill River, at Chapman, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. HENDERSON submitted an amendment providing for the construction of drainage facilities in connection with the Newlands reclamation project in the State of Nevada, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CAPPER submitted an amendment authorizing the widow of an officer or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, and Training Corps, while she remained unmarried, to purchase for cash for her personal use Government subsistence stores at the price charged officers and enlisted men, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

GOVERNMENT OF ITALY.

Mr. KING. I offer a resolution which I ask may be read, and I shall ask for its adoption unless there is objection to it.

The resolution (S. Res. 372) was read, as follows:

Whereas upon the 24th day of May, 1915, Italy declared war upon Austria-Hungary for the redemption of her people who had for centuries been under the Austrian yoke; and

Whereas the armies of Italy with unexampled fortitude and sacrifice, and in the face of unparalleled obstacles, battled heroically and persistently throughout the war, and upon the 24th day of October, 1918, initiated the gigantic offensive which expelled the vanquished armies of the enemy from Italian soil, caused the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and was the prelude to the victories of the French, Belgian, British, and American forces in France and Flanders, which ended in the armistice of November 11, 1918; and

Whereas the unshakable faith, tenacious valor, and heroic courage of Italy were vital factors in the war, and through the intense sufferings and privations of Italy, liberty has come not only to the Italians of Trent and Istria, but also to the Czecho-Slavs and Jugo-Slavs, formerly subject to the alien rule of Austria-Hungary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate, on this fifth anniversary of the entrance of Italy into the war, felicitates the Government and people of Italy upon the splendid accomplishments of Italy for the defense of civilization and the liberation of subject peoples, congratulates Italy upon the reintegration of her ancient national territories and the complete national unity of the Italian people, and extends its good will for the continued prosperity and glory of Italy in the community of the free nations of the world.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. If there is to be objection to the resolution, let it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BORAH. I do not see why it should not be adopted.

Mr. KING. Very well; I ask for its adoption at this time.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on Thursday next, at the close of the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate upon the subject of the activities and accomplishments of the War Department during the war.

OLYMPIC GAMES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) authorizing use of Army transports by teams, individuals, and their equipment representing the United States in Olympic games and international competitions, which was to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That authority be, and is hereby, given to the Secretary of War, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to use such Army transports as may be available for the transportation of teams, individuals, and their equipment representing the United States in Olympic games and other international competitions during the present year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the language adopted by the House as a substitute and the language used by the Senate is so nearly alike that there is no objection at all to it. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 13500. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended, to establish an Hawaiian homes commission, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands, Porto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

THE BONUS IN POLITICS.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to read into the Record a very timely and pertinent editorial from yesterday's Washington Post, entitled "The bonus in politics."

"If the Republicans of the House of Representatives were actually moving to impose an additional tax of \$1,276,500,000 on the people at this time for the purpose of giving a bonus to soldiers and sailors, the move could not be ascribed to anything but madness. But as the House Republicans know very well that no such tax will be imposed, their proposal to impose it may be set down for what it really is—a hypocritical and disreputable attempt to hoodwink the soldier boys for purposes of political advantage in the forthcoming campaign.

"The House Republicans are trying to make it appear that they favor the imposition of another billion-dollar tax upon the people; that the soldier and sailor boys must have this bonus; that the Democrats are opposing the plan, and the Democratic President is intent upon vetoing the bill, and therefore that the Republican Party is the only friend of the soldiers and sailors. Hence, if the soldiers and sailors have any gratitude they will be expected to vote the Republican ticket from President to dog catcher.

"The Republicans of the House would not pass the bonus bill if they knew it would pass the Senate and be approved by the President, for they know that the people would relegate all of them to private life for incompetence in swelling the public debt at a time when the public back is bending under an excessive load. The House Republicans rely upon the Senate and the President to block the bill. Thus these 'statesmen' hope to fool the soldiers and sailors and yet avoid the wrath of the taxpayers.

"Such is the quality of statesmanship exhibited by the majority of the once great Committee on Ways and Means and seemingly approved by the Republican majority of the House.

"No more humiliating spectacle has ever been witnessed in the Capitol than that which will occur this week if a majority of the House shall vote in favor of the bonus bill. The proposal is so offensive to decency, when stripped of its hypocrisy, that no individual Member of the House would dare to champion it in the presence of self-respecting soldiers and sailors of the recent war. It is an indictment of the good faith of its supporters, and the roll call will be used against them, individually, by their rivals in their districts. These rivals will not fail to tell the people how their Congressmen voted for an additional tax of \$1,276,500,000. They will fully explain to all soldiers and sailors how the vote was cast in the knowledge that the bill could not pass—that it was, bluntly speaking, a swindle disguised as a bribe, intended to deceive them into voting the Republican ticket. How can any Congressman voting for this bill successfully cope with a rival who thrusts these deadly facts into the campaign?

"The Congressmen engineering this fraudulent measure confidently count upon the ignorance of the soldiers and sailors. They seem to regard these young men as too simple to understand the intricacy of the scheme that has been hatched. They expect to convince the fighting men that a Democratic minority in Congress, or the Democratic President, as the case may be, blocked the bonus which a grateful Republican Party was anxious to give them. But the soldiers and sailors will not be misled. The truth will be conveyed to them before the bill is voted down in the Senate or vetoed by the President.

"Should the House pass this bill, a storm of protest will arise from the taxpayers. They will speedily rip off all the pretense that now covers the proposal. The Senate debate, if held before the recess, will expose the hypocritical action of the House majority and will place before the two great elements concerned—taxpayers and fighters—the full truth. Thus the Congressmen who vote for the bill will be impaled upon one horn or the other.

"In the meantime it behooves the soldiers and sailors to understand clearly what is being attempted in the name of patriotism and gratitude. The protests which are coming in from former soldiers and sailors reveal that many of them detect the unwisdom of imposing extra taxation upon the people for the purpose of giving the fighters a bonus. Everyone knows that a tax is not only collected from the consumer, but is usually made the excuse for an extra charge. The bonus would amount to \$1,276,500,000, which is staggering enough in itself; but by the time the consumers paid the tax it would have grown to \$2,000,000,000 or more. The fighters and their relatives would pay this tax and its profiteering trailer. All patriotic families have Liberty bonds, and the value of these bonds would depreciate if they were dumped upon the market, as they would be if taxpayers were squeezed by a bonus bill. Thus the fighters' families would be doubly out of pocket.

"But there is no danger of committing the folly of enacting the bonus bill. Congress is about to adjourn. The campaign will be on. Business conditions are changing. Extra taxes must be laid to carry on the Government. The people will know more about the Government than they know now. If the House, before adjourning, should pass the bonus bill, its action will have become a hissing and a byword before the Senate, next winter, will be called upon to discuss it."

This editorial, Mr. President, indulges in very plain and, I think, truthful expression. I do not think it goes far enough, however, because I believe that many of the members of my own party are quite as much concerned for political reasons in preparing and enacting this measure as are the Republicans. But if it be true, and I do not question it, that, as here stated, the Republicans of the House would not pass a bonus bill if they knew it would pass the Senate and be approved by the President, then I feel justified, both for the purpose of relieving those gentlemen of the apprehensions they are said to entertain, and to assure them that they can accomplish their desire by accepting my statement, that four of us on this side of the Senate propose, if the bill comes from the House, to oppose it to the best of our ability. If any political advantage can be drawn from this statement, I am perfectly willing to add that every one of us is a Democrat. Whether there be others, I do not know.

We are pressed for time, and only for that reason do I make the statement, for, assuming the correctness of this editorial that the sole basis for the proposed legislation is politics, if its sponsors can be assured that their end can be reached without indulging in so much useless work, it will be mutually beneficial to declare it.

THE MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent to read into the Record a statement by the Institute of American Meat Packers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERMAN. It reads:

In reference to that part of Senator WALSH's speech in the United States Senate yesterday—

Referring to the day after the delivery of the speech—which referred to the packing industry, the Institute of American Meat Packers to-day issued the following statement:

"Senator WALSH evidently has been misled by the old charges of the Federal Trade Commission, which has been disproved in detail. What the consumer wishes to know is, How much profit does the manufacturer receive when he sells a pound or a dollar's worth of product? In the case of the packers the answer is that the average profit is a fraction of a cent a pound or less than 2 cents on a dollar's worth of product. This is doubtless the smallest rate of profit received by any industry in the world.

"The packers' profit in 1919 cost the average American family only about 5 cents a week. These facts often have been cited publicly and they never have been denied. No amount of prejudice and erroneous accounting calculations will obscure them. Moreover, the consumer is not unaware that according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, meat has decreased substantially in price since last spring, while most commodities have continued on their upward trend. The consumer is beginning to realize that the campaign of abuse and misrepresentation which has been directed at packing companies has damaged the industry, thereby affecting the interest of public adversely and working serious injury to live-stock producers. No industry can serve the public with its maximum efficiency when constantly harassed by deliberate organized vilification. All the packing industry asks is to be judged on the facts, and it is now high time for the facts to rule.

"It has been demonstrated time and time again on the basis of Government figures that the profits of packing companies play only a negligible part in meat prices—a fraction of a cent a pound. The United States census figures show that in the packing industry the cost of raw materials constitutes 87.2 per cent of the value of finished products. The packing industry has given the consumer and the Government a square deal. On that account it now deserves to be considered on its merits and not as a convenient political target."

THE SUGAR SITUATION.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter written by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] to a constituent of his on the sugar situation. I will not ask to have it read, but merely printed in the Record.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand it is a communication from the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; from the Senator.

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

LETTER OF UNITED STATES SENATOR CHARLES L. McNARY WRITTEN APRIL 26 TO AN OREGON CONSTITUENT.

"In the summer of 1918 the United States Sugar Equalization Board was incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware, the stock being entirely held by the President as trustee for the American people. This corporation was based upon the food-control bill passed by the Congress in 1917.

"This board, following its organization, entered into contract with the Cuban sugar board, through the instrumentality of the Cuban Government, and acquired Cuban raw sugar at the price

of 4½ cents a pound at northern ports and 4 cents a pound at southern ports. The sugar was then transported to the United States where it was refined.

"The Sugar Equalization Board entered into agreement with the refiners for a charge of \$1.54 per hundred pounds for refining, so that the sugar was sold by the refiner at 9 cents per pound less 2 per cent for cash. This brought refined sugar to the home of the consumer at from about 10 cents to 10½ cents per pound.

"This arrangement worked satisfactorily. In fact, at the hearings held by the subcommittee, of which I was chairman, no complaint was made by producers, refiners, or distributors to this plan.

"PRESIDENT REFUSED TO ACT.

"In the summer of 1919 the Sugar Equalization Board petitioned the President to again acquire the Cuban crop of sugar. He refused to act. In the early fall they again renewed their petition to the President to buy this sugar at a price not agreed upon but thought to be about 5½ cents, a rate in increase of 1 cent above the 1918-19 price.

"Again the President refused to take any action. Therefore a resolution was introduced in Congress setting forth the President's position and anticipating the condition which now exists—namely, conscienceless prices.

"The Agriculture Committee was asked to look into the matter. I was chairman of the subcommittee. I held hearings. Later I framed a bill authorizing the President to buy the crop and to license refiners and dealers in sugar. Again he refused to act, and a statement to that effect was issued from the White House. This is the history of the transaction.

"Now I shall present the consequences. The Attorney General, acting, in my opinion, without authority of the law, told Louisiana refiners of cane sugar that they might charge 18 cents for their product and it would not be considered profiteering.

"Naturally the Cubans, realizing that the price of 18 cents had been placed on the product here, began to raise the price for their product until the last information I have had from the President of the Cuban Republic is that Cuban raw sugar is being sold for 14 cents a pound in Cuba, whereas we bought it for 4½ cents last year.

"Not only that, but as stated and stated by me on the floor of the Senate, foreign nations have entered the Cuban market and from statistics supplied me by the Cuban people they have taken almost one-third of the crop.

BIG PROFITS FROM SUGAR.

"The refiner is charging more for refining than he did last year by practically 100 per cent. I suppose the broker and retailer are taking a big profit, until now sugar is being sold from a wide spread of from 20 to 30 cents per pound. Our beet-sugar crop does not come in until October, and I am afraid during the canning season that sugar will go up higher.

"I do not know what Congress can do. The President has the old food-control bill which he can act under, and which he did in 1918. He has what is called the McNary bill, passed in 1919, again reciting his power, giving him power to purchase, and power to license, and power to control, and power to set prices, but he does not act. I have given up a tremendous lot of time in the hope that something might be done, and worked days to get the bill through Congress, only to have it overthrown by a stubborn and short-sighted Executive.

"More money has been wasted by reason of the excessive price on sugar for this year than it cost to run the Government before the war, and that was in excess of \$1,000,000,000."

RECLASSIFICATION OF SALARIES.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the discussion which has been going on here with regard to the postal employees. I am hopeful that in the near future something may be done to readjust the salaries of those servants of the people. I am inclined to believe that something will be done regarding the postal employees, and I sincerely hope so. One reason for my hope is that those employees as a rule vote, and there is an election coming on, and that may be some spur to activity in regard to them. I hope it will prove such a spur.

I wish, however, to call attention to another class of employees who generally do not vote, and see if I can not in some way arouse some interest in their behalf.

On the 12th of March the Joint Commission on the Reclassification of Salaries of Federal Employees in the District of Columbia made its report and at the same time reported a bill for the purpose of putting its work into operation. There is no question that the Federal employees in the District of Columbia are unfairly treated. There is no question that the service of

the Government in the District is suffering because of this unfair treatment. Hundreds and thousands of these employees are leaving the service because they can not support themselves on the meager salaries which they are receiving. The result of it is that these active, progressive employees who can find employment elsewhere are seeking it and the Government service is suffering accordingly.

This is a matter of prime importance. The commission has made its report. It reported a bill at the same time and, so far as I am advised, neither has received the slightest consideration.

I desire to state also that there are other thousands of employees throughout the country to whose interest no attention is being paid by anyone connected with Congress, so far as I know. The Joint Commission on the Reclassification of Salaries of Federal Employees in the District of Columbia related only to those employees and the other commission related only to postal employees throughout the country, but there are the other thousands from whom I am receiving letters from all sections of the country who are pleading that something may be done for their relief. I think there is not a Senator here who does not believe that they are justly entitled to some relief, and I trust while this matter is being brought to the attention of the Senate something may be done regarding the postal employees, something with respect to Federal employees in the District of Columbia, and that we may then take up this other great army of employees who demand, and justly demand, relief. They are not making an assault upon the Treasury of the United States, but they are simply asking for justice, that they may serve their country faithfully and efficiently.

Mr. PHELAN. May I ask the Senator from New Mexico if the report of the commission has been filed?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The commission's report was filed on the 12th of March. It also presented a bill at the same time, which the commission hoped might be acted upon by Congress; and it reported a scheme of reclassification and readjustment of salaries that it was hoped might be put into operation.

Mr. PHELAN. That is in relation to the postal employees?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It relates to the Federal employees in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PHELAN. Not the postal employees?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Not the postal employees. There has been considerable discussion this morning regarding the postal employees, and the hope has been expressed that something will be done regarding them before the close of this session of Congress.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] made the remarkable observation that the Federal Government is suffering by reason of the fact that the Federal service is no longer attractive to energetic and active men, and that he would advise those now in the service, since there is an opportunity to find employment elsewhere, to leave the service.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the Senator unintentionally misquotes me. I did not say the Government was no longer responsive to the needs of the public service. I think the Government is as responsive now as it ever was. What I said was that the average man and woman is better off in private life than in public service.

Mr. PHELAN. I understood the Senator to say that he would advise his friends in the service to abandon it for these reasons.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; every man and woman who writes me asking my advice gets that reply. I think they owe it to themselves, especially if they have initiative, to develop it in private life because it is difficult to do so in the public service.

Mr. PHELAN. I am sure the Senator has no serious intention of trying to break down the Federal service.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly not. There is always an army of applicants ready for the places which become vacant.

Mr. PHELAN. If the Senator seeks to obtain good service for the Federal Government, one of the means by which the service could be improved would be by making it more attractive and increasing the pay, for instance, of deserving employees of the Post Office Department.

Mr. THOMAS. What advance would the Senator suggest?

Mr. PHELAN. I have been waiting for the report of the commission, not desiring to anticipate it; but I know, and the Senator knows, that the service is demoralized, because men are seeking and accepting employment elsewhere.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator knows, too, that the advance will only be to meet the high cost of living, and will remain at about that level. Does the Senator think that an improvement which would prove attractive to the ordinary man or woman endowed with ordinary American initiative?

Mr. PHELAN. Whereas there is great call for men in all branches of work, I suppose those who are attached to the service of the Post Office Department would like to remain if the conditions of life were made tolerable for them by the Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Following the thought suggested by the Senator, is it not undoubtedly true that a large number of these men are hunting for other work and are wanting to get out because they simply can not live on the present pay, the Government pay now being below the pay for similar work in private life?

Mr. PHELAN. That is true, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have just returned from my own home and I find that the same kind of work, work requiring the same capacity, is receiving in private occupations 50 per cent more than these people are getting.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I should like to put myself in the position of one in common with my colleagues who are seeking a means and a method by which we can keep these people in the Government service. We are charged with the duty of making employment sufficiently attractive to hold experienced men in the service. So it is more than a question of meeting the high cost of living. That is a temporary matter. We can reach that by a bonus, perhaps; but the Federal Government does not adequately compensate its employees in both the high positions and the low positions. A commission should seriously consider readjusting salaries.

