

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 25, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (S. 2104) to amend sections 4402, 4404, and 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 686), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8625) to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 687), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 398) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish the House information regarding the diversion of water from Niagara River by the Province of Ontario, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 688), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12549) 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; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12550) for the appointment on the retired list, United States Army, of Brig. Gen. James Rush Lincoln; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 12551) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," approved June 25, 1910, amended by act approved August 19, 1911; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 12552) to authorize an appropriation not exceeding the sum of \$1,000,000,000, or so much thereof as may be needed from time to time for the reclamation of arid lands, to provide farms for soldiers, Red Cross nurses, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: Resolution (H. Res. 400) to print extra copies of the soldiers and sailors' civil relief act for the use of the House; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PETERS: Resolution (H. Res. 401) requesting the Board of Managers of the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to report to the House of Representatives conditions at the soldiers' home in Virginia and the reasons for separation of Joseph S. Smith from the governorship; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 12553) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Darlington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12554) granting an increase of pension to Mary Belle Chitwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 12555) for the relief of the Yosemite Stone Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Miss RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 12556) granting a pension to Phineas Arthur White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12557) for the relief of Sylvester Hannan, alias Henry Edwards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BROWNING: Petitions of citizens of Almonesson and of Woodbury, N. J., urging nation-wide prohibition during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of the Iowa State Manufacturers' Association, concerning the production and transportation of essential products, also concerning the distribution of Government purchases with reference to the transportation problem; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of members of the Essex County (N. J.) Medical Society, urging the passage of House bill 9563; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of citizens of Marshall County, Minn., in favor of the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Resolutions of the Iowa State Manufacturers' Association, relative to the production and transportation of industrial necessities, also with reference to the distribution of Government purchases as it affects the transportation problem; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the Pennsylvania Housing and Town Planning Association, asking Congress to increase appropriation for house building to the extent necessary to provide proper and sanitary dwellings for workers on Government war contracts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, June 25, 1918.

(Legislative day of Monday, June 24, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hale	Nelson	Smoot
Baird	Harding	New	Sterling
Bankhead	Hardwick	Norris	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Henderson	Nugent	Thomas
Colt	Hitchcock	Overman	Tillman
Culberson	Hollis	Page	Trammell
Cummins	Johnson, Cal.	Poindexter	Underwood
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson	Vardaman
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Shafroth	Warren
Fall	Kirby	Sheppard	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Shields	Weeks
Gallinger	McKellar	Simmons	Williams
Gerry	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	
Gore	Martin	Smith, Ga.	
Gulon	Myers	Smith, Md.	

Mr. JONES of Washington. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I wish to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] on official business.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is detained by illness. I wish also to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] on official business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is detained by illness.

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

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 247).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$1,000,000 required by the Interior Department for survey, investigation,

and study looking to the reclamation of arid lands, cut-over timberlands, and swamp lands, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12541) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12441) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, requests a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERLEY, Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, and Mr. MONDELL managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 9160. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war;

H. R. 9612. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 10027. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

PETITIONS.

Mr. ASHURST presented petitions signed by Rev. William H. Fowle, pastor First Baptist Church, Mesa, Ariz.; Rev. F. W. Perkins, moderator Flagstaff Baptist Church, Flagstaff, Ariz.; Rev. E. L. Barkley, pastor Baptist Church, Winslow, Ariz.; Dean Hamilton, pastor First Baptist Church, Prescott, Ariz.; Rev. Richard S. Beal, pastor First Baptist Church, Tucson, Ariz.; Rev. T. M. Smith, pastor Baptist Church, Palo Verde, Ariz.; Rev. C. M. Northrup, pastor Glendale Baptist Church, Glendale, Ariz.; Rev. S. E. Newell, pastor Mount Calvary Baptist Church, Tucson, Ariz.; Rev. Samuel G. Bridges, pastor Baptist Church, Buckeye, Ariz.; Dr. John T. Taylor, moderator Baptist Church Middle Verde, Ariz.; Rev. P. S. Virgin, pastor First Baptist Church, Chloride, Ariz.; Rev. J. W. Johnson, pastor Baptist and Methodist Church, Somerton, Ariz.; Rev. William J. Gordon, pastor First Baptist Church, Nogales, Ariz.; Rev. J. Humphrey, Saint Paul Baptist Church, Bisbee, Ariz.; Rev. Cecil V. Overman, pastor Baptist Church, Clifton, Ariz.; Rev. C. M. Rock, pastor Calvary Baptist Church, Phoenix, Ariz.; Rev. R. P. Pope, pastor First Baptist Church, Scottsdale, Ariz.; Rev. George M. Lehigh, pastor First Baptist Church, Phoenix, Ariz.; urging and petitioning that no food nor fuel be permitted to be used in converting grains into alcoholic beverages, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING.

Mr. HENDERSON, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the years 1919 and 1920, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 523) thereon.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations through the Bureau of Mines of lignite coals, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 524) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 4745) for the relief of the claimants of certain unsurveyed lands in Mississippi County, Ark.; and

A bill (S. 4746) to authorize the drainage of certain lands in the State of Arkansas, counties of Mississippi and Poinsett; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4747) to amend section 11 of the Federal reserve act approved December 23, 1913, as amended by the act of September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARDWICK:

A bill (S. 4748) conferring jurisdiction on the District Court of the Canal Zone for the naturalization of certain aliens; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 4749) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay Mrs. Elizabeth Braddy, of Gibson, Glascock County, Ga., the sum of \$601.75, the value of 145 war saving stamps which were destroyed by fire on the 26th day of May, 1918; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 4750) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by requiring the use of an automatic electric cab-signal and train-stopping device by common carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 4751) granting an increase of pension to Albert F. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN:

A bill (S. 4752) permitting suits against the United States for damages caused by vessels owned or operated by the United States or by corporations controlled by it; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 4753) amendatory of the act of May 11, 1912, granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Pensions.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate of the bill (H. R. 12441) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MARTIN, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. GALLINGER conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 19th instant approved and signed the act (S. 4445) granting the consent of Congress to Marion and Horry Counties, S. C., to construct a bridge across Little Peedee River.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 12541. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12281) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the Senate was proceeding with the committee amendments to the bill at the time the recess was taken yesterday evening, and I ask that we proceed at the point where the Senate left off.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would the Senator accommodate me by recurring to the first amendment that was passed over during my absence yesterday relating to the equipment, maintenance, and training of foreign troops?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the one we are coming to now in regular order.