During the war many were attracted to the service of the Government for patriotic reasons. Now, when there is no great emergency which calls upon them to sacrifice their private interests, we should be able to hold in the Shipping Board, for instance, and in the great departments men capable and experienced. The whole service has deteriorated since the war, which during the war showed great efficiency.

The postal employees, I know of my own knowledge, are inadequately compensated. I consider that they are the connecting link between the manufacturer and the customer, between the producer and the consumer. It is an agency of the highest value to the people, and I think the administration will stand the highest in history—as the most efficient—which carefully maintains its Postal Service as among its most useful activities.

We have just provided for speed by making an appropriation of \$1,400,000 for conveying letters across the country by airplane. We must not in this age of speed forget the necessary work of distribution in the great cities by carriers, and maintain a standard of adequate pay and living conditions just and fair to the rank and file alike.

EUROPEAN FOOD CONDITIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I will occupy the attention of the Senate for a moment if I may be permitted to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORAH. A few days ago I called attention to a statement of one of our leading financiers, who is advising the Congress to appropriate \$500,000,000 with which to do charity work in Europe. I was of the opinion then that the necessity for such an appropriation was greatly exaggerated, to say nothing of the constitutional difficulties. Since that time I have received a letter from the president of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, of Philadelphia, Mr. Samuel M. Vauclain, who has just returned from a 10 or 12 weeks' trip in Europe, during which he traveled throughout central Europe, visiting most of the countries which were most directly affected by the recent war. In this letter he says:

I have just returned from an extensive tour of this district and take pleasure in sending you a printed copy of a confidential letter in connection therewith which I sent to my works.

I am opposed to appropriating any more money for relief purposes and am in favor of removal from Europe of all our various representatives excepting those which of necessity must remain for military or governmental purposes.

The manufacturers of the United States should be placed in a position that will enable them to extend credit for a period of years to the various industries of central and southeastern Europe to assist these wonderful peoples by their own effort and industry to rehabilitate their countries and assume their rightful places among nations.

In an interview which he gave to the Public Ledger, of Philadelphia, upon his return home, he said:

"Prices on all foodstuffs will come down after a while," said Mr. Vauclain. "Wages will have to come down, too. Wheat prices will come down fast when grain can be imported from Europe. When the seven or eight years' crop that is being stored in Siberia can be exported the effect on the prices here will be something awful. Wheat, I think, will be one of the first things to drop in price."

"Crop conditions are wonderful all over Europe. In Serbia I saw some of the most beautiful fields of grain and herds of cattle that I have ever seen in my life. The outlook for good crops is excellent in every country in Europe."

The political aspect in Poland, according to Mr. Vauclain, is excellent. In his opinion it will be only a matter of a few years when that country will have paid its debts to the outside world.

The sugar shortage, judging from Mr. Vauclain's remarks, is confined almost solely to the United States. In every European country, except England, he said, sugar is plentiful.

Mr. Vauclain did not visit Russia on account of "diplomatic reasons." From what he could learn, however, he does not believe that the conditions in that country are as black as they are painted, and is confident that Russia will recover its stability soon.

Since receiving that letter I have had the pleasure of an interview with Mr. Vauclain, and it is exhilarating to talk with a man who sees Europe as it really is, who has been on the ground and actually observed, and is faithfully reporting, in my judgment, the conditions that there obtain. I repeat what I said the other day, that what we need is to restore business relations as rapidly as practicable with all of the countries of Europe.

There is a plentiful food supply in Europe. There is, of course, a breakdown in their transportation system, which prevents the distribution of the food supply as effectually as desired, and as it ought to be had; but, outside of that, the conditions in Europe are by no means so bad as they have been supposed to be.

Dr. Alonzo Engelbert Taylor, of the University of Pennsylvania, upon May 16 said:

Americans are largely wasting their sympathy when they talk of destitute, hungry women and children in Europe. There are not any. We might save our sympathy for America, where the food situation is not much better than abroad. Either Americans are becoming hysterical in their desire to aid everyone or else the people here are being imposed upon.

Europe is producing more foodstuffs to-day than ever before in its history. There is an abundance of food on hand to last until October, when, according to the present outlook, food will be more plentiful there than in America.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, that there are places in Europe where there is a lack of a proper supply of food; in the districts where contention and strife are still going on and in those districts which it is difficult to reach by transportation, I have no doubt there is a want of food; but the conditions which have been presented to the Senate by some of those who feel so desirous of appropriating money for the purpose of taking care of the situation, in my judgment, do not exist. If we can restore our business relations and connect up the commercial lines between those countries and the United States, there will be no necessity for our appropriating \$500,000,000 to be used for charitable purposes. Mr. Vauclain told me of an interview which he had with the Queen of Roumania, which I do not feel entirely at liberty to repeat, but it would seem that the people of Europe who are responsible as its rulers and governors are not asking for charity. They are asking for a restoration of business relations and for a certain amount of confidence until they can demonstrate their capacity to take care of themselves.

HIGH PRICES AND CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 366. I do not think there is any opposition to it, and it certainly should not take a very long time to act upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the resolution is one coming over from a preceding day, and the Senator from Massachusetts is entitled to have it taken up under the rule.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 366) submitted by Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, on the 18th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to appoint a select committee of five Senators, three from the majority and two from the minority, to investigate and report to the Senate the relation between high prices for necessities and the concentration of wealth, and for this purpose the President is hereby requested to permit such committee to inspect the tax returns of any corporation, association, or partnership in accordance with section 257 of the revenue act of 1913.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that if the proposed investigation for which the resolution provides is to amount to anything, of necessity it would call for the expenditure of some money; and if that is the case the resolution would have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate under the law before it could be acted upon by the Senate. Does the Senator have any objection to having the resolution referred to that committee?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Certainly not; because I can well appreciate that any investigation would be useless if money were not furnished with which to conduct it.

Mr. SMOOT. The law itself, not the rule of the Senate, requires wherever there is to be an expenditure of money from the

contingent fund of the Senate that the resolution calling for such expenditure shall go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I urge upon the chairman of the committee to give the matter as early attention as possible?

Mr. SMOOT. I am a member of the committee, and I shall call it to the attention of the Chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar may be dispensed with. I will say that I make the request in order that the conference report on the water-power bill may be considered.

Mr. PHELAN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. PHELAN. My objection arises from the fact that, the session being limited, we will not reach the bills on the calendar if we abandon the morning hour on Monday, which is set aside for their consideration.

RESTORATION OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first business on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) defining a peace treaty which shall insure to the people of the United States the attainment of the ends for which they entered the war, and declaring the policy of our Government to meet fully obligations to ourselves and to the world, was announced as first in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be transferred on the calendar from Rule VIII to Rule IX.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, before that is done I desire to say that I am not sure about the wishes of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] in regard to the resolution, whether he might want to call it up and possibly offer amendments to it in case his other resolution shall meet with an Executive veto. I should rather have him on the floor when the request is made.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I withdraw the request. I thought that the so-called Knox resolution having passed the Senate there was no real necessity for having Senate resolution 76 remain on the calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If this were the same resolution, there would not be any such necessity, but the Senator from Pennsylvania introduced several resolutions on the same subject, and the Senator from Utah will remember that the one which was passed was amended in the committee, and I am not sure of the identity of the resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I withdraw my request, and merely ask that the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

BUSINESS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 529) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 600) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

STEAMER "MAYFLOWER."

The bill (S. 1223) for the relief of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower* and for the relief of passengers on board said steamer was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this bill is similar to other bills which have already been passed. It is permissive only, and merely allows the parties interested to file claim for damages in the United States district court.

Mr. SMOOT. It does not make a direct appropriation?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It does not, I will say to the Senator, but is only permissive. Several bills of a similar character have been passed, but for some reason this one has been held up.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I will not object.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the fact that the bill provides that if there shall be a decree finding the sum due, the money is appropriated by the bill to pay it.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, of course, the Senator from Massachusetts must either allow that provision to be stricken from the bill or else let the bill go over. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that in the case of all the bills of a similar character which have been passed the provision for an appropriation to meet whatever judgment might be obtained has been stricken out, and it must be stricken out of this bill if it is to pass.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I see no objection to that provision being stricken out, and I move an amendment to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In section 1, page 2, after line 10, it is proposed to strike out "Provided further, That should damages be found to be due from the United States to the owner of said steamer *Mayflower* and her passengers, or any or either of them, the amount of the final decree or decrees therefor shall be paid out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated," and, on the same page, on line 16, after the word "Provided," to insert the word "further," so as to make the section read:

That the claim of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower* and the claims of the passengers on board said steamer arising out of a collision between said steamer and the U. S. submarine *L-10* in President Roads, Boston Harbor, on the 11th day of August, 1917, for and on account of the losses alleged to have been suffered in said collision by the owner of said steamer *Mayflower* through damage to and detention of said steamer *Mayflower*, and by the passengers on said steamer by reason of personal injuries sustained in said collision, may be submitted to the United States court for the district of Massachusetts, the district in which said collision occurred, under and in compliance with the rules of said court sitting as a court of admiralty: *Provided*, That the said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the whole controversy and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of the legal damages sustained by reason of said collision, if any shall be found to be due, either for or against the United States, upon the same principle and measure of liability with costs as in like cases in admiralty between private parties with the same rights of appeal: *Provided further*, That such suit shall be brought and commenced within four months after the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 174) for the relief of Emma H. Ridley was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1722) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 168) to create a commission to investigate and report to Congress a plan on the questions involved in the financing of house construction and home ownership and Federal aid therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2224) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1660) to provide a division of tuberculosis in, and an advisory council for, the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

LIBRARY INFORMATION SERVICE.

The bill (S. 2457) to provide for a library information service in the Bureau of Education was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if he has not concluded that he can now remove his objection to this bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that as the bill is drawn it simply requires a duplication of work which is absolutely unnecessary. I have talked to a number of persons interested in this bill, and have called their attention to that fact. They have left my office, many of them, stating that they would study the bill, and if they found it to be as I suggested they would either send me a proposed amendment to the bill or they would say nothing more about it. Up to the present time I have not received any suggestions as to how the duplication of work would be done away with.

I recognize that there is a necessity for this class of legislation, but we do not want to pass legislation that will interfere with the Superintendent of Documents at the Government Printing Office and bring about the duplication of work that would follow from the passage of this particular bill, and it is for that reason that I ask that it go over.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am glad to get the Senator's suggestions. It seems to me that the bill has a great deal of merit. It proposes to make every public library in the country an information bureau to the citizens about the activities of their Government, and I am sure that if that is done the Members of Congress will be relieved of a great many inquiries that are made of them from time to time at present and about which people could be informed by going to the library. I hope the Senator will agree that the action of the committee, which was unanimous in this matter, is in the public interest, and will support the measure after the proposed amendment is suggested.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware that a few of the principal libraries of the United States would be greatly benefited by the passage of a bill of this character, even though the duplication of work were taken out of the bill; but I will say that under the law the great majority of the libraries of the United States now receive every public document that is printed, and I have been appealed to by many of them to stop having them sent, because they have not the room for them.

I have not any doubt but that the libraries in Boston and New York and some of the larger centers could make use, and have made use, of the information that has been sent to them in the past. I want to assure the Senator from Massachusetts that I recognize that fact, and I recognize the wisdom of passing a bill of this kind perhaps, if we confine it to the libraries that make application for the documents, or if we confine it to such documents and publications as are not sent them under existing law.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The trouble now is that this information is not catalogued or indexed. A pamphlet is sent to-day and another one to-morrow. The purpose of this bill is to inform the librarians of just what these documents are, how useful they can be made to the patrons of the library, and direct them in disseminating the information they contain.

Mr. SMOOT. If we pass the printing bill, which I hope will be passed at some time or other, almost all of the reasons for the passage of this bill will be eliminated. I recognize, however, that that bill has not become a law, and really I do not know when it is going to become a law, because I find that it is a mighty hard thing to pass a law through Congress if it is going to save any money to the Treasury of the United States; and if we can pass that bill it will save about a million dollars a year to the Treasury.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that a number of persons have been to see me in regard to this bill, and have suggested that the duty should devolve upon the Congressional Library here in the city of Washington. I have no opinion on the subject, but I merely invite the Senator's attention to it. They say that they have the personnel fully equipped to discharge the duties which this bill would impose upon another department of the Government.

I have no opinion on the matter myself, and I merely challenge the attention of the Senator to the suggestions which have been made to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection having been made, the bill will be passed over.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 131) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over. The matter has been cared for in other bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1448) for the relief of Jacob Nice was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 172) for the selection of a special committee to investigate the administration of the office of the Alien Property Custodian was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2785) to provide aid from the United States for the several States in prevention and control of drug addiction and the care and treatment of drug addicts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) directing the Court of Claims to investigate claims for damages growing out of the riot of United States negro soldiers at Houston, Tex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2672) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2444) to create the commission on rural and urban home settlement was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3201) fixing the salary of the district attorney for the eastern district of New York was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3224) relating to the creation in the Army of the United States of the grade of lieutenant general was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 215) providing that whenever the United States becomes a member of the League of Nations this Government should present to the council or the assembly of the league the state of affairs in Ireland and the right of its people to self-government was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3090) to repeal the espionage act was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over. It is adversely reported, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2707) for the relief of Ellen M. Willey, widow of Owen S. Willey, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 848) to reimburse Isaiah Stephens, postmaster at McMechen, Marshall County, W. Va., for money and postage stamps stolen, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3109) to amend section 26 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that may go over to-day, as the whole subject is being considered in another bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1455) for the relief of John L. O'Mara was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2954) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Albert F. Smith, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3152) for the relief of George W. Mellinger was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1453) for the relief of Adolph F. Hitchler was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to investigate and report upon the available sources of water supply for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, an appropriation has already been made for that purpose in the water-power bill, and we hope the conference report on that bill will be considered within the next few days. I therefore ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2822) making available additional moneys for the reclamation fund, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it will be impossible to pass that bill before 2 o'clock. Therefore I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 139) repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3746) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3747) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6639) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7775) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3395) to discontinue the improvement to provide a channel extending from the sea to the Charleston Navy Yard was announced as next in order.

Mr. DIAL and Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3396) to discontinue the construction of a dry dock at the navy yard, Charleston, S. C., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING and Mr. DIAL. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 310) for the relief of John Murphy was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

COMPENSATION OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES.

The bill (H. R. 5726) to fix the compensation of certain employees of the United States was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "day," to insert "including any Government bonus"; on line 9, after the word "annum," to insert "including any Government bonus"; and on page 2, line 11, after the words "age of," to strike out "18" and insert "20," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That after the passage of this act the minimum compensation of any person employed by the United States or by the government of the District of Columbia shall be not less than \$3 per day, including any Government bonus; or if employed by the hour not less than 37½ cents per hour; or if employed by the month not less than \$90 per month; or if employed by the year not less than \$1,080 per annum, including any Government bonus: *Provided,* That persons employed on a monthly or annual salary basis and who regularly perform less than a full day's service shall receive compensation at the rate of not less than 37½ cents per hour: *Provided further,* That the provisions of this act shall not apply to persons enlisted in the military or naval branches of the Government nor to the employees in the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, the Territory of Hawaii, the Territory

of Alaska, and the Panama Canal Zone, nor to persons holding appointments as postmasters, assistant postmasters, rural carriers, postal clerks, carriers in the City Delivery Service, or railway mail clerks: *Provided further,* That the provisions of this act shall apply only to those persons who shall have attained the age of 20 years: *And provided further,* That in the case of an employee receiving quarters and subsistence in addition to his compensation, the value of such quarters and subsistence shall be determined by the head of the department, and the compensation of such employees, plus the value of quarters and subsistence, shall in no event be less than the rate fixed by this act.

The amendments were 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.

*BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2292) for the relief of the William Gordon Corporation was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) to permit the payment for certain lands whereon Army supply bases are situated was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3844) to provide for discontinuing the purchase and sale of grain by the Government, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3430) fixing the salaries of certain United States attorneys and United States marshals was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

LANDS IN HAWAII.

The bill (S. 3461) to provide for the exchange of Government lands for privately owned lands in the Territory of Hawaii was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, when in his opinion the public good demands it, to exchange any land or any interest in land owned by the United States now or hereafter set apart for military purposes in the Territory of Hawaii for privately owned land or any interest therein of equal value located in that Territory and selected by the Secretary of War, and thereafter to set apart for military purposes the lands or interest therein so acquired: *Provided,* That the Attorney General of the United States shall first pass upon and approve the title to the privately owned lands or interest therein to be acquired by the United States before any exchange of lands shall be made under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. That the value of the lands or interests to be so exchanged shall be determined by three appraisers, one of whom shall be appointed by the Secretary of War, one by the owner of the private property, and the third shall be chosen by the two appraisers so appointed. The expense necessary to effect the appraisements herein authorized, when approved by the military commander of the Hawaiian Department, may be paid out of the current appropriations for contingencies of the Army.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator reporting the bill is in the Chamber, and I would like to ask him whether he knows what lands are involved, whether it is a general bill to be passed without a real necessity for it at this time, or whether it is to take care of some particular situation existing in the Hawaiian Islands now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is to take care of a situation existing at this time in the Hawaiian Islands. It is to effect an exchange of lands without cost to the Government. The Government will get lands it wants and give up lands it does not want. That is the effect of it.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that is the effect of it, but I was wondering whether it is really intended to take care of a situation at Honolulu or in the Island of Oahu.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is in the Territory of Hawaii, as the bill describes in line 7, page 1, and it affects lands only which are now or which may hereafter be set apart for military purposes in the Territory of Hawaii. The War Department informed the committee that the exchange would be to the great advantage of the Government. There is some land which the Government owns which is very desirable for private ownership and some lands which private parties own which will be very desirable for Government ownership. The values are about alike, and they want to make a trade.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 8078) to regulate the importation of coal-tar products, to promote the establishment of the manufacture thereof in the United States, and, as incident thereto, to amend the act of September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. I presume that had better go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3944) to create a Federal live-stock commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3928) relating to the ships acquired from Germany, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9281) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 10515) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1853) to reimburse E. T. Thing and S. A. Thing for losses and damages sustained by them by the negligent dipping of their cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3725) authorizing the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Capt. David McD. Shearer for compensation for the adoption and use and acquisition by the United States Government of his patented inventions was announced as next in order.

Mr. NUGENT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1391) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt National Park was announced as next in order.

Mr. NUGENT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5218) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of magnesite ores and manufactures thereof in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7785) to provide revenue for the Government, to establish and maintain in the United States the manufacture of laboratory glassware, laboratory porcelain ware, optical glass, scientific and surgical instruments was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The 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, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7705) to amend section 339 of the tariff act of October 3, 1913, in respect to the tariff on buttons of steel and pearl was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4437) to provide revenue for the Government and to promote the production of tungsten ores and manufactures thereof in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

WALTER I. WHITTY.

The bill (S. 2989) for the relief of Walter I. Whitty was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, may I inquire whether there was an objection made to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. THOMAS. I objected to it; but I will withdraw the objection.

Mr. ROBINSON. It was discussed in the Senate on a former occasion, upon the objection of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. I merely want to say that I would like to have the bill considered, if the Senator will withdraw his objection.

Mr. THOMAS. I will withdraw the objection.

Mr. KING. I would like to say to the Senator that since I objected to the consideration of the bill I have received a communication from the Compensation Board, and likewise a written statement, which was submitted at my request, and from the statements made to me it would seem that the bill ought not to be passed; that it would be a very bad precedent.

Mr. SMOOT. If would involve a great many other cases, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. I merely want to say, Mr. President, that the bill has a favorable report from the Surgeon General and from the Secretary of War. Of course, the question of policy involved in the bill is one for the determination of the Senate, and I realize that under the rule under which we are proceeding I can not insist upon a further discussion of the matter, if the Senator objects.

Mr. KING. I would like to say to the Senator that I intended to bring that report here this morning. I shall hand it to the Senator, and if he still insists that the bill should be taken up, I shall withdraw objection; but I shall vote against the bill. I shall not object to taking the judgment of the Senate upon it.

Mr. SMOOT. I take it for granted that the junior Senator from Utah has received the same information I have received, and if the information I have is correct, and I get it from the department, of course it will open the door for all sorts of claims, amounting to a greater expenditure than I or anyone else can estimate.

Mr. ROBINSON. Of course, I am not in possession of the information to which the Senators from Utah refer, and I am not in a position to pass upon the value of that information without having seen it. I suggest that it might be well for them to put it in the Record, if they care to do so, or furnish me with a copy of it. I do not know of any other way to get it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being objection, the bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3139) for the purchase of land adjoining Fort Bliss, Tex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 10918) to provide revenue and encourage domestic industries by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6238) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of zinc ores and manufactures thereof in the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 4166) to provide for election contests in the Senate of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SALE OF TIMBER ON POWER-SITE LANDS.

The bill (S. 3763) regulating the disposition of lands formerly embraced in the grants to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and Coos Bay Wagon Road Co. was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the act approved June 9, 1916 (39 Stats. L., p. 218), revesting title in the United States to the lands formerly granted to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. remaining unsold July 1, 1913, and the act approved February 26, 1919 (40 Stats. L., p. 1179), authorizing the United States to accept from the Southern Oregon Co. a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell the timber on lands classified and withdrawn as power-site lands in such manner and at such times as he is now authorized to sell the timber from lands classified as timber lands: *Provided*, That if a valid claim for a preferred right of homestead entry is shown to exist, in accordance with the terms of section 5 of said act of June 9, 1916, or a preference right of purchase or entry under section 3 of said act of February 26, 1919, for lands thus classified and withdrawn, it may be exercised therefor, as provided in section 2 hereof.

Sec. 2. That the lands embraced in homestead entries or sales authorized by the proviso to section 1 hereof shall be subject to disposition as water-power sites upon the compensation of the owner of the land for actual damages sustained by the loss of his improvements thereon, through the use of the land for water-power purposes, such damages to be ascertained and awarded under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior; and the rights reserved under this section shall be expressly stated in the patent.

Sec. 3. That the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 31, 1918 (40 Stats. L., p. 393), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange for lands in private ownership lands formerly embraced in the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co.," as amended in section 4 of this act, shall be extended to the lands reconveyed to the United States under the terms of said act of February 26, 1919, and authorize the exchange of lands embraced therein in like manner and for the same purpose.

Sec. 4. That said act of May 31, 1918, is hereby so amended as to require the applicant for exchange to pay a filing fee of \$1 each to the register and receiver for each 160 acres or fraction thereof of the public lands embraced in proposed selections, whether now pending or hereafter tendered.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (H. R. 13229) to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. It will be impossible to consider this bill in the moment of time left of the morning hour, and for that reason I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 64) to establish military justice was announced as next in order.

Mr. MYERS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2) to pension soldiers of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition, was announced as next in order.

Mr. NEW. It is very evident that we can not get anywhere in the consideration of this bill in the one minute of time which remains of the morning hour; that is, if there is anyone who cares to speak further on it. The bill has been twice under consideration in the Senate. I do not know whether anyone cares to speak on the bill. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] was interested in it and I think at one time expressed to me a desire to say something further on it before it came up for final passage. I would like to know if he is still of that mind?

Mr. KING. Yes, I will say to the Senator, and I have several amendments to offer to it.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 13587.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13587) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, just prior to adjournment on Saturday last the reading of the bill was completed and the last amendment passed over until this morning. That amendment reads:

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Col. William C. Brown, United States Army (retired), to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list.

Of course, if a point of order is made against the amendment, it will go out. I shall occupy a very brief space of time before such point is presented, if it is to be made, addressing myself to the merits of the amendment, although its purpose is obvious from the recital.

Col. Brown is now upon the retired list, and is therefore ineligible for further promotion or official consideration except as provided by this amendment, which, while it might be more appropriate upon some other measure, has been offered and accepted here largely because of my inability to secure its recognition in the omnibus bill of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], which was designed to and did cover other similar cases, and which has recently become a law.

The omnibus bill to which I refer, among others, included the case of Col. William A. Simpson, a case largely similar to that of Col. Brown, and perhaps more analogous to it than any of the other various measures of relief of this sort which have been favorably considered by the Congress. It is thus referred to in the committee report:

Senate bill 2488—

Which was the omnibus bill—

provided that the President should be authorized to promote Col. William A. Simpson to the grade of brigadier general. Col. Simpson entered West Point as a cadet in 1871 and graduated four years later. On February 11, 1918, he was retired, after more than 46 years of active service, but was immediately called into active service and assigned to duty as adjutant of the Eastern Department, serving in that post during the war with Germany. It appears upon the records

before the committee that in 1898 Col. Simpson, then a major, was taken from duty with troops and assigned to The Adjutant General's Department. In that department promotion was slow, and although he rendered very valuable service many officers of the line junior to him reached higher rank than he did. It is for the purpose of giving him the rank he would have reached had he not been assigned to The Adjutant General's Department that this is proposed.

Col. Brown was recommended for promotion to the rank of brigadier general immediately prior to his having reached the retirement age, and his misfortune is that he was born a little too soon to receive the full meed of recognition which his service requires. It is also unfortunate that this gentleman, whose record is of the best, should not have received the same distinction which in another bill has been conferred upon an equally gallant and deserving officer.

If the Senate will bear with me for a moment, I will briefly refer to this officer's record, which, I think, will be recognized as exceptional.

He has served continuously upon the active list for over 45 years. He participated in two Indian campaigns, in the Spanish-American War, in the Philippine insurrection, in the Mexican punitive expedition, and was under fire in all of them; he has been brevetted for gallantry in action against hostile Indians. He served in France in the war against Germany for over a year, and has been cited for exceptionally meritorious and conspicuous service in such war. Before retirement he was recommended for promotion to the grade of brigadier general.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think it was at my suggestion, or upon my inquiry, that this item went over on Saturday.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to say to the Senator that I am entirely satisfied with the statement the Senator has made, and the statement that the Senator has in his hand, which I have examined.

Mr. THOMAS. I am very greatly obliged to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will make no objection to it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I would not want the Senator to stop his argument on the strength of the statement of the Senator from Washington. I am satisfied with the merits of the case, but I shall feel constrained to make a point of order, as I am informed that if this goes on without a point of order there are a number of cases that will be offered here on the floor. I have just been informed of one or two of them, and in accordance with what I have done in the past I shall have to make the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. If there are other cases as meritorious as this I think they ought to be included in the bill. The crowning difficulty with cases of this kind is their unquestioned merit, coupled with the inability of the department to recognize them except by further congressional legislation.

Of course, if the Senator from Wisconsin feels it to be his duty to make the point of order the amendment will be stricken out. There is no question about that. But I appeal to the Senator to consider that this is a case in which 45 or nearly 46 years of constant, active, dangerous, and recognized service has been rendered by one of the finest officers who ever wore the uniform of the United States Army; that he performed the last year of his service in France, and as a result of it his chief, Gen. Harbord, one of the greatest of the officers developed in that greatest of all wars, took occasion to specifically make this recommendation. The recommendation was supported by that of other officers, notably Gen. Kuhn, also thoroughly familiar with the character and the extent of the service rendered. Under these circumstances I venture to appeal to the sense of justice of my friend from Wisconsin and ask him to allow this matter to go to conference.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, it is certainly not an agreeable task for one to make a point of order upon a private bill that is very meritorious. It does not seem to me that it is fair to other cases, which may be equally meritorious, to violate the rules of the Senate by giving preference to one and shutting out others. It is not very long since I made a point of order on a very meritorious bill under similar circumstances, and I think that officer would have very good grounds for complaint against me if I made the point of order in his case, as I did make it, and decline to make it in another case, certainly not any more meritorious, in my judgment.

There is no objection whatever to the passage of the bill as a separate bill, a private bill, and if it is as meritorious as the Senator says—and I do not question that it is—it seems to me there ought not to be any difficulty in securing the passage of the bill through the Senate and through the House as well, without placing it as a rider upon an appropriation bill. If we are going to begin to set a precedent for putting private bills on

appropriation bills, then the Senator can readily see where our appropriation bills are going to come to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDGE in the chair.) Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, this is not the precedent. It has many precedents of similar character to justify it. I have no doubt that a special bill would pass this body at once, but I think the Senator is mistaken in his estimate of the possibilities of securing its consideration at this session of Congress by the House.

Mr. LENROOT. I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin makes a point of order as against lines 9, 10, 11, and 12, page 75, of the bill under consideration. The presiding officer, under Rule XVI, of the standing rules of the Senate, must decide that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may the deferred amendments be taken up in their order? There were some that were passed over on Saturday.

The READING CLERK. The first amendment passed over is, on page 7, line 14, after the word "records" to insert a comma and the following words:

And for the employment of clerical help required to furnish to the adjutants general of the several States statements of service of all persons from those States who entered the military service during the war with Germany, is hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1921, for all expenses, including the employment of clerical and other help in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army, necessary for the completion and preservation of the selective-service records and the completion of the work of furnishing statements of service to adjutants general of States: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be disbursed by such officer as may be designated by the Secretary of War for the purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is interested in that amendment, and he informed me a few moments ago that he was compelled to be out of the Chamber for a little while. He will be back in a short time, and I ask that the amendment be temporarily laid aside until his return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New York if he would just as lief turn to page 39 of the bill and take up an amendment at that point in which I am interested? I am a member of a conference committee, and I should like to have the amendment disposed of, if that course is agreeable to the Senator from New York, before I am called upon to attend the meeting of the conferees. The amendment to which I refer—on page 39—was passed over on last Saturday. It covers an item which was estimated for by the War Department and which the House accepted after the estimate had been reduced by the House Committee on Appropriations, but the Senate committee has reported to strike it out. The clause reads:

Provided, That not to exceed the following sums may be used in the erection and completion of buildings enumerated at the places named—\$404,256 for motor training-school buildings at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; \$600,000 for construction of officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters and the repair and remodeling of such existing buildings as may be available for such quarters at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

I may state to the Senate that when the Army appropriation bill was before the Senate for consideration a year ago I was about to offer an amendment providing for the construction of these buildings, when I asked the chairman of the committee the following question:

I desire to ask the chairman a question with reference to an item which was sent up by the War Department. It asks for an appropriation of \$383,000 for the building of a mechanical repair shop at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. I ask the chairman if the item requested by the department can be taken care of out of the lump-sum appropriation for barracks and quarters, water supply—

And so forth.

The Senator from New York replied:

It is my opinion that it can be taken care of out of the item for barracks and quarters, water, sewers, roads, walks, and drainage.

So I did not offer the amendment, because, although the department had asked for the appropriation, the opinion was expressed by the chairman of the committee that the sum needed for the purpose indicated would be available from a lump-sum appropriation; but afterwards it was held by The Adjutant General, I think, that under section 1136 of the Revised Statutes the lump-sum appropriation could not be used for that purpose. So this year when the bill was under consideration an appropriation was asked for and was granted by the House of Representatives. For some reason, however, the Senate committee has seen fit to eliminate the provision.

The buildings referred to are greatly needed at Fort Leavenworth. In the construction of the motor training school buildings old material now on hand at the fort may be used, prison labor may be employed, and the buildings can thereby be erected at a saving of several hundred thousand dollars. It seems to me it would be economy to erect the buildings at this time. I think the chairman of the committee will admit that the buildings are greatly needed. The War Department desired the appropriation, and, after careful consideration, the item was inserted in the other House. I hope the Senate committee amendment will not be agreed to. That is all I desire to say at this time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the Chief of the Construction Division, Gen. Marshall, came before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate to defend the items in this bill, his department being interested, and there were also laid before the committee recommendations of a similar character emanating from other branches of the War Department—I mean by that, recommendations involving the erection of permanent buildings at Army posts and cantonments. The list is a very long one, and, if all the recommendations were acceded to, many millions of dollars would be required.

On examining the different recommendations and the different proposed projects, the committee was unable to determine why this particular provision was the only one authorized by the other House. The conditions at Leavenworth with respect to motor training facilities and quarters for officers and noncommissioned officers are not nearly so difficult or inconvenient as at many other places. The Senate will note that the appropriation of \$600,000 in this instance is asked for the construction of officers' and noncommissioned officers' quarters at Fort Leavenworth. That is a large sum of money to be spent at this time on permanent construction. We have examined the reasons given, and which the Senator has set forth, for this proposed appropriation, and we found the reasons to be about as follows: Fort Leavenworth is the site of the school of the line or the service school. There are a number of noncommissioned officers stationed there on duty at the school. My recollection is that the total number is about 52; that something over 30 of them have quarters provided now in the post; and there are something like 12 or 15 men who live outside the reservation in town and come in and go out each morning and each afternoon. Their quarters are commuted for them. Of the officers I think something like 50 out of several score have to do the same thing, and their quarters are also commuted for them by the Government under the law. The situation does not constitute an emergency.

It is true that there is a certain degree of inconvenience for the small number of men involved, but the Senate committee thought we might postpone the spending of \$600,000, especially as there are many other places at which the Army is stationed where conditions are infinitely worse. I can name one close at hand. At the Army War College in Washington, as Senators know, there are officers' quarters, though there are not many of them. A large number of officers are on duty at the Army War College, but the quarters at the Washington Barracks, next to which the War College is situated, are utterly incapable of housing more than a small percentage of the officers at the Army War College. The result is that those officers have to rent apartments and houses here in the city of Washington at very high rentals. The value of the commutation of quarters which they receive from the Government does not anywhere near pay the rent which they have to pay the owners of the apartments and the houses here in Washington. The percentage of inconvenience at Washington Barracks is infinitely greater than it is at Leavenworth, and yet we do not find anything in this appropriation bill which has been passed by the House which does anything for Washington Barracks. As a matter of fact, in going through these projects proposed by the General Staff and submitted to the committees by the chief of construction it actually seemed to us that the Leavenworth item was the one which ought to be attended to last; but we declined to act upon any of them.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that there is a shortage of barracks here in the city of Washington, but I presume additional barracks have not been erected because it is expected that many of the officers now detailed in Washington will leave here.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But others will come in their places; the War College is full all the time.

Mr. CURTIS. They ought not to; there are probably more here now than are needed. However, in view of the Senator's

statement, and in view of the fact that motor training-school buildings, involving an expenditure of \$404,256, can be erected at this time by utilizing material on hand and employing prison labor and other available labor at the school, resulting in an estimated saving of about \$300,000, I should like to ask if the Senator will not consent to disagree to that part of the amendment ending with the word "Kansas," in line 21, and allow the remainder of the amendment to be agreed to? That would give us \$404,000 for the erection and completion of buildings for the motor training school, in connection with which old material on hand could be utilized and the prison and other labor there could be employed. The department states in its letter that there will be a saving, as I recall, of some \$300,000 if that can be done.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Do I understand that the \$404,000 appropriation is supposed to represent the cost of the proposed construction, even though prison labor is used?