The SECRETARY. On page 65 the first amendment passed over is under the side head "Equipment, maintenance, and training of foreign troops," after line 6, to insert the following:

Equipment, maintenance, and training of foreign troops: Under such regulations as the President shall prescribe, contingents of troops from any country joined with the United States which during the existing emergency is or shall be at war with any country with which the United States is at war may, with the approval of the country from which they come, be equipped, maintained, and trained with our own troops, and at the end of such training may be transported with our troops to the European front and there equipped and maintained

during service with our own troops against the common enemy; and the several items of expense involved in the equipment, maintenance, training, and transportation of such contingents may be paid from the respective appropriations herein made, or from any subsequent appropriations, for the equipment, maintenance, training, and transportation of the military forces.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, the Committee on Woman Suffrage has prepared a unanimous-consent agreement fixing a time for a vote upon the suffrage constitutional amendment, and if the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill now under consideration and others will give their consent, I should like at this time to have the agreement read to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I did not hear the request of the Senator from New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He is trying to get a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. On this bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; on the woman-suffrage constitutional amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator is going to ask unanimous consent without any discussion, I have no objection; but if it leads to any discussion—

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will lead to a call of the Senate, the Chair will state.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would rather proceed with this bill for a while.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Of course if the Senator from Oregon prefers that the matter shall go over for a while, I shall not object myself; but the purpose of the agreement is to fix a time for a vote, and it was not the intention at this time to enter into any discussion of the matter.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is very essential that this Army appropriation bill should be passed. The appropriations were exhausted on the 15th of June in many instances, and the War Department must have the money that is provided for in the bill. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will not insist on that until later in the day some time. We can probably reach a time in the afternoon when it can be taken up. I therefore insist that we shall proceed with this measure.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to have the agreement read at this time, so that Senators may be considering its purport, if there is no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator in charge of the proposed joint resolution that, so far as I am concerned, I am disposed to reach an agreement by unanimous consent—that is, I am perfectly willing that a vote shall be taken on the joint resolution at the proper time—but I would be unwilling to enter into an agreement by unanimous consent for the consideration of the joint resolution so long as this war bill is pending, because if we reach an agreement of that kind and the war bill is pending it might have the effect to cut off all debate and all consideration of the proposed joint resolution. If the Senator expects to get a unanimous-consent agreement, I think it can be done at the proper time, but I hope that he will not attempt to ask for unanimous consent until he brings the joint resolution before the Senate. If he does, I give notice that he will force me to enter an objection.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Whatever is done will be satisfactory to all Senators. If the proposal which we now present is not satisfactory, we will try to make it satisfactory.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not saying that the proposal is not entirely satisfactory at the proper time, but I do not think it should be made until the Senator brings the joint resolution before the Senate.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Very well.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I request now that we recur to the amendment on page 65, line 23, of the bill, which was passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment is to insert from line 7 to line 22 what has been read by the Secretary. Is there any objection to that amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment passed over, beginning on line 23, page 65, will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 65, after line 22, the Committee on Military Affairs reports to insert:

Slavic Legion: That, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, a force of volunteer troops in such unit or units as he may direct may be raised to be composed of Slavs, Jugo-Slavs, Czecho-Slovenes, and Poles belonging to the oppressed races of the Austro-Hungarian or German Empire resident in the United States but not citizens thereof nor subject to the draft. Such force shall be known as the Slavic Legion or by such other description as the President may prescribe. No man shall be enlisted in it until he has furnished satis-

factory evidence that he will faithfully and loyally serve the cause of the United States and that he desires to fight the Empire of which he and his race have been unwilling subjects. The force so raised and duly sworn into the service may be equipped, maintained, and trained with our own troops or separately as the President may direct and thereafter may be transported to such field of action as the President may direct to be used against the common enemy in connection with our own troops or with those of any nation associated with the United States in the present war; and the several items of expense involved in the equipment, maintenance, training, and transportation of such force may be paid from the respective appropriations herein made or from any subsequent appropriations for the same.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, in the drafting of this amendment several mistakes were made, and I am offering some formal amendments to the amendment.

In line 26 I move that the first word, the word "Slavs," be omitted. That is desirable because the enumeration of the Slavic races will be sufficient without the use of the general term.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the first word in line 26, the word "Slavs," and the comma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be agreed to, without objection.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, in line 26, I move to strike out the word "Slovenes" and insert the word "Slovaks." I find I was in error in using the term "Czecho-Slovenes." It should be "Czecho-Slovaks."

The SECRETARY. In line 26 strike out "Slovenes," after the word "Czecho," and insert the word "Slovaks."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I come to another amendment which I think should be inserted. I have not discussed the matter with the chairman of the committee, but I have been waited upon by an eminent Czecho-Slovak, Prof. Mazaryk, who suggests that the Ruthenians should be included, the Ruthenians being an oppressed race of Austria, akin to the Ukrainians of Russia—in fact, neighbors of theirs—and belonging to the same branch of the Slavic races. I therefore move that the word "Ruthenians," with "Ukrainians" in parentheses, be inserted after the word "Slovaks."

The SECRETARY. In line 26, after the word "and" and before the word "Poles," insert the words "Ruthenians (Ukrainians)."

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to ask the Senator why he has not included in his amendment Russians?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. For the reason that we are now dealing only with those who are technically alien enemies, who can not be enlisted in our Army under the present law because they are technically alien enemies, and the Russians do not fall within that class.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Russians are out of the war, so far as their de facto government is concerned. I scarcely know whether to class them as alien enemies or as friends or neutrals, but I am only suggesting the matter in order that it may get serious consideration. A great many of the Russians are of the same blood and race as the people who are mentioned in this amendment, with the same racial ambitions, traditions, and desires and the same interest in this war, and it seems to me that it would be a very congenial element to go into the make-up of such a legion as this. I assume that a great many of them are in the United States, and it would open up a great resource of men who might be added to the force of this organization.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator has no objection to the amendment including Ruthenians?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask that the amendment be again stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. As proposed to be amended, the amendment would read:

That, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, a force of volunteer troops, in such unit or units as he may direct, may be raised, to be composed of Jugo-Slavs, Czecho-Slovaks, and Ruthenians (Ukrainians), and Poles belonging to the oppressed races—

And so forth.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, after that amendment shall have been agreed to I have another amendment which I wish to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment still further, on page 65, line 26, by striking out the word "Poles." I offer this amendment not with any desire to exclude the Poles from this Slovak legion, but because

It has been represented to me by those in charge of French interests in this country that it will probably result in some interference with the efforts they are making to raise a Polish legion, or, in fact, a Polish army, for active use in France. This movement has already gone so far that France, with the approval and cooperation of the United States Government, has taken over from our shores thousands of Poles; probably two-thirds of those secured for the Polish legion in France have come from the United States. Only a few days ago the Polish legion, which had heretofore passed under that name, received a new baptism, and under the name of "Polish Army" was decorated by the President of France in the field. Thus Poland was born again upon the battle fields of France.

I would not do anything in this measure to detract from the effort which France is making to enlist a great Polish Army to cooperate with the French Army, as has been proposed by France. I believe, therefore, it will conduce to harmony of effort and to unity of enterprise to omit from this Slovak legion the name "Poles." They can now fight in France under their own banner—under the silver eagle of Poland—and I am sure it would be unwise to attempt to divide their allegiance or to divide their interests by incorporating them in this Slovak legion. I therefore move, Mr. President, that the word "Poles" be omitted from the amendment as presented.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. Possibly not directly upon the question of removing the Poles from this amendment, but upon the broader question, I should like some information from the Senator from Nebraska—that is, what is to be the status of these divisions after the war is over? They are at present to be made up of alien enemies. Of course, if they remain aliens and return to their own country, every one of them would be subject to be indicted and to be executed for treason against their own country. If they remain here, they ought to remain, of course, as American citizens. If we hold them during the war, we must necessarily protect them after the war. That seems to me to be one of the principal questions in this case; that is, the relation of this Government and its duty to protect these people against any law of their own country after the war is over. I assume that the Senator from Nebraska, of course, has considered that phase of the question, and I should like to have his views upon it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the question raised by the Senator from North Dakota is of some importance, but I have not given it much consideration. I assume, however, that if it were necessary the Government of the United States would protect those men in the treaties of peace that are finally entered into. Certainly we would owe them a heavy obligation if, without any legal obligation, they volunteered and risked their lives. I feel certain, however, that even without any protection from the Government of the United States the feeling of these Jugo-Slavs is so intense, they are so against the countries which have oppressed them and their relatives in the past, they will enter the war even though they know that upon capture they are to be shot. I have never found in my experience such intensity of patriotic feeling, such intensity of zeal, as is manifested in the conversation of these oppressed Slovak races concerning their aspirations for liberty. I believe they will esteem it a favor to be permitted to volunteer and to get the opportunity of service against the common enemy.