Mr. CURTIS. That would be the cost if prison labor were used, but without prison labor the cost would be over \$700,000; and I wondered if the chairman of the committee would not consent to having that item remain in the bill and let the others go out for the present, in view of the policy followed by the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Kansas puts me in an embarrassing position.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not desire to do that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I know, of course, the Senator's interest in this matter, and it is quite a legitimate interest; but the committee struggled hard to save money and to keep these appropriations down.

Mr. CURTIS. I feel more interested in this than the Senator realizes, because of the fact that I was going to offer a similar amendment last year, and it was the statement of the chairman himself that prevented me from doing so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I had no idea that the Senator was going to ask for over \$400,000 for erecting a motor-training school building.

Mr. CURTIS. Three hundred and odd thousand dollars was the amount estimated at that time, but it will cost more now than it would then. I do not blame the Senator, for he thought, as I did at the time, that the buildings could be erected out of a general lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I thought the buildings for a motor-training school could be covered in an item of something like twenty or thirty thousand dollars. My recollection was that there was some rule or perhaps some statute which authorized the erection of buildings under the appropriation for "barracks and quarters," when the amount to be expended was limited, and I thought that the item in which the Senator from Kansas is interested could be taken care of in that way. My recollection is that there are nine motor transport stations over the country. There is no real emergency for this item right now.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator think that the department would have recommended the appropriation if it had not wanted it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, the department recommended estimates carrying a billion dollars; they do not care what they recommend; they estimate for and recommend anything they want. The item covered by the amendment is rather desirable, I will admit, and some day they ought to have a motor-training building at Leavenworth, probably.

Mr. CURTIS. Did not the Senator feel last year that there should be such a building at Leavenworth?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at this cost; I had no idea such an amount was involved. I had no idea that the Senator had in mind such an extensive program and elaborate program, involving the expenditure of over \$400,000, to erect permanent buildings at this time, when the Army is in a state of flux and when the Motor Transport Corps already has a training school at Holabird, in Maryland, in full blast, with 2,500 men there, and has, according to my recollection, although I am not absolutely certain, eight other depots scattered over the country similar to the one which it is proposed shall be erected on a permanent basis at Leavenworth.

Mr. CURTIS. How much does the Senator think ought to be required to erect the necessary buildings at Leavenworth?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That would be a hard question to answer, even if I could be persuaded that the buildings are necessary. I hope the Senator will not insist upon my taking one and leaving the others. They are, as I have said, not emergency items; they are desirable I will admit, but they are not emergencies.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask for a division of the amendment, so that we may have a vote, first, on the part of the amendment ending with the word "Kansas," in line 21, on page 39, which will cover the item appropriating \$404,256 for the erection of a motor-training school building or buildings. As I said a moment ago, the labor is to be performed by prison labor and much of the material is old material which now is on the ground.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Capper in the chair). The Senator from Kansas asks for a division of the question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask that the amendment be stated; I do not understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment as proposed to be divided.

The READING CLERK. The committee amendment proposes to strike out the proviso, beginning with line 17 and ending with line 24, on page 39. It is proposed to divide the question so that the vote may be taken on the first portion of the proviso, which reads as follows:

Provided, That not to exceed the following sums may be used in the erection and completion of buildings enumerated at the places named—\$404,256 for motor-training school buildings at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I should like to read merely one little paragraph from the memorandum for Gen. Hervey, Director of Operations of the General Staff:

Subject: Repair unit and shop at Fort Leavenworth.

With reference to the memorandum of the Acting Secretary of War, dated April 10, 1919, herewith, it would appear that the Acting Secretary did not thoroughly understand what the plan for building and equipping shop at Fort Leavenworth contemplated. It is recommended that the disapproval of this proposition be reconsidered and that the project be approved, or, if necessary, that it be submitted to Congress recommending approval.

Then the memorandum goes on and makes an argument for it; but it is apparent from that that the War Department itself was not convinced that it was an emergency, as the Acting Secretary of War upon one occasion disapproved it as an estimate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the first branch of the amendment and the second branch of the amendment will be voted on separately, as requested by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to clarify this matter a little. This neither increases nor diminishes the appropriation, as I understand.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, yes, Mr. President; the Senator will note that we decrease—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not the amendment as stated. The proviso is that \$404,000 may be used for that purpose. That is stricken out. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that I have had some experience with an amendment of that sort. I succeeded in securing the insertion of such an amendment at one time upon a bill of this sort, and I found afterwards that it was merely permissive, and that it did not require the department to make the appropriation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Nebraska need not worry about it; they will spend it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I did worry about the other, and they did not spend it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator wanted it spent on that occasion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I feel reasonably satisfied that the Senator from Kansas will not secure his appropriation by securing the elimination of this amendment. I inquire again of the chairman of the committee whether this changes in any way the total amount appropriated for these items?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator will notice that on line 17 the House had appropriated \$10,000,000 for barracks and quarters. The Senate committee has reduced it to \$7,500,000 and has stricken out a million dollars for the special purposes. Now, if the Senate is going to defeat the Senate amendment and restore those two Leavenworth items, we will have to raise that \$7,500,000 by a million dollars.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have not asked for any such amendment. I am asking for a separate vote on the one matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I was grouping them together. I was simply explaining the parliamentary situation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think, then, in view of what the chairman states, that I am in favor of the amendment. I believe in holding the appropriations down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the committee amendment.

On a division, the first branch of the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the second branch of the committee amendment.

The second branch of the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The READING CLERK. The first amendment passed over is on page 14, in lines 20, 21, 22, and 23, which reads as follows:

And provided further, That hereafter the Army Air Service shall control all aerial operations from land bases, and that naval aviation shall have control of all aerial operations attached to a fleet.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to perfect the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I am not opposing the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I had it printed on Saturday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 14, line 23, after the word "fleet," it is proposed to insert:

Including shore stations whose maintenance is necessary for operations connected with the fleet, for construction and experimentation, and for the training of personnel.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I understand that this is for the purpose of perfecting the original amendment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as I have just stated, I have no objection to the amendment. It makes the clause better. My objection is to the clause put in by the House, and even with the amendment I object to it.

The House provided:

That hereafter the Army Air Service shall control all aerial operations from land bases, and that naval aviation shall have control of all aerial operations attached to a fleet.

That, of course, as it stood, as it came from the House, made it simply absolutely impossible for the Navy to carry on an air service. All they were permitted to do was to command their own ships, and when they were using airships in connection with the other ships they would have control of them. It is utterly impossible to carry on naval aviation without land bases. We have six provided for in the appropriation bill. We must have bases for the hydroplanes, for the training of the men, and for all that goes with the maintenance of an air squadron.

Mr. President, I think such an arrangement can lead to nothing but dissension and trouble. If you attempt to put the men and officers of the Navy under the control of Army officers in connection with everything on shore, you create a situation which seems to me utterly impossible. I can not imagine running the military and naval departments on such a basis as that. If all the air services are to be consolidated into one, as proposed by the Senator from Indiana, that is another and very different question. This, as it stands, as it came to us from the House, simply transfers the Naval Aviation Service to the control of the Army, except while the hydroplanes are in absolute use with the fleet at sea. It did not put the ships and the hydroplanes, when at sea, under the control of the Army, but it did everything else.

That I can not conceive to be a good working arrangement. I think to put the sailors of the Navy and the officers of the Navy under the command of Army officers at all the land bases could not possibly lead to good service. I know, of course, that the Navy Department is strongly opposed to it, and I am also assured that the War Department is opposed to it. The two departments have made an arrangement between themselves, which is printed on a little leaflet that I have not here at the moment, for cooperation in air service.

I can not extend particularly the argument upon this subject, because it seems to me to argue itself. I hope that the Senate will strike out the whole provision, and let it go back to the House for reconsideration.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I have taken some little pains to ascertain the views of both the War Department and the Navy Department touching this amendment; and as they are very brief I think I will have them appear in the RECORD.

The first is a letter from the Secretary of the Navy. He says:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I thank you very much for your kind letter of April 20, regarding the clause appearing in the Army appropriation bill. Your communication reached me to-day just as I was directing a letter to the President of the Senate regarding this matter.

There can be no doubt of the impropriety of inserting such a clause as this in the Army bill. Necessarily, all naval operations must primarily start from a land base. While we hope to give naval aviation the mobility which belongs to other naval units, nevertheless in certain activities aviation will be compelled to make its start from the land. Manifestly it would be confusing, and therefore undesirable, to have

such activities controlled or interfered with by another service than the Navy.

I trust that the Senate will see fit to eliminate this clause which is included in the Army bill as it passed the House.

Attached herewith is a copy of the letter above mentioned regarding this matter, which has been addressed to the President of the Senate.

Very truly, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

This letter was written in April, but the matter has been the subject of a good deal of discussion in the Navy Department as well as in the War Department; and Assistant Secretary Roosevelt, under date of May 19, wrote me another letter in which he expresses substantially the same view. I will read it:

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of May 18, 1920, regarding a measure which has been inserted in the Army appropriation bill, and which is objectionable to the Navy.

The impropriety of including in an appropriation bill for one branch of the Government anything involving the policies of other branches of the Government would seem manifest.

And that is what they do in this case. This is a matter pertaining to the Navy. The amendment does not originate with the Naval Affairs Committee either in the House or in the Senate, but is a matter put on by the Committee on Military Affairs in the House. It seems to me that they are overstepping their particular bounds of propriety in seeking to regulate the Navy from the Army end.

Where the interests of both services have not been previously investigated, the insertion of such a clause would seem particularly objectionable.

I have invited the attention of Senator LODGE to this point, and he is in agreement regarding the impropriety of inserting the clause proposed in the Army bill. I have also discussed the matter with Secretary Baker.

I want to call especial attention to this fact, because I understand that Secretary Baker has written a letter which, it seems to me, ought to be given to us by the Senator from New York. Am I right about that? Has the Senator from New York a letter from the Secretary of War touching this matter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have.

Mr. PAGE. I understand that both the Army and the Navy are agreed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Has the Senator from New York any objection to supplying us with that letter from the Secretary of War?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not the slightest. I was going to describe, when my turn came, just how everybody felt about it.

I am not attempting to conceal what the Secretary of War feels and says. There are occasions, however, when the Committee on Military Affairs has not followed the advice of the Secretary of War.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would like very much to have the letter available, so that we can see exactly what his attitude is.

Mr. PAGE. I commence again:

I have also discussed the matter with Secretary Baker, who informs me that the clause was inserted without his knowledge, and that he is in agreement that the enactment of this legislation is undesirable.

Thanking you for your interest in this matter, and trusting that the clause in question may be eliminated from the Army appropriation act,

I am, very truly, yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Acting Secretary.

Senator C. S. PAGE,

Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

The man who perhaps knows more about this matter of aviation than any other—at any rate he is in a position to know—is Capt. Craven, director of naval aviation. It is true that Capt. Craven has had a long conference with the Senator from New York, and they have agreed in regard to this amendment, which Capt. Craven and the Senator from New York drew. It provides:

Including shore stations whose maintenance is necessary for operations connected with the fleet, for training of personnel, and for construction and experimentation.

It is true that that very much improves the bill as presented to us originally, but it does not remove the objection which I think exists properly to transferring, without the knowledge or consent of either the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, something which pertains to the naval side of this matter, and ought not to have been introduced on the military side, from my point of view. I ask to have the letter of Capt. Craven read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Georgia in the chair). Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Reading Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, May 15, 1920.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My attention has been drawn to a clause appearing in the Army appropriation bill, as agreed to recently by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, which is very detrimental to the best interests of the Navy.

This clause reads as follows:

"And provided further, That hereafter the Army Air Service shall control all aerial operations from land bases, and that naval aviation shall have control of all aerial operations attached to a fleet, including fleet shore naval air-station bases."

I deem it my duty to bring to your notice the following results of such a measure, if it should be enacted into a law:

(a) The definition of a base at once becomes an important point at issue, and the exact meaning of the law as written in the above clause, if it should be enacted, is not evident. Possibly the committee had no intention of restricting naval operations, but a rigid interpretation of the clause might prevent the Navy from projecting aviation operations from the land, which in preparation for war or in time of war would materially and improperly interfere with naval activities.

(b) If the bill is passed as framed by the committee, the future of the station now being created by the Navy at great expense in Lakehurst, N. J., for the purpose of erecting rigid dirigibles, is immediately changed. The work is now progressing under appropriations for the Navy, the rigid having been shown to be essentially a naval unit. By recent arrangements between the Army and the Navy, to avoid duplication, the development of rigid in this country has been placed in the hands of the Navy. If the only station at which erection of these large craft can be undertaken is taken out of the hands of the Navy, confusion, delay, and expense to the Government must result.

(c) The status of the Naval Aviation School, at Pensacola, becomes uncertain with the enactment of a measure such as that proposed. The reasons would seem compelling for the Navy to retain a school for teaching flying in seaplanes and the operation of these craft in connection with ships. At this school Army fliers designated to fly seaplanes are instructed. Aside from merely piloting a machine, many other details of a professional and highly technical nature and necessary for a naval aviator are taught at this place.

(d) With the enactment of this legislation, the naval air stations at Chatham, Rockaway, Cape May, Anacostia, and Coco Solo would immediately pass into the hands of the Army. These stations have been maintained by and for the Navy, and are in neighborhoods where it is deemed important that such stations should exist for naval purposes, though they may not be considered as naval bases.

Chatham is on Cape Cod, and is the only naval air station in New England. It is convenient to the naval rendezvous and to the area in which the Navy is accustomed to exercise in Cape Cod Bay.

Rockaway is off the entrance of the port of New York. It would seem unnecessary to point out the responsibility of the Navy in guarding this region, in the event of hostilities, and of the necessity for training and preparing for this work in normal times of peace in this region.

Cape May is an important station, where aviation would work in connection with submarines and other small naval craft, for guarding the entrance of the Delaware.

Anacostia is a small station for seaplanes on the edge of Bolling Field, at Washington, D. C., from which important experimental work is carried on. This work is in connection with the development of radio communication, direction finding, engineering, and ordnance features of naval aviation.

Coco Solo is a small air station in the Canal Zone, from which naval aviation projects its operations for assisting in the guarding of this important region.

At all of the above-named stations, training and development operations are carried on, essential at this time, in order to make the art of aviation useful for naval purposes.

(e) With these stations taken from the Navy, the only aviation bases remaining would be at Hampton Roads and at San Diego.

A clause of this kind, having such a wide effect upon the military and naval policies of the country, it would seem should not be enacted into legislation, without a full consideration of its results from every point of view, and therefore I deem it my duty to bring this matter to your careful attention at this time.

Very truly, yours,

THOMAS T. CRAVEN,
Captain, United States Navy,
Director of Naval Aviation.

Senator C. S. PAGE,
Chairman Naval Affairs Committee,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I want to say simply, in connection with the matter, that it has been before us now for something more than a month, and the protests which come to me from all branches of the Navy Department with whom I have been in contact are uniformly opposed to this legislation. They think it is so wrong that it is surprising that anybody should try, from the military end of the matter, to regulate the Navy, as is sought to be done by this amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the letter put into the Record by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], from Capt. Craven, which has just been read, is completely out of date. It might just as well have not been read. It does not apply to the question before the Senate at all, for since that letter was written Capt. Craven and myself prepared the amendment to the committee amendment which the Senate a few moments ago adopted.

It may be that the captain at the head of naval aviation is not in favor of any legislation at all. I think it is true that he is not in favor of any legislation. It may be that the Secretary of the Navy is opposed to any legislation. It may be that the Secretary of War, on being requested by the Secretary of the Navy, replies that he, too, thinks that legislation is undesirable. But the fact is that this committee amendment as now presented to the Senate does not do to the Navy any of the things which it is alleged the House of Representatives or the Senate Committee on Military Affairs intended to do.

The House language was clearly faulty. The House language, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said, would probably have confined naval aviation entirely to the carrying of air-

planes on battleships or airplane carriers, and would have prevented the Navy from maintaining any naval aviation base or station on shore. Such a proposal as that was clearly impossible. When it came before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate we recognized that situation, and our first amendment, which we intended as a cure to the fault which we believed existed in the House provision, provided for adding the words, after the House language, "including fleet shore bases." On consultation with Capt. Craven we learned that the term "fleet shore bases" would not include several of the activities of naval aviation which it was absolutely necessary for them to carry on upon shore, for example, the training schools, the aircraft factory at Philadelphia, the new dirigible base at some point in New Jersey, and two or three other of the naval stations which could not be called "fleet shore bases."

So this language was drafted in my office by Capt. Craven and myself. We had already stricken out, at the end of line 23, the first committee amendment, which read "including fleet shore bases," and we had substituted this language:

Including shore stations whose maintenance is necessary for operations connected with the fleet, for training of personnel, and for construction and experimentation.

I am assured that that language covers every naval aviation activity on shore which is a legitimate part of naval aviation on shore; that it covers everything they intend to do in the future. It is true, however, that it would not permit them to do in the future some of the things which they have done in the past, and those things which they have been doing in the past which the committees of both the House and the Senate want stopped are things which duplicate what the Army must do anyway.