Mr. McCUMBER. Naturally, Mr. President, under the laws of nations and the laws of war, if any of them were taken prisoners they would be subject to be shot and undoubtedly would be immediately court-martialed and executed for the offense of treason against their own country. Therefore I was a little at a loss to know the sentiment that was back of this provision; whether it is a sentiment to free their own country, to fight as aliens to this country; whether it is a sentiment to assist this country; and whether the people of this blood intend at present to become American citizens or after this war is over. Of course, we could not take them in at present, but it would have a great bearing upon what our attitude should be and what provision we should make. If they were intending to become Americans, if they were intending to fight for America, then we ought to have some provision that would allow them to become American citizens or to declare their intention to become such, at least, and we ought to throw over them the protection of this Government, so that if any of them were taken prisoners we could apply the law of reprisal if they were executed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think there is much merit in what the Senator from North Dakota says; but I doubt whether what he suggests would really give to these men any actual protection if the authorities of Austria and Germany

chose to disregard such an act of Congress. I should be very glad to cooperate with the Senator from North Dakota hereafter in giving to these men who had enlisted some privilege of naturalization if it could be made effective; but for the present the chief thing, it seems to me, is to avail ourselves of this man power which is in this country, and which is inspired with a tremendous zeal against our common enemy.

Then, Mr. President, there is another thing that I have omitted to say. It is not so much the man power which will be acquired by enlisting this Slovak legion that will prove effective; it is the tremendous moral effect of having the news spread throughout those countries which are inhabited by the Jugo-Slavs, the Croats, the Slovenians, the Istrians, the Dalmatians, the Bosnians, the Herzogovinians, the Roumanians, and the Moravians that there is a Slovak army under the Stars and Stripes fighting upon the western front or upon any other front. The effect of that knowledge in those countries will do much, not only to keep alive the spirit of revolt, which is already burning fiercely there, but it will undoubtedly do a great deal to disintegrate the Austro-Hungarian Empire and to weaken it in the present struggle.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that after the word "subjects," in line 9, page 66, we add the words "and the allies thereof," so that the oath required by the law will be that the subject "desires to fight the empire of which he and his race have been unwilling subjects and the allies thereof."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; that would be entirely acceptable to me; but the present amendment relates to the Poles.

Mr. THOMAS. May I move the amendment which I have suggested?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is an amendment pending now to strike out the word "Poles." That might be submitted first, and then the Senator's amendment could be offered.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. I have not the text of the amendment before me. Can the Senator give the page?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Pages 65 and 66.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is it proposed to organize this legion as a part of the military forces of the United States, or is it to be an independent force?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is left in the control of the President.

Mr. HARDWICK. We do not know, then, whether this legion will be a part of the military forces of the United States or not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They are to be treated as a part of the military forces. The language used in the latter part of the amendment is as follows:

The force so raised and duly sworn into the service may be equipped, maintained, and trained with our own troops or separated, as the President may direct, and thereafter may be transported to such field of action as the President may direct, to be used against the common enemy in connection with our own troops or with those of any nation associated with the United States in the present war.

Mr. HARDWICK. That would be true about all the American forces, and that, I think, is a necessary discretion to give the Commander in Chief in relation to all military forces; but, after all, these people will be a part of the military forces of the United States, will they not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think so.

Mr. HARDWICK. If that is so—the Senator spoke of their naturalization just now—there is already provision made for their naturalization.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That occurred to me while I was on my feet after the Senator from North Dakota had asked the question. The pending amendment is to strike out the word "Poles."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 65, line 26, in the amendment reported by the committee, before the word "belonging," it is proposed to strike out the word "Poles."

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

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

Mr. NELSON. It occurs to me that if these Poles are not enlisted under the authority of the United States they will not have the immunity of ordinary prisoners of war if they are captured. Is it not a dangerous thing to leave them "outside the breastworks," and not treat them as soldiers of the United States Army? I submit that question to the Senator.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator will realize that the answer to his question is that those Poles who have enlisted already in the foreign legion of France have the protection of

France to as great an extent as they could have the protection of the United States.

Mr. NELSON. Certainly, I agree with the Senator that the Poles who have enlisted under the colors of France are certainly protected.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. But the Poles embraced in this amendment, unless they are brought under our protection, or under that of France, are left up in the air and will not have the immunity of prisoners of war.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am moving to strike out the word "Poles" from this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the word "unwilling" found in the amendment on line 9, page 66. The sentence reads:

No man shall be enlisted in it until he has furnished satisfactory evidence that he will faithfully and loyally serve the cause of the United States and that he desires to fight the Empire of which he and his race have been unwilling subjects.

It seems to me that the word "unwilling" there is a little out of place. It may have reference to time. When were they "unwilling subjects"? Were they "unwilling subjects" at the time they left their native country or were they up to that time willing subjects of that country?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is merely descriptive matter and would not control the military authorities in drafting the affidavit which a man would make. It is merely a description in the law to guide the military authorities.

Mr. STERLING. Well, it seems to me that it is either a question of proof that he is an unwilling subject or else we are assuming that he was an unwilling subject at the time he left his native country and came to the United States. It seems to me that the word "unwilling" there is wholly unnecessary; that if he is a subject and if he has complied with other requisites here and makes affidavit accordingly, that he will "faithfully and loyally serve the cause of the United States and that he desires to fight the empire of which he and his race have been subjects," that that is all that should be required, and we need not refer to the matter as to whether or not in the past he has been an unwilling subject.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was not intended, Mr. President, that the man should assert that he had been an "unwilling subject." It is merely a description to guide the military authorities. It is a matter, however, of historical notoriety that all of these races have been unwilling subjects of these empires. The Senator will hardly question that the Poles, the Bohemians, the Moravians, the Croatians, the Slovenians, the Istrians, the Dalmatians, the Bosnians, and the Herzegovinians have all been unwilling subjects of the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires. I have used the word merely as a description. It is not of great importance, and I think it could be left out.

Mr. STERLING. We have understood, as a general proposition, that they have been unwilling subjects; but I do not think that warrants us in writing it here in the statute that they are unwilling subjects or that they have been unwilling subjects. It is enough to say that they have been subjects of these countries.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I rather think there is some advantage in the word, because the very theory of this legislation is for us to violate the ordinary custom, which does not contemplate the use of an alien enemy, and enlist a man who is technically an alien enemy, the only theory and the only excuse for using him being that he and his race have been unwilling subjects; that they are a subject race to the Austro-Hungarian Empire. I think the Senator will gain nothing by striking out that word.

Mr. STERLING. It occurs to me that the word "unwilling" is of no use, and I move to strike it out.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 66, line 9, before the word "subjects," it is proposed to strike out the word "unwilling."

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word in answer to a suggestion made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON].

It did not seem to me that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] made the matter as plain as it ought to be made, that under the language of this amendment these people, no matter what they were, will become soldiers of the United States if this legislation passes and they enlist in accordance with its provisions. The language of the provision is:

That under such regulations as the President may prescribe, a force of volunteer troops in such unit or units as he may direct may be raised to be composed of Slavs. * * * Such force shall be known as the Slavic Legion or by such other description as the President may pre-

scribe. No man shall be enlisted in it until he has furnished satisfactory evidence that he will faithfully and loyally serve the cause of the United States—

And so forth.