I refer, especially, Mr. President, to aviation patrol of the coasts. I am informed now that the Navy intends no longer to continue coast patrol with its aviation. It has been doing that in the past. We do not want to see it resumed in the future, because the Army must do it anyway. We want to see it understood that naval aviation should not be used to patrol forest areas. We want to see it understood that naval aviation should not be used to patrol, for example, inundated areas on the Sacramento River. We know that those things have been proposed. We know that there has been a great deal of duplication in the past and a good deal of it has been eliminated. As I said before, the chief of naval aviation tells me that this does not do the naval aviation any harm whatsoever, but where we can stick a pin in without doing any harm to either service we propose to do it in order to save the taxpayers' money.

This whole question of aviation, of course, is a mighty difficult one, because, try as they will, Mr. President, there is bound to be some duplication. We are trying to reduce the duplication. Even under this amendment there will be duplication, because both services are training fliers to do exactly the same kind of thing in the elemental courses. The Army trains part of the Navy fliers and the Navy trains a part of its own fliers. The day will come some time when one service will train all fliers.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] and myself argued that to the Senate at the time his aviation department bill was being considered. We proved to our own satisfaction, but not to that of the Senate, that it would be to the interest of the taxpayer to cut down overhead. There is an example right here at Bolling Field. There is one Government flying field. The Army has a repair shop there, the Army has hangars there, and the Army has officers and enlisted men. Four hundred yards away from that the Navy has a repair shop, the Navy has its hangars, and the Navy has officers and enlisted men, and when the naval aviators want to indulge in their prescribed flying in order that they may be entitled to flying pay they go over to the Army and ask them to let them fly their machines in order to qualify to get the advanced pay of a flier.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, while it is a pretty thing to have around, there is no more use from the taxpayers' standpoint, there is no more use from a tactical standpoint that I can think of, for having a naval aviation station equipped with a fleet of boats here at Washington than there would be of having it at the top of Pikes Peak. It is not operated in conjunction with the fleet. It is not used as a training school to teach the personnel in the first instance, so far as I know, and it is not used to construct airplanes or flying boats.

Our attempt in this matter is not to injure anyone. Not one of the letters that have been put in the Record asserts that the amendment which has been agreed upon injures the Navy. But it will prevent the Navy from establishing a coast patrol up and down the Atlantic coast, running on exactly parallel lines with the Army coast patrols which must operate between the several coast-defense stations of the Army. The Army avia-

tion is compelled to assist the Coast Artillery posts up and down the coast where the fixed emplacements and the big guns are located. The Army aviation perform their reconnaissance duties for them. They patrol out from the Coast Artillery stations, and wireless or telephone back the signals to the forts who are members of the Army. They start out from these posts and go up and down the coast in time of war, keeping in constant touch with the Army that has control of the Coast Artillery stations and the mine fields.

There is no reason whatsoever in having another coast patrol and this amendment in part is to stop that duplication. It has been given up at this moment. The Navy is giving up its coast patrol under regulations, but it is astonishing how easy it is to amend regulations in order to permit two people to do the thing which one person alone can do.

The amendment will also stop what I think that the Navy does not want to do; it will stop the naval aviation from being used as a patrol for the forests. There is a provision in the Army reorganization bill which authorizes the Secretary of War to use the Army aviation to patrol the forest reserves for the next year. We simply want it so that if it has to be used to patrol the forest reserves the work will be done by the Army aviation, and that the naval aviation will not be used. That is the purpose of the amendment. There is nothing mysterious or dangerous or destructive about it. Neither of the Secretaries is apparently enthusiastic about it, and neither has pointed out what harm will be done the Navy.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In just a moment.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to ask that the amendment may be read again, so that we may be able to understand it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have assured the Senator from Washington that I would put in the RECORD a letter received from the Secretary of War by myself, dated May 21, on this question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would like to have the letter read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Reading Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 21, 1920.

MY DEAR SENATOR WADSWORTH: I venture to inclose a letter which has just come to me from Secretary Daniels with regard to the provision in the pending Army appropriation bill on the subject of air bases. I fully concur with Secretary Daniels in believing that an Army appropriation bill ought not to contain provisions of any sort with regard to naval operations, since naval authorities are not heard by the Military Affairs Committee, and their views are not, therefore, consulted. As I understood from our telephone conversation, you also agree to this view, and I supposed that you had accomplished the entire object of the Navy in the amendment worked out with Capt. Craven. I assume, however, from Secretary Daniels's statement that the Navy Department would still desire the entire elimination of my reference to the Navy, and for the reasons above stated I take pleasure in concurring in the Secretary's views.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
United States Senate.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York very kindly stated that the letter from Capt. Craven is entirely a back number, that it has no particular force after adding the few words that have been added by the amendment at the bottom of page 14.

The facts are that Capt. Craven, speaking for the Navy, accepted this amendment as possibly the best thing that could be done under the circumstances, but I wish to say that the amendment is not satisfactory to the Navy Department, that the amendment does not meet with the approval of the Secretary of War, as is shown by this letter, and that it does not meet the approval of the Secretary of the Navy. All I can say is that the department which seems to control on the part of the Army has stepped in and said not that this or that thing must be done, but let me read it so you can see how sweeping it is:

That hereafter the Army Air Service shall control all aerial operations from land bases, and that naval aviation shall have control of all aerial operations attached to a fleet, including—

And so forth.

If it is true that this is a duplication of work, instead of having this passed over to the Army, as is done by the bill, why do not the Army and the Navy Departments say that the Navy shall have control, as in my judgment they ought to have charge, of all matters pertaining to naval aviation? It is so objectionable to everyone with whom I have talked from the Navy Department that I think there must be some mistake on

the part of the Senator from New York in insisting that everything is cared for by these three or four lines. That is not the view of the Navy Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator point out what is not cared for in this perfected amendment?

Mr. PAGE. The burden of proof is put upon the Navy to show that everything except the little matter mentioned in those three lines has been passed over to the Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It certainly did not alarm the head of naval aviation. He almost guided my pencil as I wrote it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood the Senator a moment ago to state that Capt. Craven desired this entire provision to be eliminated.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He expressed that as a preference, but he certainly assured me and other members of the committee that if this perfected amendment in the bill were agreed to it would not hurt the Navy at all.

Mr. PAGE. I was present when Capt. Craven and the Senator from New York, the chairman of the committee, got together and tried to improve the provision, but the fact is that after they had improved it to the extent that they could, and had gone on to their different departments and sat down and studied it in cool blood, those representing naval aviation said they did not believe that we ought by one sweep to pass over everything beyond recall to a department that ought not to have taken consideration of naval aviation affairs at all.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I have listened to this discussion, and I have listened very carefully to the Senator from New York. Of course, the amendment offered by him does clarify the situation very much indeed and eliminates three-fourths of the objections contained in the amendment as it came to the House. But I wish to call to his attention the reason why the men in the Navy think this amendment will interfere with some of their operations.

During the war the Army and the Navy had a specific agreement as to aviation—as to what part the Army should do and what part the Navy should do and what they should do jointly. I will not refer to the Army part of the aviation, as this provision certainly could not under any circumstances interfere with that. This was the agreement during the war, or rather a memorandum of the understanding as to what they should do:

Naval forces: Operation from mobile floating bases or naval air stations on shore (a) as an arm of the fleet—

The provision as amended could not interfere with that part that was given to the Navy—

(b) for overseas scouting—

It could not interfere with that—

(c) against enemy establishments on shore when such operations—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Why does the Senator say it would not interfere with overseas scouting?

Mr. SWANSON. Because the Army would not do the scouting outside of the 3-mile limit.

Mr. POINDEXTER. We are speaking about what the situation would be. If the Army would not do it and the Navy is prohibited from doing it, then it is not done at all.

Mr. SWANSON. It is not prohibited from overseas scouting, but I will point out where it does seriously interfere.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not going to interfere with the course of the Senator's argument, except to point out at this particular juncture his statement that the amendment as now proposed by the Senator from New York would not interfere with overseas scouting. In my opinion it would interfere with it, because the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York limits the aviation service of the Navy to the stations that are connected with the operations of the fleet. Overseas scouting is not necessarily connected with the operations of the fleet.

Mr. SWANSON. In that way it might be, under that narrow construction, if that narrow view was taken.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I had assumed, as apparently had the author of the memorandum from which the Senator was reading—

Mr. SWANSON. This is my interpretation of the memorandum that was furnished to me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Overseas scouting is a part of the operations of the fleet.

Mr. SWANSON. The third duty given the Navy, which a literal, narrow construction of this amendment would seriously interfere with, is the following:

(c) Against enemy establishments and on shore when certain operations are conducted in cooperation with other types of naval forces, or alone when their mission is primarily naval.

At the Navy Department those who have read this amendment tell me that if they endeavor to establish on shore a naval

base that they are afraid it would be so construed that they could not do scouting work in connection with it. The Comptroller of the Treasury might construe it that no money could be utilized for the purpose because it was given as a part of the naval functions during the war.

I can readily see when I read it that the establishment of a base which might be used for Army or naval purposes is not connected with operations of the fleet. If that is true, under a strict legal construction of this amendment as amended, the naval aviation would be powerless and could not be utilized for that purpose.

When we have this naval aircraft what is the use of putting in amendments to the effect that it can not be used for this purpose, which under a strict construction of it might so confine it that in time of war it could not be used? The Navy is compelled to build aircraft for that purpose, and if they should put the naval base down in Cuba in time of war, which was friendly to us, or on St. Thomas, and if an effort was made by the enemy, under a literal construction and if they did not broaden this construction, naval aircraft could not be utilized. That is a very serious objection to it.

The next is to protect coastal sea communications. Under that the Navy was given the right to patrol the coastal sea. We prohibit the Navy from doing any patrol on the coast. It is the function of the Navy. We make no appropriations for it and it has been abandoned. There is no duplication of work there. But supposing during a war submarines of the enemy would come inside the 3-mile limit, it ought to be the right of the aircraft to follow them and destroy them. They tell me that under a literal construction, unless a very broad construction was given to it, not connected with the operations of the fleet, if a submarine of the enemy was to come within the 3-mile limit and this amendment as perfected was in effect they could not utilize the Navy aviation. We have no desire to do that. We do not want a duplication of the patrol of the coast, and Senators felt that way about it, and they made no appropriation for that purpose.

Why should money appropriated and its use be limited so that if a submarine should come inside the 3-mile limit naval aircraft could not be employed for the purpose of its destruction?

(II) Convoy operations.

The Navy during the war had aircraft and vessels for convoying ocean vessels through and outside the 3-mile limit. The convoy was not conducted as a part of the operations of the fleet; it was an independent service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Was not the convoy a part of the fleet?

Mr. SWANSON. A considerable portion of the fleet was in Hampton Roads; but why adopt an amendment to an Army appropriation bill which, if construed literally, would prevent naval aircraft convoying vessels for a certain distance at sea?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator knows that the fleet includes all the vessels of the Navy?

Mr. SWANSON. But some of these convoys were armed merchant vessels.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But were they not naval vessels?

Mr. SWANSON. To some extent they were.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Were they not actually commanded by naval officers?

Mr. SWANSON. But what is the use of adopting any such legislation as that here proposed? Under the law that now exists the Army does all of the mining within the 3-mile limit; the Navy's mine operations are outside the 3-mile limit. When it is provided that the Army shall control the air service from land bases and that the naval air service shall be limited to specific operations, it might be construed as prohibiting the Navy from operating within the 3-mile limit.

(III) Attacks on enemy submarines, aircraft, or surface vessels engaged in trade prevention or in passage through the sea area.

If an enemy vessel should come within the 3-mile limit on the coast of the United States and naval aircraft were available, they ought to be permitted to destroy it, or at least to attack it; they should not be compelled to remain idle and await the action of the Army, because, after all, naval aircraft are, perhaps, better adapted to that purpose than are the Army aircraft. I think under a strict construction of the amendment that such action could hardly be taken by the Navy.

(e) Alone or in cooperation with other arms of the Navy, or with the Army, against enemy vessels engaged in attacks on the coast.

If an enemy vessel were to come to our shores, whether a war vessel or any other kind of a vessel, if it comes within the 3-mile

limit, I see no reason why Navy aircraft should not be permitted to attack it, and why they should not be permitted to engage in scouting work and be on the lookout for such enemy vessels. A literal construction of this amendment, in my opinion, would prohibit such activity on the part of the Navy, while a broad construction of it might not. The Navy has requested that its activities be not restricted in the manner proposed.

I think Gen. Mitchell, when he made the statement to which reference has been made in the hearings had before the House, was entirely unaware of some of the facts and aspects of the situation. If the Navy feels that the Comptroller of the Treasury in interpreting the provisions of the appropriation bill will decide along the lines indicated, I think it would be most unfortunate to add such a provision to the bill.

The Navy must develop aircraft so as to meet the submarines within the 3-mile limit, and to attack other vessels of the enemy that come within the 3-mile limit both here and in the Philippines; and it seems to me to put in a prohibition here to prevent their performing that useful service is not wise. It seems to me the right thing to do, if it is desired to prevent duplication, is to strike out this amendment; let the matter go to conference; and if there is any duplication which it is desired to get rid of, eliminate that duplication. In that event I will be with you; but it does seem to me unwise, in general terms, to put a limitation on the aerial activities of the Navy.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry? What is before the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. I move to strike out the proviso on page 14, beginning in line 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 14, line 20, after the word "appropriation," it is proposed to strike out the following proviso:

And provided further, That hereafter the Army Air Service shall control all aerial operations from land bases, and that naval aviation shall have control of all aerial operations attached to a fleet, including shore stations whose maintenance is necessary for operations connected with the fleet, for construction and experimentation and for the training of personnel.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who is in charge of the pending bill, if he will agree to lay aside the unfinished business temporarily so that I may submit the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill? I should like to say to the Senator from New York in making this request that there is only one amendment in dispute, but it will be an amendment that will perhaps involve some debate, though I do not think very much. I shall also want a roll call on the final disposition of the report. I understand under the rule I can present the conference in any event, but that I can not have it taken up except by unanimous consent under the existing parliamentary situation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I have every sympathy with the Senator from Nebraska in his desire to secure quick action on the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation, but it is my duty and the duty of the other members of the Committee on Military Affairs to secure quick action on the military appropriation bill, which has not yet reached conference. I understand that the matter in disagreement between the two Houses on the Agricultural appropriation bill is the famous matter of the free distribution of seeds, and I anticipate that the debate to which the Senator from Nebraska has referred may last a little longer perhaps than he thinks.

Mr. NORRIS. As representing the conferees on the part of the Senate, I desire to say to the Senator from New York that I do not expect to debate the amendment further than to state the question and to obtain a vote of the Senate thereon. There may be, however, other Senators who will desire to debate it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the Senator says there will be a roll call, which will probably involve the calling for a quorum. We are just about to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and after that I think there are only a couple of other amendments left to the bill, which may be disposed of in a short time. If the Senator will let me get the Army appropriation bill out of the way, I shall be glad to have the conference report to which he refers considered.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from New York that I expect to make a motion to recede from the Senate amendment. I do not intend to debate it at all, but merely desire a vote, in order to get the matter out of the way, unless some other Senator desires to speak.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it the intention of the Senator from Nebraska to ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the report?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; there will be a record vote. Of course, I am not going to attempt to secure action on the report without the consent of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Nebraska has not submitted a request for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. NORRIS. No. I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 93 to the bill (H. R. 12272) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 93 to the bill (H. R. 12272) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, having met, after full and free conference have been unable to agree.

A. J. GRONNA,

G. W. NORRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

G. N. HAUGEN,

J. C. McLAUGHLIN,

GORDON LEE.

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I shall have to deny unanimous consent on that question, although I regret to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska does not need to ask unanimous consent to submit the report.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from New York does not object to my presenting the report, does he?

Mr. LODGE. That is a privileged question.

Mr. NORRIS. That is a privileged question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not object to that. I object to taking up the report for consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator feels that way about it, I shall not insist on the report being considered at this time; but I give notice that to-morrow after the morning hour, or immediately after the disposition of the morning business, I shall call up the conference report for consideration.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I ask the Senator before he takes his seat if the report presented by him is a final report on the Agricultural bill?

Mr. NORRIS. I can not say that it is. It is a report of disagreement on the only amendment that is left in conference.

Mr. WARREN. The bill has been sent back to conference and there is only one amendment in disagreement. The bill went back to conference, and the conferees now submit another report.

Mr. NORRIS. The last report submitted by the conferees embraced two other amendments, which have been disposed of.

Mr. WARREN. A report was made as to those items and it was accepted; but one item was left in disagreement, so that conferees were again appointed, and they have met again.

Mr. NORRIS. We have met again and present another report.

Mr. WARREN. The conferees have met, tried out the case, and find they can not agree, so they now report the disagreement to the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is right.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13587) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the object sought to be obtained by this amendment was too clearly stated by the Senator having charge of the bill to need any further elaboration. It appears to me that the objections made to his statement are founded upon conditions which are largely, if not entirely, imaginary, certainly under conditions which have any existence in time of peace. If we should be so unfortunate as to encounter another war in the near or the distant future and any embarrassments resulting from this measure should confront the Navy Department, it would be the easiest thing in the world to remove them.