I have no doubt myself that the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota is eminently proper; that the legal status of these people ought not to be left up in the air; and that the United States Government ought not to be in any position where there could be any doubt about its rights to claim and assert for these people the fullest protection that we can assert or secure or enforce—and "enforce" is a better word, probably—for any of these soldiers. But my own judgment is that it can. I understand the language means that these men are to be soldiers of the United States, however they are employed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HARDWICK. And if that is true, by reprisal, if necessary, or by any other military methods that can accomplish that purpose, we can give to them exactly the same protection, no more and no less, that we can to any other soldier who wears our uniform and serves under our flag.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Colorado, I move to amend the amendment by inserting on line 9, page 66, after the word "subjects," the words "and the allies thereof."

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

The SECRETARY. After the word "subjects" it is proposed to insert a colon and the words "and the allies thereof."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to the amendment.

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the proposed amendment, the following proviso:

Provided, That American citizens of Austrian or German birth who have passed the necessary examination and whose loyalty is unquestioned may, in the discretion of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, be commissioned in the United States Army or Navy.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer this amendment so as to have the Senate go on record on the question of commissioning in the Army and Navy of the United States men who are of alien-enemy birth, but whose loyalty is unquestioned. There has been a suggestion of late that men of this type should not be commissioned. I know of some men who have been told that they could not have commissions because they were born in Austria or Germany. The committee amendment to which this amendment is offered proposes to permit the creation of a division in the American Army of men who are under our laws alien enemies. My amendment simply seeks to provide that men born in alien-enemy countries but of American citizenship and qualified in every other respect, in the discretion of the President may be commissioned in the Army. To deny these men the right to be officers because of alien birth and then insist that they shall be subject to the draft and serve as private soldiers is, to say the least, very un-American.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment, and I believe that no man on the Military Affairs Committee has any objection to the commissioning of officers who are of the same birth as those men included in the paragraph who have demonstrated that they are thoroughgoing Americans, have been naturalized, and have passed through the officers' camp.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, is there any question but that they may be appointed now?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, Mr. President, that brings up a rather remarkable ruling of the War Department. A few days ago, when the Senate Military Affairs Committee was in session, a woman fairly burst into the room to tell the chairman of the committee the case of her son. He had gone through one of the officers' camps, stood third from the top in excellence, was highly recommended by his local officers, but because he had been born in Hungary, under the Austrian flag, he was denied a commission; and others are in the same class. We have denied commissions to Armenians because they were born under the Turkish flag, although they hate Turkey. We have denied commissions to men who are technically Austrians although they hate Austria. The plea that the woman made before our committee impressed every member of it that the War Department was making a great mistake in excluding from officers' commissions those well-educated young Slavs in this country who have gone through college, who have gone through the officers' camps, and who are eminently qualified to become officers, simply be-

cause they were technically born under the flag of one of our enemies.

I therefore approve the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, this is a mere ruling by the department, is it not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is a mere ruling.

Mr. McCUMBER. There is no law that justifies it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. None whatever.

Mr. McCUMBER. And if we add this to the law, it has no more than a merely suggestive application?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is about all.

Mr. McCUMBER. It does not change the law in any way?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is true.

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

Mr. WARREN. I ask that it may be again stated.

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

The Secretary again stated the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with the amendment offered by my colleague, at least in its spirit; but, as I understand, his purpose in offering it at this time is to secure an expression of opinion from the Senate upon this question. I notice, however, that his amendment is confined in its operations to men who were born in Austria or Germany. I ask if he would not be willing to broaden that provision, and make the amendment operative over men who were born in what is now alien enemy territory?

I have in mind the case of a young man who was born in Syria. Every one knows that Syrians despise the Turks; that they have been brutalized and oppressed by them for centuries. He came to this country at a very early age, when he was a mere infant, went through our school system, and graduated at a university. He then went to an officers' training camp, graduated from our own officers' training camp, and was about to receive his commission, when he was told: "No; you can not have it, because you were born in Syria." I was wondering if my colleague would not enlarge the jurisdiction, as it were?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I am certainly willing to accept that suggestion.

The SECRETARY. After the words "of Austrian or German birth" it is proposed to insert the words "or who were born in alien enemy territory."

Mr. CALDER. I accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New York, as modified, to the amendment of the committee.

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 SECRETARY. On page 78, beginning with line 19, it is proposed to strike out that line and all down to and including line 24, on that page, and insert:

Importation of certain war materials free of duty: That during the present emergency upon request made by the Secretary of War to the Secretary of the Treasury, and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, there may be imported into the United States without payment of duty thereon raw materials, parts or partly fabricated parts of equipment, and finished equipment required to hasten or facilitate the production of munitions or machinery of war whenever such duty would otherwise be payable directly or indirectly from appropriations for the support of the Army.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can not believe that the Senate will approve this amendment. It means that manufacturers who already have contracts with the Government based upon paying duty upon the goods imported which enter into the goods made to fill those contracts shall be relieved of the amount of duty paid upon such importations. As far as the Treasury of the United States is concerned, it would be like taking the money from one pocket and putting it into the other; but, as far as the manufacturer is concerned, he having bid upon goods imported with the duty added, it would be a gain of whatever the duty would amount to.

I want to call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that at the close of business on June 22 this year, the amount of customs collected is \$174,777,345.73, as against an amount on the same date for last year of \$220,241,500.54, or a loss to the Treasury of the United States in round numbers of \$46,500,000. It is not possible that the Senate is going to adopt at this time an amendment that will relieve manufacturers and importers of paying duty on material that enters into the construction of machinery or munitions of war or war materials of any sort, when it would not in any way benefit the Treasury, but would simply mean that there would be just so many dollars given to all the manufacturers who have at the present time contracts with the Government for furnishing goods at a fixed price.

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am inclined to agree with the Senator. It seems to me it is absolutely certain that the one immediate and direct effect of the adoption of this amendment would be to permit those who have already contracted with the Government to buy their materials at a very much less price. It would be virtually legislating into the pockets of these gentlemen who have contracts with the Government already the difference brought about by the import duty; and, so far as I am concerned, I am going to vote against this amendment. It was not called to my attention in this way before the committee, and I believe it ought to be defeated. I think the Senator's motion to strike it out is proper.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Utah, who is so much more familiar than myself with the rules concerning revenue legislation if he has given consideration to the question as to whether or not we could originate this legislation? This is a repeal of a tariff law and it is not on a revenue bill. This bill does not pretend to deal with the revenues. There is nothing about the tariff in the bill; and I will ask whether the Senator has considered that question?

Mr. SMOOT. I will state to the Senator that the committee of the Senate no doubt took jurisdiction and included this amendment in the bill, because there was a House provision on the same subject applying only to the Ordnance Department, and the Senate committee has enlarged that so as to cover all departments; so I think, under that provision, perhaps they had jurisdiction. I will say, however, that it seems to me that simply to state the case is enough to defeat the provision. Two years ago, I think, the same provision was asked for by one or two of the departments, and at that time it was put in one of the appropriation bills, and it was stricken from the bill. Last year the same provision was put in one of the bills—I forget which one—but when the attention of the Senate was called to it, it went out of the bill immediately; and I have no doubt that this ought to go out.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if he does not think also that the House provision ought to be struck out?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the Senate ought to disagree to the committee amendment, and then strike out the House provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I take it, in answer to the Senator from Pennsylvania, that the House, having legislated on this very subject, it was perfectly pertinent for the Senate committee to offer the amendment. I hope the amendment will be defeated, and I hope the chairman will accept the suggestion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in view of the action of the committee, I do not feel that I can accept the suggestion. The matter was discussed at considerable length in the committee, and this is the result of the committee's action. I can see objections to the provision and there is force in the suggestions made by the Senator from Utah. On the other hand, members of the committee took the view that it was simply taking money out of one of the Government's pockets and putting it into the other; in other words, that it was just about as broad as it was long to admit free of duty these raw materials that go into the manufacture of munitions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to say that that would be true in so far as future contracts are concerned, but as to contracts already existing it would have an entirely different effect. Instead of taking money from one pocket and putting it into the other, it would be legislating a lot of money into the contractors' hands.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am inclined to believe that the serious objection to the provision is the one raised by the Senator from Pennsylvania. It is revenue legislation in a sense, and ought to originate in the House; but if it is stricken from the bill, in view of the fact that the House bill had a provision on the subject, we could take up the whole matter in conference and consider it there. I am not going to oppose the motion very seriously.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, that disposes of the affirmative amendment on page 79.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, the House provision would remain in the bill. I therefore move to strike from the bill lines 19 to 24, on page 78.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 78 it is proposed to strike out lines 19 to 24, inclusive, in the following words:

Provided further, That all material purchased under the appropriations for the Ordnance Department in this act shall be of American manufacture, except in cases when, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, it is to the manifest interest of the United States to make purchases abroad, which material shall be admitted free of duty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator a question before we take up the next one of the committee amendments that were passed over.

I ask the Senator having the bill in charge to turn to page 89. Under the provision for printing and binding there is the following proviso:

That printing, binding, and blank books required for use outside of the District of Columbia in connection with the support of the Army and the National Guard may be done or procured elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office when in the opinion of the Secretary of War such work can be more advantageously done or procured locally—

And so forth. I should like to ask the Senator if any real good reason was given why that provision should be put in the bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator will remember that two years ago, I think it was, possibly when the last appropriation bill was up, it was physically impossible for the officers at the cantonments to get printing done in time to distribute it among the soldiers and give them the information which it was necessary for them to have. The red tape that had to be gone through and the difficulty of getting printing done here in Washington led some officers in the National Guard to have the printing done at their own expense, in order that they might get the material prepared.

Mr. WARREN. I think they made a perfect case, and the provision was necessary.

Mr. SMOOT. I think so, too, and that is why two years ago it was allowed to be put in the bill. I simply want at this time to say that as soon as the war is over I think a provision of this kind ought never to appear in the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am in thorough accord with the Senator. I think it is a bad plan as a general rule; but in view of the rapidity with which these men have to be raised and gotten into the cantonments and the amount of literature it was necessary to place in their hands the committee was led to act favorably at this time, and also when the last appropriation bill was up.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an amendment in line 20, page 90. Yesterday afternoon I had an amendment made inserting the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary" after "\$316,941." I have looked at the Record, on page 8192, and I find that the amendment was not agreed to finally. I now offer it again, as the Record does not show that it was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was agreed to. The Journal so shows. We do not go by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Journal shows that it was agreed to? The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is entirely satisfactory, if the Journal shows it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 100, after line 15, the Committee on Military Affairs reported to insert the following:

CHAPTER IX.

Army Mine Planter Service: That hereafter there shall be in the Coast Artillery Corps of the Regular Army a service to be known as the Army Mine Planter Service, which shall consist, for each mine planter in the service of the United States, of 1 master, 1 first mate, 1 second mate, 1 chief engineer, and 1 assistant engineer, who shall be warrant officers appointed by and holding their offices at the discretion of the Secretary of War, and 2 oilers, 4 firemen, 4 deck hands, 1 cook, 1 steward, and 1 assistant steward, who shall be appointed from enlisted men of the Coast Artillery Corps under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Coast Artillery Corps is hereby increased by such numbers of warrant officers and enlisted men as may be necessary to constitute the force provided by this chapter: *Provided further*, That the annual pay of the warrant officers and enlisted men in the various grades established by this chapter shall be as follows: Masters, \$1,800; first mates, \$1,320; second mates, \$972; chief engineers, \$1,700; assistant engineers, \$1,200; oilers, \$432; firemen, \$396; deck hands, \$216; cooks, \$360; steward, \$540; assistant stewards, \$288: *And provided further*, That warrant officers shall have such allowances as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and shall be retired, and shall receive longevity pay, as now provided by law for officers of the Army, and that the enlisted force herein provided for shall receive the allowances and continuous-service pay now provided by law for enlisted men of the Army: *And provided further*, That in computing length of service for retirement, and in computing longevity pay for warrant officers and continuous-service pay for the enlisted men authorized by this chapter, service on boats in the service of the Quartermaster Department or the Quartermaster Corps prior to the passage of this act shall be counted: *And provided further*, That during the continuation of the present emergency all enlisted men of the Mine Planter Service of the Army of the United States in active service whose base pay does not exceed \$21

per month shall receive an increase of \$15 per month; those whose base pay is \$24, an increase of \$12 per month; those whose base pay is \$30, \$33, \$36, or \$40, an increase of \$8 per month; and those whose base pay is \$45 or more, an increase of \$6 per month: *And provided further*, That the increases of pay herein authorized shall not enter into the computation of continuous-service pay.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee something about that amendment, and to call his attention to some facts that have been brought to my attention in connection with it. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if the objections of the mine planters to this provision were considered by the committee?

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I will state that I was appointed on a subcommittee with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and we heard all the objections filed by all the men who are now in operation of the mine-planter outfit. We had a proper hearing of both sides of the matter, and we were led to the conclusion, and recommended, that the amendment should be adopted as it is set out here, and the committee also recommended it. We heard all the objections of the mine planters which were presented.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let me ask the Senator this question: Under the terms of this bill the master, for instance, of one of these mine planters gets \$1,800?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. These masters are now getting \$2,800.

Mr. KIRBY. That is true.

Mr. JONES of Washington. How does the committee justify a reduction of that kind under the present condition of things?

Mr. KIRBY. These mine planters are not now in the military service of the Government. They are civilians. They strike, or insist upon this sort of a wage or that sort of a wage, and they say it is only reasonable under present conditions; but we are told by the department here that it is necessary to put them within the service of the military department, so that we can rely upon these people who will be officers and men in the service. Then we can keep them in the service under any emergency and at all times, and this is enough money, under existing conditions, to secure all the talent that is needed to operate the mine-planter service. That is the condition as it was developed before the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course I can understand why the Army wants these mine planters in the service; but this compensation was fixed by the Secretary of War, and if it was reasonable at the time when he fixed it it seems to me that some arrangement ought to be made under which the compensation of these men would not be subjected to such an extreme reduction, at any rate. These people, many of them, have their families; they have to take care of them, and they are just able to do it upon the compensation they are now receiving. To make such an enormous reduction as this would be very unjust and very unfair. The general plan is to increase compensation now rather than to decrease it, and yet here you are decreasing the salary, for instance, of a master \$900.

Mr. KIRBY. We are not expecting these men, if the salary is not satisfactory, to stay in the service. The department desires men who will be in the military service who can be designated to perform this particular duty, and who will be there when required to be there.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does not the Senator think that we need these experienced men? I wish to say, in justice to these men, that they say they will not leave the service. I will just read a statement from one of them.

Mr. KIRBY. I have no objection to the Senator reading it, but we had all those statements before us.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to read it for the Record. Here is what one of them says:

Mr. Senator, should we be penalized for working for Uncle Sam, which we will be should this bill go into effect as we can not resign, and will not during this emergency, no matter what happens? Commercial companies do not ask such a sacrifice, and why should the United States Government?