The fundamental object of the amendment is economy, unity, and efficiency in service. I can conceive of nothing more in-

congruous in legislation than the possibility of such a duplication of the Air Service as to give the Navy Department jurisdiction over the forests of the interior. However, the point I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, is that this discussion has, to my mind, clearly demonstrated the need for placing the Air Service in a separate department authorized to take jurisdiction of and to administer it in all its branches. I think it demonstrates the wisdom of the bill which is now pending, offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New], to which he has devoted a great deal of thought, and regarding which he at one time addressed the Senate. Of course, nothing of that kind is at present possible. The suggestion has encountered the combined opposition of both departments, and probably always will; but the ultimate solution of the problem will come when its vast importance is duly appreciated and the conflict of authority and the duplication of administration indicate the necessity of an independent air service, as in years gone by the need was indicated for the separation of the Navy from the War Department.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I am through.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wish to say to the Senator in connection with what he has just said that I specifically stated that I was not discussing the question of consolidation.

Mr. THOMAS. I am aware of that.

Mr. LODGE. The consolidation proposed by the Senator from Indiana is a wholly different question.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator so stated, and I understood him fully.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, if I may trespass for a few moments on the time of the Senate, I should like to add just a word or two to what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has said. I think this whole discussion ought to be an object lesson to the Senate itself, but I am pessimistic enough to doubt that that will be its effect.

It is perfectly apparent here that there is involved here the same old question of a difference of opinion between the Army and the Navy. The Senator from Vermont cites a letter from the Secretary of the Navy in which that official refers to this whole matter from the standpoint of the Navy, while the Secretary of War has written another letter, which has been presented here and is now a part of the record in this case, in the course of which the Secretary of War speaks of the objection to the consideration of a naval matter by the Committee on Military Affairs.

I should like to ask the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, or any Senator here present, how you are going to refer a matter affecting the aviation service to any given committee of the Senate without in some degree trespassing upon the function of some particular department with which that committee is not in any way connected, and which it does not represent.

If this subject had been referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, some objection would have been raised by the Army, as it has now been raised by the Navy, because of its consideration by the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Senator from Vermont would find himself and his Naval Affairs Committee assailed for having trespassed upon the functions and affairs of the Army; and so it is, and so it will ever be, until there is a separate department of aviation and a separate committee of each House to consider these questions as they very properly should be considered.

The Secretary of the Navy, Capt. Craven, and the others who have appeared here and who have spoken or written of this subject, speak of it from the Navy standpoint as it affects the question—

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question right there?

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

Mr. NEW. Yes.

Mr. PAGE. Is it not true that the Army and the Navy are both in absolute accord about this matter, and are not both opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York?

Mr. NEW. Oh, yes; they are in absolute accord on what? They are in absolute accord on the one fact that neither one of them wants to give up anything that his particular department has. That is all. That is the extent to which they are agreed.

Mr. PAGE. But in this case the Secretary of War declines to interfere with the action of the Secretary of the Navy in matters which pertain purely to the Navy.

Mr. NEW. Yes. That is, as the Senator from New York suggested, a case of secretarial reciprocity. That is senatorial courtesy in the Cabinet.

It is exactly true, however, that the Secretary of the Navy and those officers connected with the Navy who have testified on this subject are viewing it from the standpoint of the interests of the Navy, if you please; those who come to speak from the Army are representing the interests of the Army, and neither one of them is speaking from the standpoint of the interests of aviation. They are each considering the whole subject as an adjunct of his particular department, his particular line, and neither of them is regarding the thing from the standpoint from which it should be regarded, and that is as a thing separate and distinct from either of their departments.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

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

Mr. NEW. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator what he thinks about the courtesies he suggests when he proposes to take a matter that is very vital to the Navy, and, without a single reference on the part of the Committee on Military Affairs to the Navy, proposes to take away the functions of the Navy and transfer them to the Army without their consent?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, this does not take away anything, and so far as that is concerned, I want to say now that for months and months I have been endeavoring here to get, just as a matter of agreement, a committee composed of members of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which might sit down and just as a matter of common agreement consider this whole question as one appertaining to aviation, as it concerns and affects all three of these services, and see if we could not agree among ourselves upon some kind of a program, some suggestion that we could make to Congress; and I have not yet been able to get that committee appointed. I never have been able to get it together. Months ago a request was made for the appointment of a committee on aviation, which should deal with this whole subject as it should be dealt with, as one pertaining to aviation and aviation alone. It has been impossible to get such a committee, and here we find ourselves, after months of consideration of this question, right up against the old proposition, the Navy objecting to the consideration of a question by the Committee on Military Affairs. I have no possible doubt that the Army would be quite as vociferous in its objection to a reference to the Committee on Naval Affairs and I think the Post Office Department probably would resent anything that might be decided by either of the other committees, and certainly they would object to anything that might be suggested by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; and there you are.

Congress is perhaps as much to blame for the lack of progress by this country in this most important matter as is anybody else through our failure to apply the only remedy that I think can be applied, and that is by the appointment of a separate committee which can consider this thing independent of the interests of any particular branch of the service and to deal with it on its own merits.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the argument that has just been made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] in favor of the unification of aviation control is a very strong argument for the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] to strike this clause out of this bill and to leave this subject for consideration in a more fundamental way until there is an opportunity by the Senate to determine the question of whether or not there shall be a department of aviation independent of either the Army or the Navy.

It certainly is very inconsistent, if one believes in an independent aviation control, to proceed in the meantime, and before that control has been established, to give the Army jurisdiction over branches of the service which are now controlled by the Navy. That is no advance toward independent control. The Senator from Indiana has just said it should be independent of the Army and should be independent of the Navy. How are we arriving at any such independent control by giving the Army an extended jurisdiction over a service which is now part naval and part military?

There is another suggestion made by the Senator from Indiana to which I want to call attention. It was also made by the Senator from New York [Mr. Wadsworth]. In fact, I think it was made first by the Senator from New York. He said, in response to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Page], that this amendment would not take anything from the Navy.

Well, if it would not take anything from the Navy, why is it proposed? If it does not take anything from the Navy, if it leaves the naval service just as it was before, then we are engaged in a futile discussion, and the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts ought to be adopted, because the provision, if passed, according to both of its sponsors here, would have no effect. It would simply add to the uncertainty and confusion of this controversy between the two departments.

So far as the duplication of work is concerned, the Senator from New York called attention to Bolling Field, the hangars and machine shops of the Army and of the Navy on this same field, and the cadets in the aviation service of the Navy asking permission to fly the airplanes of the Army at this field.

The adoption of this amendment would not change that situation in any way. There is nothing in the amendment, even though it should have the effect that is apprehended, that would prevent the Navy from still maintaining the aviation service at Bolling Field in connection with the fleet of vessels which are gathered at the navy yard and in connection with the operation of naval vessels to and from the navy yard up and down the Potomac.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I had not meant to have it understood that I thought this amendment would prevent naval aviators from doing their service flying in Army machines. I merely indicated that as one of the forms of duplication, and indicated Bolling Field as a duplication of overhead which I hoped some day would all be stopped by having one service; that is all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think there is a great deal to be said in favor of the object that the Senator from New York has just stated; but the point I am making is that we are making no progress toward attaining that object by the provision which is now sought to be stricken out. The Senator from New York has repeated, in his last utterance here on the floor, that these conditions that he has used as an illustration would not be improved by the adoption of this provision.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, I think they would be vastly improved. I think they would not be entirely eliminated.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood the Senator to say that they would not be changed in any way at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just as to the specific thing which the Senator had mentioned a few minutes before. That would not be changed, but there are many other things which would be prevented.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Now I want to point out just what effect it seems to me this provision would have upon the naval aviation service.

There has already been established between the War Department and the Navy Department a committee called the Joint Army and Navy Aeronautical Board for the purpose of coordinating the air service of the Navy and of the Army and avoiding duplication. That was referred to by the Senator from New York a moment ago when he said that a good deal of this duplication had been eliminated. He stated, I believe, that the coast patrol which heretofore had been maintained by the Navy had now been turned over, by voluntary agreement between the Army and the Navy, to the Army; so that no legislation is necessary to accomplish that, and all other duplication has been eliminated by this board that I have just named.

I have here the division of the branches of the Air Service which has been agreed upon by this board between the two departments. The program is as follows:

- Army aircraft: Operations from bases on shore:
- (a) As an arm of the mobile Army.
 - (b) Against enemy aircraft in defense of all shore establishments.
 - (c) Alone or in cooperation with other arms of the Army or with the Navy against enemy vessels engaged in attacks on the coast, such as—
 - (I) Bombardment of the coast;
 - (II) Operations preparatory to or of landing troops;
 - (III) Operations such as mine laying or attacks on shipping in the vicinity of defended ports.

All of that program of the Air Service, by the voluntary agreement of the joint Army and Navy Board, has been turned over to the Army. No legislation is necessary in order to accomplish that.

In this same program the following has been allotted to the Navy:

- Navy aircraft: Operations from mobile floating bases or from naval air stations on shore—
- (a) As an arm of the fleet;
 - (b) For overseas scouting;
 - (c) Against enemy establishments on shore when such operations are conducted in cooperation with other types of naval forces or alone when their mission is primarily naval;

- (d) To protect coastal sea communications by—
- (i) Reconnaissance and patrol of coastal sea areas;
- (ii) Convoy operations;
- (iii) Attacks on enemy submarines, aircraft, or surface vessels engaged in trade prevention or in passage through the sea area.
- (e) Alone or in cooperation with other arms of the Navy or with the Army against enemy vessels engaged in attacks on the coast.

All that is entirely without regard to the operations of a fleet. The fleet might be a thousand miles away, and yet these services would be allowed under this program of the allotment to the branches of the service to be performed by the Navy. I continue reading:

Marine aircraft: The functions normally assigned to Army aircraft shall be performed by the marine aircraft when the operations are in connection with an advance base in which operations of the Army are not represented. When Army and marine aircraft are cooperating on shore, the control of their operations shall be governed by the one hundred and twentieth article of war, United States Army.

If there is to be an independent air service, whether under a board or an independent director or under a department, that is one thing, and it is a very different thing from transferring the powers of one department to the other department. If the functions of one department are to be transferred to the other department, why transfer the naval service to the War Department? Why not reverse it and transfer the Army service to the Navy? You would secure just as much unity of control in that way as you would by transferring the naval air service to the Army. Is there anything in the aviation records of the War Department which would lead to a selection of the War Department in preference to the Navy Department, if you are going to give either one the predominance in the air service of the country?

Mr. NEW. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator from Indiana says "yes." I suppose he has in mind the fact that the War Department expended a large part of over a billion dollars appropriated and did not get a battle plane of our own make in France. We are somewhat familiar with that record. There is no doubt that the personnel of the Aviation Service of the Army acted in a most creditable way. The training of the men in certain respects was very commendable and the qualifications of our trained flyers were very fine. But the trouble was that under the War Department management they did not have any American battle planes to fly in, and hundreds of them who had been trained at great expense by the Government spent months waiting in France for an opportunity to fly, but the War Department furnished them with no American planes in which to fly.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will permit me, of course, I had no reference whatever to the disastrous program for the manufacture of planes which we carried on here during the war; but in answer to the Senator's query as to whether there is a greater reason for giving the control to the War Department or to the Navy Department, if it is to be given to either, I would say that the reason is found in the fact that the Army employs a great many more men and the Army service is several times bigger than the Navy service. The Army can do practically everything that the Navy does, and the Navy can do very little that the Army does. The argument, if it is to be given to either one as against the other, is altogether with the Army.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is, so far as numbers of men and amount of money appropriated are concerned, but otherwise, so far as the quality of the service is concerned, I do not think the argument is altogether with the Army.

Mr. NEW. I do not think it should be with either.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think necessarily the decision ought to depend on mere size or mere numbers of men.

But that is really aside from the question, as I think this whole provision is aside from the question of the unification of the air-service control. The Navy is not asking that any part of the Army service be transferred to the control of the Navy.

The peculiar situation exists that although the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are both opposed to this amendment, by some influence, some representations that were made to the committee in the House of Representatives which put this provision in, and which I may say is very much improved, I think, from the standpoint of fairness to the Navy, by the amendments proposed by the chairman of the Senate committee—it is a peculiar situation, that so far from the Navy asking any extension of control of the air service, it is only asking to be let alone, and the head of the War Department is asking the same thing, but nevertheless some influence was exerted upon the House committee, without calling any representative of the Navy Department and giving that department an opportunity to be heard, to present that phase of the question, an amendment has been brought here which if adopted as originally passed by the House and sent to the Senate would revolutionize the relations between these two departments of

the Government, and would do so without giving an opportunity for presenting the essential and vital facts upon which the entire matter ought to be decided.

I am told that the head of the Army Air Service has been engaged for a considerable time in agitating this question of a unification of the control of the Air Service, and that it was through his activity and his testimony that this provision for extending the Army control was inserted by the House.

To show the unreliable character of the information upon which, apparently, this provision was inserted, I have here the following statement, furnished to me by an officer of the Navy Air Service, and which I submit on his authority, and not upon mine, which shows that Gen. Mitchell's testimony before the House committee contained a great many errors as to important facts.

Gen. Mitchell, so it is asserted here, argued before that committee that there were a number of unnecessary stations under the control of the Navy in which the Army work was duplicated, and he named Rockaway; Yorktown; Hampton Roads; Coco Solo, Canal Zone; Anacostia, D. C.; New London, Conn.; Dutch Flats, Calif.; Boston, Mass.; Narragansett Bay; Culebra, Canal Zone; Portsmouth, N. H.; Hawaii; and Philadelphia.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. NEW. I merely wish to inquire of the Senator from Washington if he does not think that that in itself argues a rather remarkable state of facts, that those naval aeronautic stations should have been discontinued and the head of the Army aeronautical service not advised of the fact? Is not that of itself proof conclusive that there is an utter lack of cooperation and coordination between the Army and the Navy?

If the Senator will permit me just one further word, I think, in justice to Gen. Mitchell, it ought to be said that the Senator does not accurately represent his contention. His argument is in favor of a separate service altogether, not definitely locating it with the Army, but a separate service altogether.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In response, apparently, to his information and his testimony, it was to be located, according to this provision, with the Army and put under the Army control. That is the express provision which is the subject of this discussion.

The Senator asked me if this statement on the part of Gen. Mitchell as to the existence of stations which had been abandoned did not indicate a lack of coordination of the services. It certainly indicates a lack of information on the part of the Army of the aviation service of the country, and it certainly does not afford any argument in favor of conferring upon a department which displays such an astounding lack of information about the condition of the aviation service this extended authority which would be given to it by this amendment, even as it is modified by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

It may be, and I accept the correction, that Gen. Mitchell proposes to have an independent service and does not urge that the services be consolidated in the War Department. All that I say is that apparently upon his testimony the War Department was given this jurisdiction.

Quoting from a letter from the Naval air service addressed to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], it is said:

It may be noted that the Culebra that the Navy has in mind is not the Culebra of the Canal Zone, but the island of Culebra in the Danish West Indies, to the east of Porto Rico. The general then goes on to show a saving due to reduction in personnel necessary to operate these stations. He stated that this saving amounted to \$1,625,000. This statement is entirely incorrect and misleading, for at certain of the above-named places no complement of personnel is intended by the Navy. Therefore I fail to see what right Gen. Mitchell has to assign a complement of personnel to these stations and to claim that they are a duplication because of the presence of such personnel. The Navy has no air stations at the following above-named places: New London, Boston, Yorktown, Narragansett Bay, Culebra, and Portsmouth. The Navy has intended to have at these places facilities only for hauling out boats when aviation is cooperating with surface craft.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York stated, I think, at one time, that this proviso would not take from the control of the Navy any branch of the service which it is now conducting, but I think at other times in his argument, rather in conflict with that, he pointed out certain branches of the service which it would take from the Navy. It is either one or the other. If it takes none, then it is useless; if it takes any, then it is making an important change without a hearing.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, the Senator knows I meant legitimate uses of naval aviation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I accept that statement of the Senator and, of course, what are the legitimate uses is a matter of conflicting opinion.

If we accept the judgment of the joint board which was established as the representative of the two departments, then this provision takes away a number of the legitimate functions of naval aviation. For instance, in this program which has just been marked out by the board, as I have stated, operations "against enemy establishments on shore when such operations are conducted in cooperation with other types of naval forces, or alone when their mission is primarily naval," would not necessarily be in connection with the operations of a fleet. This proviso limiting the Navy control to such services as are in connection with operations of a fleet would prevent the Navy from carrying out this program.

Quoting further from the naval program agreed upon by the joint board—

Reconnaissance and patrol of coastal areas.

That has been allotted to the Navy, exclusively to the Navy, under the voluntary arrangement between the two departments, and yet the amendment, even as amended by the Senator from New York, would deprive the Navy of that control.

So as to convoy operations, unless they were in connection with the operations of a fleet. It might be considered that the escort of a convoy constituted a fleet, but there could very readily be a construction contrary to that, as has been pointed out here by the Comptroller of the Treasury, who might hold that such service was not in connection with the operations of a fleet.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator must know that the term "fleet" includes every vessel in the Navy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not understand that at all. Suppose we have a couple of vessels engaged in escorting a convoy, or a single vessel, even; I do not understand that that would be considered necessarily as a fleet.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not a fleet, but it is a part of a fleet. The Senator can not mention a naval vessel by name that does not belong to the fleet.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is a very broad construction and would not necessarily be the definition that would be given by the accounting officers of the Government. I do not think that it is the ordinary definition, and if the Senator will pardon me, I do not think it is an accurate definition of the word "fleet." According to that, any tugboat, isolated as it might be in some port, would be a part of a fleet.