These men do not propose to leave the service if we cut their wages much lower; but it does seem to me to be a very great injustice. We provide here that the mates shall get \$1,320. These mates are getting now \$2,280. Their pay is to be cut to that extent. Second mates are to get \$972. They are getting \$1,680 now. That was the compensation fixed by the Secretary of War for this service.

I want to say that these are men of experience. Many of them have been in the service for a great many years. We do not want in this emergency to take new men and displace these old ones, even if the department contemplated getting their services. We do not want to do that.

As I have read from the letter they do not propose to leave, but we ought not to take advantage of that circumstance to cut their wage as we seem to be doing here. They are going to

have to do just the same class of service, work in the same danger, and with the same energy they have been doing heretofore. Their work during this war has been much more arduous than it ever has been before, much more dangerous than it was when this compensation was fixed. Here we give the chief engineer \$1,700. He is getting now \$2,500. We cut his pay \$800. Here are the assistant engineers, whom we put at \$1,200. They are now getting \$2,100. In other words, we cut their compensation \$900 by this measure. Then we give oilers \$432, and they are now getting \$1,320. In other words, we reduce the salary of these men \$900.

Mr. REED. What section of the bill is that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Chapter IX, page 101.

Mr. WARREN. I can explain it to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I am trying to find out. I want to find out why we are treating these men in this sort of way.

Then firemen, according to this bill, get \$396. They are now getting \$1,260. That is their compensation. Then deckhands under this bill get \$216, and they are now getting \$1,140. Why make such an enormous reduction as that? What is the reason for it? Is it possible that when a man enters the service of Uncle Sam and does the same kind of work that he has been doing all the time he has got to give up so much of his salary and compensation, and under this bill get \$360 where he now gets \$1,080; in other words, a reduction of over \$700? Cooks, under this bill, get \$360. They are now getting \$1,080; in other words, a reduction of over \$700. Then stewards, under the bill, get \$540, where they are now getting \$1,200.

Mr. STERLING. In what service?

Mr. JONES of Washington. In the mine planters' service. Assistant stewards are to get \$288, and they are now getting \$900.

Now, I want to show how we treat them in the Navy:

These warrants are not even commission warrants, as provided in the Navy, and in no sense of the word do they equal the Navy rate except in the higher grade; the lowest commissioned warrant officers in the Navy receive as a salary a pay of \$1,500 per year.

Then why should not these men, at any rate, if they are going to be taken into the Army, have the same sort of treatment we accord men in the Navy?

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] suggests to me that no enlisted men in the Army get what they do in the Navy. I am not familiar enough with the technical terms to know just the difference, but I take it from this letter that in the Navy they have men in similar positions, and they are getting \$1,500 per annum, or much greater than that proposed here.

Mr. KIRBY. If the Senator addresses his inquiry to me, I think—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am addressing it to anyone who will answer it.

Mr. KIRBY. The whole matter was presented to the committee. These men are in civil employment. They can leave when they get ready. They are not subject to the order of the Government at all, any further than that they are employed. It was deemed necessary and desirable to have them in the Government service, so that they can be relied upon. Men are being trained for this service and the salaries are regarded as sufficient by the War Department. They will have no trouble, they think, in getting the kind of talent they need for the discharge of this sort of duty at this figure.

It seems to me that there should come a time when the Government ought to get something at its reasonable worth. It is time, when we are asking everybody in the world to subscribe to liberty bonds and saving stamps, that we should not expend more money than ought to be expended for this particular service. The Judge Advocate General, who was getting \$15,000 or \$20,000 before he went into the service, gets \$2,500. Take a man in the Medical Department. He was making \$25,000 a year, probably, before he entered the service, and he gets \$2,000 under the commission he has taken here. If we can get the service—and the War Department says we can get the service—I do not see why we should allow anybody else to control the establishment and organization of this service except the War Department, which must be responsible for it. We reached a conclusion after hearing both sides and all the objections that have been presented here, and we reported it to the committee and the committee recommended it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I agree with many of the suggestions of the Senator from Arkansas, but if we are going to reduce pay we should reduce it, and let us not stop with a certain class. This, I think, is the only class whose pay we have been reducing. We have been increasing salaries generally, and we should have some other reason given for this reduction than that given by the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. On page 101, starting with line 13, it reads:

That warrant officers shall have such allowances as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and shall be retired, and shall receive longevity pay, as now provided by law for officers of the Army, and that the enlisted force herein provided for shall receive the allowances and continuous-service pay now provided by law for enlisted men of the Army: *And provided further*, That in computing length of service for retirement, and in computing longevity pay for warrant officers and continuous-service pay for the enlisted men authorized by this chapter, service on boats in the service of the Quartermaster Department or the Quartermaster Corps prior to the passage of this act shall be counted: *And provided further*, That during the continuation of the present emergency all enlisted men of the Mine Planter Service of the Army of the United States in active service whose base pay does not exceed \$21 per month shall receive an increase of \$15 per month; those whose base pay is \$24, an increase of \$12 per month; those whose base pay is \$30, \$33, \$36, or \$40, an increase of \$8 per month; and those whose base pay is \$45 or more, an increase of \$6 per month: *And provided further*, That the increases of pay herein authorized shall not enter into the computation of continuous-service pay.

These men need not enter the service, but if they enter the service they know that they will have all the allowances of clothing, shelter, food, and retired pay after they have been in the service long enough for retirement. They will have also increased pay from time to time for long service. So, while they commence at low pay, finally they arrive at a high pay, considering all their allowances.

These enlisted men are very different from the men who are hired from day to day or month to month as civilian employees.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator would have us understand, then, that the committee considered those things as full compensation for this reduction, or, rather, as I understand, that the committee think it is best to take these mine planters into the Army and make their crews and officers enlisted soldiers and place them upon a par with all other soldiers?

Mr. WARREN. Exactly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. And if these people do not want to stay in at the compensation provided, of course they can go out. Of course, if the committee thinks that is wise, I really have nothing to say. These men, I take it, are speaking of this proposition on the basis that they are expected to continue in the service. They have been in this service for a great many years. While it is true they are civil employees, I suppose they are under the control of the War Department. As a matter of fact, the Government, as I understand it, has three mine layers, and these men are employed by the War Department and their compensation was fixed by the War Department.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. I have been detained in committee work, and I have not heard all this discussion, but may I ask the Senator how the present salary or wage was fixed? Was it by salary or by the War Department?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand it was fixed by the War Department several years ago. I think the statement that I read is to that effect.

Mr. POMERENE. In any event, Congress has not fixed it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I do not think Congress has fixed the pay. This man who writes to me says:

Myself being a second mate at present, with a yearly wage of \$1,764, it is proposed under this bill to cut it to \$972 per year, or to \$81 per month. As I am now getting \$147, it will mean a cut of \$59 a month, which is a very unfair cut.

Out of this pay I must purchase food and uniform and maintain my family.

Apparently they are required to have a certain kind of uniform.

Mr. KIRBY. They do not buy that after they go into the service.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This man ought to know whether he has to have a uniform. He has been doing this service for a good while, and he said he had to purchase a uniform.