It is only a part of a fleet when it is operating with a fleet. We might have a number of fleets. We have vessels in the Pacific that might properly be designated the Pacific Fleet. We have vessels operating together in the Atlantic described as a fleet, but I do not accept the definition of the Senator from New York that every detached vessel of our naval equipment, of whatever size or character, or whatever work it may be engaged in, that is under the control of the Navy Department, constitutes a fleet or a part of a fleet.

Here is another division of Air Service allotted to the Navy by the joint board:

Attacks on enemy submarines, aircraft, or service vessels engaged in trade prevention, or in passage through the sea area.

Our fleet might be in the south seas. The enemy submarines might be in the north Atlantic. The only recourse, the only defense, the only means of protection that might be available might be by naval airplanes; and if they could not operate under the law except in connection with operations of the fleet, when the fleet was a thousand miles away, it seems to me it would be a somewhat strange state of the law which by this provision would forbid the Navy from engaging in that proper naval operation.

So it seems that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] ought to be adopted, and the provision ought to be eliminated, and the matter ought to be left for consideration upon the proposal of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], supported by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], for the consolidation of all of the various aerial services of the Government under one head, and until that time has come that we should not complicate the situation by allowing the Army to invade the field of the naval service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Before the question is put I should like to offer an amendment by way of a perfecting amendment, though perhaps that is not exactly an accurate description of it. I call it to the attention of the Senator from Washington. In line 21, on page 14, after the word "hereafter," I move to insert the words "in time of peace."

Mr. LODGE. There is no objection to that.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In line 21, same page, after the word "all," I move to insert the word "military." That is to prevent any conflict with the coastal department.

Mr. LODGE. There is no objection to that amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to have the proviso read as now amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proviso as amended.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

And provided further, That hereafter in time of peace the Army Air Service shall control all military aerial operations from land bases, and that Naval Aviation shall have control of all aerial operations attached to a fleet, including shore stations whose maintenance is necessary for operations connected with the fleet, for construction and experimentation, and for the training of personnel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts to strike out the proviso as amended.

On a division, the motion was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 15, where the Senate committee proposes to strike out lines 20 to 25, inclusive, as follows:

For the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of 640 acres of land, more or less, and the appurtenances thereunto belonging, situate in Macomb County, State of Michigan, now occupied by the Air Service of the Army as an aviation station, and known as Selfridge Field, not to exceed \$190,000.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will not be agreed to. This provision was adopted by the Senate at one time and failed to receive consideration in the House. The House Committee on Military Affairs incorporated it in the bill and the Senate committee disagreed to it. It was not considered by the Senate committee, as I understand the matter, but went out on the theory that it properly should be considered by the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the sundry civil appropriation bill.

I paid no attention to it myself, because when the House adopted it, knowing that the Senate had agreed to it heretofore, I took no further interest and did not notify the committee that I hoped it would be retained. When I learned that the Senate committee had stricken it out, I then went to the committee. I went to the Committee on Appropriations, which was then in session, thinking that it would be placed in the sundry civil appropriation bill, if true that the objection to it was that it properly belonged there. I was then told that inasmuch as it had passed the House and was on the Army appropriation bill it would be better to bring it up here and ask the Senate to disagree to the committee amendment.

I will briefly state the facts in the case. This item proposes an appropriation of \$190,000 to purchase Selfridge Field, between Mount Clemens and Detroit, Mich. It is a field consisting of 640 acres of land, upon which the Government has already expended something over \$2,300,000. It has an option from the owner of the property to purchase it at \$190,000. It was not purchased at that time, but condemnation proceedings were instituted. When I asked the department why condemnation proceedings were instituted, I was told that they did not wish to be subjected to any criticism in the purchase of any property of this kind, and therefore they thought it best to institute the proceedings, because if a jury should find that it was worth more than \$190,000 the option would compel the owner to sell for that sum anyway.

Mr. President, this property is worth a great deal more than \$190,000. The owner of the property is not insisting at all that the appropriation shall be made, although he is perfectly willing that the Government should have the field, which was prepared for this particular service. I am satisfied myself that if the Government did not intend to use the property as a flying field it would still be the duty of the Government to buy it and dispose of it for a larger sum than the cost price. I am told that the property would sell to-day for at least half a million dollars and probably for a larger sum.

I repeat that the Government expended over \$2,300,000 on the field. If we are to embark in the flying business in this country, if we are to conduct aircraft experiment and conduct an aircraft division under the Government, it seems to me we need this field near Detroit.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator what the distance is from Detroit to this field?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have never been to it.

Mr. THOMAS. Approximately?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I should think perhaps 12 or 15 miles. It is between Mount Clemens and Detroit. It is on the Lake front. It is a very valuable piece of property as it has now been arranged. It is in the north central region of the country. The aircraft department believes that we need an aerodrome there and that we need the field for the purpose of training

liers. It is in the very center of aircraft production. There is opportunity there for constructing planes, for training men, and the public interest is very great indeed. I believe it is conceded, at least from all the information I can obtain on the subject, that it is one of the best located fields in the United States. May I just read a letter that was submitted to me in the form of a memorandum of this subject? It is directed to me, and is as follows:

1. The Air Service is desirous of acquiring Selfridge Field and the fundamental considerations still exist and point particularly to the necessity for its retention, owing to its strategic location, both from a military and an aircraft producing standpoint. The following are some pertinent facts relating to Selfridge Field:

(a) Acreage, 640; cost of construction, \$2,385,770.53; cost to acquire, \$190,000.

That is the option price; that is what it will cost the Government to obtain it.

Annual rental—

We do not own it—

\$13,500.

(b) This field was one of the group selected by the General Staff of the War Department for retention by the Air Service.

(c) The subcommittee of the House Military Committee which investigated the purchase of fields for the Air Service recommended Selfridge Field for retention. A bill for the purchase of this field was passed by the House recently and several months ago was passed by the Senate.

(d) Selfridge Field is the only field in the north central section of the United States, and it is very essential that an aerodrome be maintained in this locality on account of its strategic value. This field is a terminus of a chain of Air Service stations for aerial communication through the east Central States, north and south.

(e) The Air Service desires to use Selfridge Field for the organization, training, and maintenance of aero squadrons in pursuit and aerial gunnery. This field is located on Lake St. Clair, and due to the fact that the water is very shallow in that vicinity the Air Service would be able to carry on aerial target practice without danger to the civil population and without any additional expense to the Government in providing facilities for such training.

(f) There are a large number of reserve military aviators in the north Central States; and, in order that these reserve pilots may keep up their flying training with a minimum of expense to themselves and a maximum of result to the Government, it is necessary that a flying field be retained in this part of the country. Should the War Department organize reserve aero squadrons at some future date a field would be needed in this locality, and it is believed that Selfridge Field fully meets all the requirements for such purposes.

(g) In view of the cost of construction of this flying field and the investment of the Government, it is believed that it will be economical to the Government to acquire this field for permanent use.

2. The above reasons, although previously presented to the Committees on Military Affairs, both of the Senate and House, in connection with H. R. 8819, are in no way modified by any conditions which have arisen since that time.

W. E. GILLMORE,

Colonel, A. S. A., Chief, Supply Group.

Mr. President, I repeat if I had known that there was any question in reference to the favorable consideration of this item by the Committee on Military Affairs, I should have appeared before the committee; but assuming that what the Senate having done they would do again, especially as the House had passed it, and recognizing the fact that the property itself is now worth much more than the Government is called upon to pay for it, I have felt that it was entirely proper that the Senate should understand the situation, and, understanding it, I had hoped that they would agree to this amendment and permit this item to be retained in the bill as the House has inserted it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the Committee on Military Affairs has had a most difficult time keeping track of these purchases of land. The Committee on Appropriations has had an equally difficult task. The time was when permanent investments on the part of the Government for the use of the Army were handled, as I understand, by the Committee on Appropriations. Especially was that true when any matter involving the purchase of real estate was concerned.

It is true, of course, that the Military Affairs Committee has often reported appropriations for the erection of buildings upon land already owned by the Government. Some of the members of the Committee on Appropriations have been complaining during the last year that the practice of the Committee on Military Affairs of giving consideration to questions affecting land purchases ought to stop or else the Committee on Military Affairs ought to take over the whole subject. During the war, of course, when hurry calls came from the War Department, their first and easiest channel of approach was through the Military Affairs Committee, and we abandoned, as most of the other committees of the Senate abandoned, all previous customs and divisions of functions. So the Committee on Appropriations appropriated money for the purchase of land for the Government to be used by this or that department, and the Committee on Military Affairs reported appropriations to enable the Government to purchase land for the Army. Of course, that procedure can not go on; it is utterly impossible to do business

in that way. Some one committee has got to know how much land the Government is buying for all purposes.

So, as I have said, there has been a good deal of impatience expressed, notably by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who is also a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. He has said many times in the Committee on Military Affairs that it is utterly impossible for him to keep track of both committees at the same time, as very often they meet at the same hour, and different conferences are going on at the same time, all involving purchases of this kind.

Accordingly the Committee on Military Affairs, so far as it is able to do such a thing, agreed to go back to the old policy of refusing to appropriate money for the purchase of land and allowing such matters to be taken care of by the Appropriations Committee. Therefore, we struck out of the pending bill the provision for the purchase of Selfridge Field; we struck out of the bill the item for the purchase of land at Leon Springs, Tex.; and we struck out of the bill the appropriation for the purchase of a little piece of land in Boston, on the theory that those matters should be taken care of in the sundry civil bill. I think we would not have done so in any one of those three cases had there really been a great emergency connected with the proposals for the purchases, but, as we understand, there is no real emergency in the matter of Selfridge Field or Leon Springs or Boston. I understood the Senator from Michigan to say that a bill for the purchase of Selfridge Field had gone through both Houses of Congress.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The letter which I have just read from Col. Gillmore states:

A bill for the purchase of this field was passed by the House recently—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The letter continues:

And several months ago was passed by the Senate.

I assume that Col. Gillmore knows what he is talking about.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the bill passed the House recently, how could it have been passed by the Senate several months ago?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It passed the Senate first, I take it, without receiving any consideration by the other House, or some similar bill passed, or a bill in some other form. I have not looked the matter up, but the House has now passed the legislation and it comes to the Senate for action on the pending bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think Col. Gillmore is mistaken as to that. The only bill of which I have any recollection that has had to do with the purchase of fields or the completion of construction at fields is one a copy of which I hold in my hand, Public No. 151, Sixty-sixth Congress, which was originally House bill 8819, which was approved February 28, 1920—last winter. That carries an item of \$35,000 for some general construction at Selfridge Field, but it does not provide for buying the field. It is that bill, a copy of which I have, which contains the appropriations for the purchase or the completion of the purchase of the fields which the War Department stated they must have. After much discussion, both in the House and in the Senate, with which, so far as the Senate is concerned, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is thoroughly familiar, the bill was made up, and Selfridge Field was not included as one of the fields the purchase of which should be completed. The General Staff in their recommendations for appropriations to be given by Congress carry Selfridge Field to-day as one of those fields awaiting the declaration of the policy of Congress with respect to it. So Selfridge Field has been in the balance, so to speak; the department has been waiting to see what Congress was going to do, and Congress has not thus far pledged itself or declared its policy in connection with its purchase.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I recall very well when the so-called emergency bill was before the Senate. I raised the question at that time when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], as I recall, had charge of the bill. I think the committee was then favorable to the purchase of Selfridge Field, but that was a sort of emergency bill. They appropriated \$35,000 to complete some improvements on this particular piece of land, but I have never known, from any source, anything but approval of the proposition to purchase Selfridge Field. I have called up the department, and they are all favorable to it. I have presented the proposition largely from a business standpoint. There can be no denial, in my judgment, of what I have stated with reference to the value of this property.

I desire, however, to speak concerning the parliamentary situation for just a moment. Perhaps there will be no virtue in so doing, but I wish to repeat what I have said before, that I first took this matter up with the committee headed by the Senator from Missouri, but I was told that only emergency matters were to be considered and that it must wait until the general military appropriation bill was before the Senate.

That bill came to the Senate from the House with this item in it; it was referred to the committee, and the Senator from Indiana stated he would take care of it, as he was very much in favor of it, and I paid no more attention to it. When I learned the other day that objection had been made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] that this was not a proper subject to go on the military appropriation bill but should find a place in a bill coming from the Appropriations Committee, I went to that committee immediately, as they were in session, and presented the situation just as it had been presented to me. I was told that the Senator from Wyoming was not there when this item was passed upon, but that it had been generally agreed to that items of purchase should go on the appropriation bill. I then suggested that we put it on the bill which was being considered at that time, namely, the sundry civil bill, but was told inasmuch as it had been placed on the Army appropriation bill in the House and objection would not be raised, that it had better be left on that bill and allow the Senate itself to pass upon the question whether or not the committee amendment should be agreed to. So I did not urge upon the committee having in charge the sundry civil bill the consideration of the item, because I was discouraged from so doing.

The Senator from New York says it is not an emergency matter. Possibly not, although I presume that in years to come that field or some other property will be purchased; but I am wondering if it is not the part of good business to retain a piece of property upon which the Government has expended \$2,380,000 or thereabouts by paying the option price of \$190,000, for which it can be obtained now, rather than allow it to go back to those who own it, and who are perfectly willing to take it back. It is a lake-front piece of property consisting of 640 acres and is worth from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 at least to-day, without any regard as to whether it is used for military purposes or otherwise. It is, as I have said, a valuable piece of property, and I think the Government ought to buy it by paying the option price of not to exceed \$190,000 and take it. Of course, under condemnation proceedings if a jury should find that it was worth less than \$190,000 the Government would not pay any more than the jury should find; but a jury, in my opinion, would find it to be worth probably a million dollars, although the Government will not have to pay more than the option price of \$190,000. So the Government stands to win and not lose on a proposition of this kind. For these reasons I feel that this property ought to be purchased.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs that considered the purchase of a very large number of these aviation fields purely from an emergency standpoint. At that time our subcommittee found that although the War Department had leases and options upon practically every one of these fields, running in many instances to as late as 1923, and in some cases for an annual rental as low as \$1 a year, nevertheless in the face of all that, after the signing of the armistice they proceeded in many cases to exercise the option and to bind the Government to purchase this property—a case where they clearly had the legal right to do that which they did do, but, like many other things that have been done by the War Department, a very clear violation of the trust reposed in them in using the appropriations made for the purpose of carrying on the war to undertake by themselves to establish a future military policy for the Government without any action of Congress. This subcommittee in the consideration of these various matters undertook to take care of those cases where, on the one hand, the War Department had legally obligated the Government for the purchase price, and, in the second place, where the Government, having expended a very large amount of money and not being protected by options running into the future, would suffer a loss unless this real estate was purchased.

There were so many of these cases that my recollection as to Selfridge Field may not be entirely accurate; but it is my recollection that as to Selfridge Field we have an option on the purchase price of \$190,000 running to 1921 or 1922. Perhaps the Senator from Michigan can tell me more accurately as to that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The option expires the last part of next month.

Mr. LENROOT. But in the lease there is a provision for a renewal of the option and the lease, is there not?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have not seen the option, but that is not my understanding.

Mr. LENROOT. I think that is the fact—that in each one of these cases there is the option upon the part of the War Department to renew both the lease and the option, I think in

most cases running for five years from the date of the original lease; and I feel very certain that the Government is protected in this way in Selfridge Field.

In view of the present condition of the Treasury, and in view also of the fact that neither the Committee on Military Affairs nor any other committee of Congress thus far, as far as I know, has undertaken either to establish or to approve a policy with reference to permanent aviation fields in the country, I think we ought not to be making appropriations now, if the Government is protected, without that investigation being made by some committee of the Senate. The subcommittee to which I have referred did not make that investigation because I think all the members of the subcommittee—at least, all the Republican members, and I think the same was true of the Democratic members—were new Members of the Senate, who were not familiar with the aviation question; and I personally felt that when it came to the establishment of a policy as to how many aviation fields should be permanently established in the country that was a matter that should be passed on by Senators who were familiar with the entire question, and our subcommittee was not, and that the province of our subcommittee was merely to treat these matters as emergency matters so as to protect the Government in the expenditure that had already been made.

If I understand the situation correctly, the Government will not lose any rights if this property is not purchased now. If I understand the situation correctly, the original lease was to provide for a renewal of the lease and the option; and if that be true, this is no time for expending large amounts of money out of the Treasury of the United States for the purchase of real estate which can as well be purchased later on.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee I have not been able to attend as constantly as I should the meetings of the committee when preparing this appropriation bill. As to aviation, that, as we all know, is of comparatively late date before the Congress, and I have not taken it up as one of those things concerning which I expected to perfect my information or education.

As to this particular item, I did not hear all that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] said, but he involved somewhat the Committee on Appropriations. I wish to say, first, that until the confusion of war and the abrogation of peacetime rules and, I might almost say, principles, the purchase of land by the Government for new Army posts, for the extension of posts, and for new buildings, as well as other public buildings in the way of courthouses, post offices, and so forth, was always taken care of in the sundry civil bill. In cases of great emergency such items have at times been inserted in deficiency bills. I think I have stated that before the Committee on Military Affairs. I have done it without any desire to take anything from that committee over on to any one of the general appropriation bills, because I am not jealous of the joys that may come from enlarging the duties of other committees through absorption of certain appropriation items from sundry civil bills. At the present time, however, I think the Committee on Military Affairs, without so much reference to what had been the rule of peace times as to what the committee had immediately before it, did take into consideration the shunning of all expenses for land except what were considered emergency cases.