Mr. KIRBY. I will suggest that there are different conditions about the food and uniforms after they get into the Government service.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know that men in the Army are furnished with uniforms if they are privates, but if they are officers they are not furnished them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The committee was very much impressed by the argument the Senator has made, but we received a communication from the War Department and found that under the provisions of this bill the salaries or wages to be paid to these men, taken together with their clothing allowances and their mess allowances or their food, are just about the same as what they have been getting in cash, as described by that writer. Since we have received that information, and I think some members of the committee stated what was the intention of the War Department, we received no further complaint.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This letter is dated March 10, but I received another one about two weeks ago.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think it is due to a misunderstanding.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I wanted to bring out—if these people do not understand the situation, that they might be advised of it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The War Department furnished us a table showing a list of those employees, what they are receiving in civil life as mine planters, and what they would receive in money value under the terms of this bill, and they were practically alike.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why should not that statement be put in the RECORD?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will obtain it and have it put in the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Washington. When the chairman of the committee obtains his statement, I ask permission that it be inserted in the RECORD.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that will explain the situation so that these people will understand it, and that was my only purpose. I thought the committee must have some good reason for putting this matter in the shape that they have done. I can appreciate that, if this service is to be brought into the military department, it must be brought in, of course, upon the general basis of military action. I have no doubt but that these men will patriotically remain in the service and perform these duties, at least until this war is over; but the committee seems to think it would be wise, if they should not be disposed to do that, to replace them with others. So I am satisfied that this statement, together with the facts which are in the RECORD, will explain the matter so that those people will understand it. I shall not further detain the Senate, nor shall I propose any amendment to the committee amendment.

The statement referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF COAST ARTILLERY,
Washington, May 6, 1918.

MEMORANDUM FOR MAJ. GEN. E. M. WEAVER.

In compliance with your request, I am inclosing a table showing past, present, and proposed pay for members of mine-planter crews. The table also shows the rates of pay for warrant officers and petty officers performing the same work.

(a) Column 10 shows the Army grade getting the same pay as that proposed (column 8).

(b) Column 11 shows the Navy grade corresponding to master, chief engineer, etc.

(c) Under columns 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 you will notice headings "Old" and "New." The old pay was in effect until quite recently and was that upon which the proposed pay was based.

(d) Note that pay on *Ringgold* and *Armistead* is higher and always has been higher than on the other planters. This is due, I understand, to the fact that the wages for civilian crews on the Pacific coast are higher than on the Atlantic.

(e) Note the comparative low pay of ship's officers on the *Hunt* and *Knox*.

These vessels are in Manila.

(f) Note that the proposed pay, with allowances of a second lieutenant (column 12), is a substantial increase over the old pay and over pay for corresponding work in the Navy (column 9).

(g) In comparing with the Navy pay, I have included only two warrant officer grades, namely, that of boatswain and machinist, corresponding to master and chief engineer. For first mate, second mate, and assistant engineer I have made a comparison with the Navy petty officer grades of chief boatswain's mate and chief machinist's mate, since the Navy Department informed me that on vessels the size of mine planters, doing their class of work and normally working around the harbors, those would be the Navy grades assigned. If comparison is desired throughout for Navy warrant officers, the pay is the same for all grades.

Officers in the Naval Reserve Force on listed ships that are naval auxiliaries are enrolled as follows for vessels of 500 tons (gross) (planter class): Ensign (second lieutenant), corresponding to master; machinist, corresponding to chief engineer; boatswain, corresponding to first officer. This differs somewhat from the statement made above, but is due to the fact that the Naval Reserve vessels are not confined to harbors as much as mine planters.

In the above I have endeavored to give the latest pay received, although it is possible by this time that the crew of the *Frank* has had another increase, as while I was in the office of the Quartermaster General getting this data a telegram was received from the commanding officer of the *Frank* making such a request.

With reference to the inclosures with Mr. CHAMBERLAIN'S letter, I submit the following comment:

Mr. Trahey's letter: 1. He refers to the *Knox* and *Hunt* sailing for the Philippine Islands and the *Ringgold* and *Armistead* sailing for San Francisco.

These trips were unusual and some of the crew were specially detailed to make the voyages.

2. He refers to the planter making annual trips to Honolulu. Whenever the planters make a voyage to the Hawaiian Islands they are conveyed by one of our transports, and in the case of the *Armistead*'s voyage this spring, she was towed part way and conveyed the remainder.

3. In connection with the question of the second mate having to stand a watch and comparing his pay with the pay of an officer in the Navy doing the same duty, the Navy informed me that on similar vessels in their service only the master and chief engineer, as I stated above, would be warrant officers, but that on vessels which went to sea and had to stand watches, they would have the other two deck officers warranted.

Watch duty on a mine planter is very light. Joint letter from the *Ringgold*'s officers: 1. It is stated that warrant officers' base pay ranges from \$1,500 to \$2,250 per year.

In this connection I am inclosing a table (Table B) showing warrant officers' pay. You will note that the pay referred to above is that of a warrant officer on sea duty ranging from his first duty to that after 12 or more years. Moreover, the warrant officer in the Navy gets no allowances for quarters except when getting shore pay, when the monthly allowance is two rooms at \$12 each. Shore base pay is \$1,125 (see Table B). This would make his pay, with allowances, \$1,413, or \$87 less than I have shown in the tables for comparison.

You will note I have considered chiefly the pay of the warrant officers. In connection with pay of the other members of the crew it is noted there will be quite a reduction. This was fully considered at the time and the proposed rates were made, because it appeared to be unjust to pay a steward more than a first sergeant, or a cook more than a quartermaster sergeant. For further comparison, it should be noted that the pay of a master electrician, the highest-paid enlisted specialist in the Coast Artillery Corps, is \$1,188 per year.

In the above I have not included the additional war pay for grades below second mate and assistant engineer, since this increase is the same for both Army and Navy.

To be just to the members of the mine-planter crews, I believe that all men who do not desire to work under the provisions of the bill should be allowed to resign when the bill is passed, and this without prejudice, the men being allowed to accept positions in the Naval Reserve, under the Shipping Board, or where they may desire.

A course in navigation is now being started at the Coast Artillery School, Fort Monroe, and we expect to fill all positions very shortly with qualified men.

C. W. BAIRD,
Major, Coast Artillery Corps.

	1		2		3		4		5	6		7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
	Frank.	Mills.	Ord.	Armistead and Ringgold.	Graham.	Schofield.	Hunt and Knox.	Bill.		Navy.	Corresponding Army grade, based on pay.								
	Old.	New.	Old.	New.	Old.	New.	Old.	New.		Old.	New.								
Master.....	\$1,980	\$2,580	\$1,980	\$2,580	\$1,980	\$2,580	\$2,280	\$2,880	\$2,760	\$2,178	\$2,580	\$2,100	\$1,800	\$1,500	None.....	Boatswain....	\$2,182	\$2,542	\$2,000
First mate....	1,560	1,920	1,560	1,920	1,560	1,920	1,680	2,280	2,040	1,760	1,920	1,500	1,320	660	do.....	Chief boat- swain's mate.	1,702	1,966	911
Second mate...	1,200	1,680	1,200	1,680	1,200	1,680	1,380	1,680	1,800	1,320	1,680	1,200	972	660	Engineer, Fifth Engineers.	do.....	1,354	1,548	911
Chief engineer..	1,860	2,280	1,860	2,280	1,860	2,280	2,100	2,700	2,640	2,046	2,280	1,980	1,700	1,500	Second Lieuten- ant.	Machinist.....	2,082	2,422	2,003
Assistant en- gineer.....	1,440	1,920	1,476	1,920	1,440	1,920	1,500	2,100	2,160	1,584	1,920	1,380	1,200	924	None.....	Chief machin- ist's mate	1,582	1,822	1,175
Oilers.....	840	1,080	768	1,080	768	1,080	996	1,320	1,140	768	1,080	180	432		EL sergeant, sec- ond class.		628		
Firemen.....	840	1,020	768	1,020	768	1,020	936	1,260	1,080	768	1,020	240	396		Fireman, C. A. S., Second En- gineers.		592		
Deckhand.....	840	960	648	960	648	960	816	1,140	960	648	960	360	216		Private, first class.		412		
Steward.....	876	1,176	876	1,176	876	1,176	876	1,200	1,188	876	1,176	600	540		First sergeant..		736		
Assistant stew- ard.....	516	696	516	696	516	696	456	900	960		696	180	288		Corporal, Second Engineers.		484		
Cook.....	756	984	756	984	756	1,056	756	1,080	984	756	984	420	360		Quartermaster sergeant.		556		

¹ Engineer, Coast Artillery Corps, gets \$780.