As to the particular field in question, I do not know whether it is an emergency case or not. I am not opposed to it, nor do I want to favor it or any other bill until we have a little more information about what the particular terms of the contract are; but in framing the sundry civil bill, which is now ready for calling up for consideration, the House has almost entirely failed to cover matters of public buildings and land, and, in fact, has granted nothing for rivers and harbors except what is in the nature of continuation of contracts, and so forth. The House went on record—not only the House committee but the House itself—with a good deal of emphasis on a rule of no appropriations for land or new buildings, so that when the matter was brought to me as chairman of the Appropriations Committee I stated very frankly that we did not have the information we should have, and I did not believe we had any chance to get it through conference if we put it on the pending sundry civil bill, and that if it could not be considered by the Military Affairs Committee the only hope for this year would be to have it follow, as many another thing has followed during war times, for consideration in the deficiency bill which is now being considered in the House committee, where any new matter should be presented.

I doubt very much whether they are going to provide for buying lands in that bill; but the matter could be and would be, if estimated for and presented with proper evidence, a subject for

consideration in the next annual sundry civil bill. I understand from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]—and I assume that he is correct about it—that this option may rest for another year; so, without undertaking to oppose or to urge this proposition, I want to set the matter right before the Senate and before the Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 15, the committee report to strike out lines 20 to 25, inclusive, in the following words:

For the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of 640 acres of land, more or less, and the appurtenances thereunto belonging, situate in Macomb County, State of Michigan, now occupied by the Air Service of the Army as an aviation station and known as Selfridge Field, not to exceed \$190,000.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 34 the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] proposes as an amendment, on line 1, after the word "receipts," to insert the following:

Provided further, That authority is hereby granted the Secretary of War to sell or otherwise dispose of, in accordance with law and regulations, the United States Army transports *Sherman, Sheridan, Thomas, Logan, Buford, Kilpatrick, Crook, and Warren*; *And provided further*, That \$2,400,000 of the sum derived from such sale may be used for the purpose of reimbursing the United States Shipping Board for necessary improvements and alterations to the 12 transports now being constructed by the United States Shipping Board for the use of the War Department, as permanent transports to replace the aforementioned United States Army transports of which the sale is authorized herein.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not hear clearly the reading of the amendment. Has the Senator a provision in it under which these boats might be used in the coastwise trade?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is the same amendment that I offered on Saturday, which the Senator from Washington wanted a chance to examine, and it went over.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely made the suggestion. I have no objection to the amendment, but I thought it would help in the sale of these ships if we had a provision similar to that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let it go to conference, and if there is any trouble about it we can amend it in conference.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The conferees might not be able to put in such a provision. I suggest the following amendment to the amendment:

And provided further, That if sold to citizens of the United States such vessels may engage in the coastwise trade so long as they remain wholly the property of citizens of the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to that amendment to the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that probably would assist in getting a better price for the vessels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Add at the end of the proposed amendment the following proviso:

And provided further, That if sold to citizens of the United States such vessels may engage in the coastwise trade so long as they remain wholly the property of citizens of the United States.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It will be found on page 44. The committee report to strike out the proviso beginning after the numerals "\$50,000," in line 13, in the following words:

Provided, That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$88,880 for the acquisition of land as an addition to the Leon Springs Military Reservation in Texas, heretofore authorized, and now in use as a target range for Camp Travis, Tex.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I trust this committee amendment, striking out the provision inserted by the House, will be disagreed to. It would be the worst sort of business judgment not to purchase the land in question. It is not even the case of land obtained through the exercise of options that were taken during the war. It is the case of land authorized by the Army appropriation bill of June 30, 1919. While purchase was in process the act of July 11, 1919, containing restrictions on the purchase of real estate, was passed, and further procedure was suspended. The act of July 11, 1919, was not aimed at purchases like this. It was aimed at purchases on options taken during the war in connection with war emergencies, but its terms were held by the comptroller to embrace land purchases of all descriptions which had not been completed on July 11, 1919.

Let me quote what the War Department says about this particular property:

There has already been constructed on the land in question, at a cost of \$70,000, a target range which has been in use by the troops stationed in the vicinity of Fort Sam Houston, Tex. A target range in this vicinity is a vital necessity for the proper training of the troops. The land on which this target range is already erected is held on options which expire on June 30, 1920, and at prices ranging from one-half to one-third the prices now asked for ground in this vicinity. The target range already built on this land could not be rebuilt at the present time for less than \$120,000. In addition, if the land is returned to its owners it will be necessary to restore it to its original condition or pay damage claims. It is estimated that this will be equal to or in excess of the present option prices to purchase.

In view of the fact that the failure to buy will involve the Government in a financial loss, it would seem the part of good business to make the purchase now. I hope that the committee amendment will be disagreed to. The construction of a new target range will be a far more expensive proposition than the purchase of this land and the retention of the present range.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This item falls in the same category as the one discussed by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from New York knows that I did not further insist on this target range item when the committee announced its policy of not incorporating purchases of this kind in the bill, but since the Senate has taken the position it has with regard to land in Michigan, I believe it but proper that this purchase should be also authorized.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are only a few Senators here and I suppose what I have to say will not have much weight with the Senate. The Senator from Texas has expressed it exactly right. If you do it for one, you had better do it for everyone else. The Senate has seen fit to put Selfridge Field back in the bill, and therefore Boston must go back in the bill; and when we get to other things I think we might as well go back and include the item of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] at Leavenworth, and have all of the Senators who stay here and attend to business get what they want, and not the other Senators who have paid no attention to the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Before we take a vote on this question, I think we had better have more Senators here than we have now.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not in opposition to Leon Springs, I am not in opposition to Boston, and I am not in opposition to the Selfridge item. The committee made a sincere effort to re-establish consistency in the management of the finances of the Government, and we find, after carefully explaining it to the Senate, that all the Senators who have any items in the bill affecting their own States have left the Chamber, and the Senators who have no items affecting their own States stay in the Chamber and change the policy of the committee.

Mr. KING. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether there will be an opportunity for another vote on the amendment which was voted upon a few moments ago? Will an opportunity be given later on to reconsider that matter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am only speaking for myself, of course.

Mr. KING. If not, I shall move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the committee was rejected. I came into the Chamber after having been called out, and I voted—

Mr. WADSWORTH. My opposition is not to these items as such, on their merits especially. It is just as I said a moment ago, I am opposed to their being placed on this bill. The Committee on Military Affairs reached an agreement with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that we would not do it. That is the truth of it. It may be that members of the Committee on Military Affairs, when they learn that one exception has been made, will decide that we might as well make exceptions of them all, but I am not going to change; I am going to stand by the agreement that the committee made when it was in solemn session in the room of the Committee on Military Affairs. I do not know whether it will be incumbent upon me to reserve a separate vote on all these little items in the Senate. I do not know that much is to be gained by that.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will permit me, I reserve the right for a separate vote on that last item.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is, of course, the right of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order that the Senate may have a full opportunity to again pass on the policy of the committee, and in view of the fact that the question is to be raised again in the Senate when the bill is reported from Committee of the Whole to the Senate, I shall not move this disagreement at present, but will await further action of the Senate on the other proposition.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator will have to reserve something.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator wants a separate vote he will have to have the matter voted on in Committee of the Whole, because if the amendment of the committee is agreed to when it comes into the Senate the Senator will have it reserved for a separate vote.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Then I ask the Senate to take at least tentative action on my proposition now.

Mr. SMOOT. I am going to ask the Senator from New York, inasmuch as it is after 5 o'clock now, if it would not be best to take a recess at this time and leave the amendment pending, and then we shall have a quorum to vote upon it in the morning.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understood the Senator to say it would be necessary to take a vote on it before we went into the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. It will be pending, and the vote will come up to-morrow morning.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 21, 1920:

S. 2448. An act for the relief of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes.

On May 22, 1920:

S. 1699. An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes.

MANDATE OVER ARMENIA (H. DOC. NO. 791).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

GENTLEMEN OF THE CONGRESS:

On the fourteenth of May an official communication was received at the Executive Office from the Secretary of the Senate of the United States conveying the following preambles and resolutions:

"Whereas the testimony adduced at the hearings conducted by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations have clearly established the truth of the reported massacres and other atrocities from which the Armenian people have suffered; and

"Whereas the people of the United States are deeply impressed by the deplorable conditions of insecurity, starvation, and misery now prevalent in Armenia; and

"Whereas the independence of the Republic of Armenia has been duly recognized by the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference and by the Government of the United States of America: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the sincere congratulations of the Senate of the United States are hereby extended to the people of Armenia on the recognition of the independence of the Republic of Armenia, without prejudice respecting the territorial boundaries involved; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby expresses the hope that stable government, proper protection of individual liberties and rights, and the full realization of nationalistic aspirations may soon be attained by the Armenian people; and be it further

"Resolved, That in order to afford necessary protection for the lives and property of citizens of the United States at the port of Batum and along the line of the railroad leading to Baku, the President is hereby requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to cause a United States warship and a force of marines to be dispatched to such port with instructions to such marines to disembark and to protect American lives and property."

I received and read this document with great interest and with genuine gratification, not only because it embodied my own convictions and feelings with regard to Armenia and its people, but also, and more particularly, because it seemed to me the voice of the American people expressing their genuine convictions and deep Christian sympathies, and intimating the line of duty which seemed to them to lie clearly before us.

I cannot but regard it as providential, and not as a mere casual coincidence that almost at the same time I received information that the conference of statesmen now sitting at San Remo for the purpose of working out the details of peace with the Central Powers which it was not feasible to work out in the conference at Paris, had formally resolved to address a definite appeal to this Government to accept a mandate for Armenia. They were at pains to add that they did this, "not from the smallest desire to evade any obligations which they

might be expected to undertake, but because the responsibilities which they are already obliged to bear in connection with the disposition of the former Ottoman Empire will strain their capacities to the uttermost, and because they believe that the appearance on the scene of a power emancipated from the prepossessions of the Old World will inspire a wider confidence and afford a firmer guarantee for stability in the future than would the selection of any European power."

Early in the conferences at Paris it was agreed that to those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world there should be applied the principle that the well being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization, and that securities for the performance of this trust should be afforded.

It was recognized that certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized, subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone.

It is in pursuance of this principle and with a desire of affording Armenia such advice and assistance that the statesmen conferring at San Remo have formally requested this Government to assume the duties of mandatory in Armenia. I may add, for the information of the Congress, that at the same sitting it was resolved to request the President of the United States to undertake to arbitrate the difficult question of the boundary between Turkey and Armenia in the Vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, and Bitlis, and it was agreed to accept his decision thereupon, as well as any stipulation he may prescribe as to access to the sea for the independent State of Armenia. In pursuance of this action, it was resolved to embody in the treaty with Turkey, now under final consideration, a provision that "Turkey and Armenia and the other high contracting parties agree to refer to the arbitration of the President of the United States of America the question of the boundary between Turkey and Armenia in the Vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van and Bitlis, and to accept his decision thereupon as well as any stipulation he may prescribe as to access to the sea for the independent State of Armenia"; pending that decision the boundaries of Turkey and Armenia to remain as at present. I have thought it my duty to accept this difficult and delicate task.

In response to the invitation of the council at San Remo, I urgently advise and request that the Congress grant the Executive power to accept for the United States a mandate over Armenia. I make this suggestion in the earnest belief that it will be the wish of the people of the United States that this should be done. The sympathy with Armenia has proceeded from no single portion of our people, but has come with extraordinary spontaneity and sincerity from the whole of the great body of Christian men and women in this country by whose free-will offerings Armenia has practically been saved at the most critical juncture of its existence. At their hearts this great and generous people have made the cause of Armenia their own. It is to this people and to their Government that the hopes and earnest expectations of the struggling people of Armenia turn as they now emerge from a period of indescribable suffering and peril, and I hope that the Congress will think it wise to meet this hope and expectation with the utmost liberality. I know from unmistakable evidences given by responsible representatives of many peoples struggling towards independence and peaceful life again that the Government of the United States is looked to with extraordinary trust and confidence, and I believe that it would do nothing less than arrest the hopeful processes of civilization if we were to refuse the request to become the helpful friends and advisers of such of these people as we may be authoritatively and formally requested to guide and assist.

I am conscious that I am urging upon the Congress a very critical choice, but I make the suggestion in the confidence that I am speaking in the spirit and in accordance with the wishes of the greatest of the Christian peoples. The sympathy for Armenia among our people has sprung from untainted consciences, pure Christian faith, and an earnest desire to see Christian people everywhere succored in their time of suffering, and lifted from their abject subjection and distress and enabled to stand upon their feet and take their place among the free nations of the world. Our recognition of the independence of Armenia will mean genuine liberty and assured happiness for her people, if we fearlessly undertake the duties of guidance and assistance in-

volved in the functions of a mandatory. It is, therefore, with the most earnest hopefulness and with the feeling that I am giving advice from which the Congress will not willingly turn away that I urge the acceptance of the invitation now formally and solemnly extended to us by the council at San Remo, into whose hands has passed the difficult task of composing the many complexities and difficulties of government in the one-time Ottoman Empire and the maintenance of order and tolerable conditions of life in those portions of that Empire which it is no longer possible in the interest of civilization to leave under the government of the Turkish authorities themselves.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
24 May, 1920.

CONFIRMATION OF ROBERT R. CARMAN.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent, as in open executive session, to report favorably from the Committee on the Judiciary the nomination of Robert R. Carman, of Baltimore, Md., to be United States attorney. The Senator from Maryland is very anxious to have Mr. Carman confirmed, and I ask that that may be done.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. As in open executive session, from the Committee on the Judiciary, Robert R. Carman, of Baltimore, Md., to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland, vice Samuel K. Dennis, resigned, effective May 31, 1920.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominee is confirmed, and the President of the United States will be notified of the confirmation.

CONFIRMATION OF ALEXANDER C. KING.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask the Senator from New York if he will not allow us to have an executive session to consider the nomination of a circuit judge for the fifth circuit of Georgia, which was unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the nomination be considered as in open executive session.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If there is not to be an executive session, with closed doors, I ask that the nomination be confirmed in open executive session.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the nomination will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. As in open executive session, from the Committee on the Judiciary, Alexander C. King, of Atlanta, Ga., to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Don A. Pardee, deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the nomination is confirmed, and the President of the United States will be notified of the confirmation.

CONFIRMATION OF STEPHEN T. LOCKWOOD.

Mr. KING. As in open executive session, I report from the Committee on the Judiciary the nomination of Stephen T. Lockwood, of Buffalo, N. Y., to be United States attorney for the western district of New York, a reappointment, his term having expired, and I ask for action upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination is confirmed, and the President of the United States will be notified of the confirmation.

RECESS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 25, 1920, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24, 1920.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Alexander C. King, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Stephen T. Lockwood to be United States attorney, western district of New York.

Robert B. Carman to be United States attorney, district of Maryland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 24, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou God and Father of us all, infinite in wisdom, power, and goodness, who hast placed within our reach a portion of these qualities; for we realize that there is something finer in every man than anything he says or does.

When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things.

For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

It is writ:

Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

Help us to develop out of the strenuous duties of life those qualities which we know are eternal. In the precious example of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 22, 1920, was read and approved.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPH J. GILL, OF OHIO.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, my purpose in asking to address the House this morning is to inform you of the death of Hon. Joseph J. Gill, of Steubenville, Ohio, who represented the sixteenth congressional district of Ohio in the Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh, and Fifty-eighth Congresses of the United States. In the passing of Mr. Gill our district loses one of its outstanding men—a man whose liberality made possible the building of the first modern hospital in the city of Steubenville. Mr. Gill was a large employer of labor, and in more than 40 years in the factories which he controlled there never was a strike or any serious labor disturbance, because he believed in collective bargaining and always gave a square deal to those whom he employed.

As the present Member from the eighteenth district, which district is largely made up of the old sixteenth, I feel specially grieved at the passing of this splendid citizen, for it was by him that I was given my first employment and from him I received my first dollar, and I am proud to say that from my boyhood until the present time I have had the helpful influence of this splendid man, and in his passing all eastern Ohio is conscious of a real loss, and may the God that tempers the wind to the shorn lamb bring peace and comfort to the friends and relatives of one of nature's noblemen, Hon. Joseph J. Gill.

CONSOLIDATION OF FOREST LANDS, SIERRA NATIONAL FOREST.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2789) for the consolidation of forest lands in the Sierra National Forest of California, and for other purposes, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 2789, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman spoken to the ranking minority member who will be on the conference concerning sending this bill to conference at this time?

Mr. SINNOTT. The minority member will be on the conference.

Mr. GARNER. I know there will be a minority Member on the conference committee, but has the gentleman from Oregon discussed with the ranking minority Member the question of agreeing to the conference asked for by the Senate on this bill?

Mr. SINNOTT. I have not spoken to him about it.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I serve notice upon the majority side at this time that while I am in the House, if I happen to be present when such requests are made, I shall insist upon the request being accompanied with the statement that the majority has consulted with the minority Members. Therefore I object.