Allowances of second lieutenant:

Rooms.....																			
Heat (depending on locality, this is for Port Monroe).....																			
Light.....																			

Total..... 382.24

First 3 years' service.			Second 3 years' service.			Third 3 years' service.			Fourth 3 years' service.			After 12 years' service.		
At sea.	On shore or other duty.	On leave or waiting orders.	At sea.	On shore or other duty.	On leave or waiting orders.	At sea.	On shore or other duty.	On leave or waiting orders.	At sea.	On shore or other duty.	On leave or waiting orders.	At sea.	On shore or other duty.	On leave or waiting orders.
\$1,500	\$1,125	\$875	\$1,625	\$1,250	\$1,000	\$1,750	\$1,625	\$1,125	\$2,000	\$1,625	\$1,250	\$2,250	\$2,000	\$1,500

The above shows pay of warrant officers: Boatswains, gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, pharmacists, and machinists.

SEATTLE, WASH., April 22, 1918.

United States Senator CHAMBERLAIN,
Chairman of the Senate Military Committee,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned officers of the United States Army mine planter *Major Samuel Ringgold*, wish to call your attention to, and to protest against, the ratification of the Army mine planter bill, as passed by the House of Representatives on April 8, 1918.

We are basing our protest on the grounds that the bill in its present form is not a fair bill to the men now employed in this service. The greatest objection being the matter of salary offered, which is far below that now in force for these vessels and others of the same class, namely, all ocean vessels navigating the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and below the pay of warrant officers of the United States Navy, where warrant officers' pay ranges from \$1,500 to \$2,250 per year as base pay, while that offered in the bill is from \$972 to \$1,800 per year.

Attached to this communication is a scale of wages in force on the Pacific coast to merchant officers and the Army transports and to officers of the Shipping Board vessels, also an official copy of the wage scale to vessels of the mine planter service here.

It is proposed to pay the master of these mine planters less than what is paid to masters of small gas-propelled launches of the Coast Artillery Corps. At the coast defenses of Puget Sound the master of the distribution-box launch *L-35* receives a salary of more than \$1,800 per year, as do the masters of the 60-foot harbor boats *Lieut. Gurney* and *Capt. Anton Springer*. The harbor boats *Major Evan Thomas* and the *General Mifflin* pay as salary to the master \$240 per month. These vessels are much smaller vessels than the mine planters. Does it stand to reason that the crew of an ocean-going vessel should receive less remuneration than these small harbor vessels?

After reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the passage of H. R. 9898 and noting the remarks of the several Members on the bill, it is evident that the welfare of the men who operate and navigate the vessels was not considered at all, as there was no opposition or word of protest offered on the floor of the House.

In creating a new branch of the Army, as it is proposed by this bill, and which is to be a permanent arm, is it not to the best interests of the Government to create something that will attract the mariners of proven capability and keep in the service the present members who thoroughly understand all the requirements of mine planting, this planting being an art that takes years to acquire the proper skill and ability to handle a mine planter in the mine fields?

There have been many opportunities for better positions with the Navy Department, Shipping Board, and merchant fleets, yet very few have left their vessels in expectation of some satisfactory legislation being enacted that would be beneficial both to themselves and the War Department, but this present bill is not considered so. We do not believe even yet that it is the intention of the War Department to underpay its employees and to class us as of no value as compared with other vessels' crews in its harbor service. So it is our intention to get these facts before your committee before a vote is taken in the Senate. We hope that the Senate will give more consideration to our claims than was the case in the House of Representatives.

Consider, for example, the case of the first and second mates and the assistant engineer: The first mate is to receive \$1,320; the second mate, \$972; and the assistant engineer, \$1,200 per year; a comparison with the present wage we are now getting will show why this letter has been written. Mates and engineers on small tugs that operate wholly in bays and harbors receive from \$125 to \$175; and a copy of ocean-tug salaries is also attached to this letter. These schedules and statements can be verified by inquiry at any steamship office or agency.

It was stated in the House that these ocean vessels never went to sea, but hung around harbors, and would not out if it was too dark or rough. In view of the over-seas voyages that these vessels have made in the past this contention will not stand. The mine planters *Knorr* and *Hunt* both steamed across the Atlantic to the Philippine Islands by way of the Suez Canal; the *Armistead* and *Ringgold* both steamed around to the Pacific coast from the Atlantic coast by way of the Straits of Magellan; and every year the *Armistead* and *Ringgold* have alternated making a trip across the Pacific to Honolulu, the *Armistead* making the trip the present year, having left here in March and being in Honolulu at the present time, the *Ringgold* doing the planting at the Columbia River bar this year. On the Atlantic coast there are five planters that make trips on the Atlantic seaboard from Maine to the Panama Canal. So, in view of these facts, this work can hardly be likened to harbor work, and mine planters must be considered as ocean vessels in every sense of the word, and manned by ocean navigators, and can not be confused with harbor boats, which are manned and officered by strictly harbor men, whose license will not permit them to leave certain restricted inland waters. A copy of the requirements for officers of the mine-planting service is inclosed. Where can a man with such ability be secured for \$972 per year, or \$81 per month, out of which must come food and uniform?

Is it the intention of the War Department to rate these planters as in a lower class than even its smallest harbor boats?

In this letter we are telling what we know to be the truth, and the wage schedules attached are those in operation at the present time on the Pacific coast. We believe that we have a just cause or there would be no protest against this measure.

It is also evident from the conversation that took place at the time this bill was passed by the House that the Members were not very well informed regarding marine conditions, and it does not seem possible that this bill was thoroughly investigated before passage, possibly on account of many pressing and more urgent bills to come before that body. We are urging that your committee make a thorough

investigation of this bill or, if not having time at present, to delay it until such investigation has been made.

The United States Navy considers the men of this service as valuable officers, as several who have offered their services have all been accepted and given commissions ranging from ensign to lieutenant commander. These men entered the Navy early in the war, but that is not possible at present, as the Quartermaster General does not look with favor upon officers of the Army service resigning their positions for commissions in the Navy, who demand a release from the Army before accepting as members of one of these vessels. These releases are not given; and attached to this correspondence will be found two copies of correspondence. One refers to the advisability of allowing mine-planter officers to resign and the other as to the penalty for leaving the Army service.

In view of these statements, what chance have we to accept outside positions if the War Department chooses to enforce these rulings, should any of us tender our resignations, which, under this bill many of us will be forced to do, for the reason that it will be next to impossible to support our families on the salary offered, especially the lower officers.

Every one of us wish to remain where we are at present, if possible, and have no reason for leaving under present conditions, and it is not yet too late to make this an attractive proposition by rectifying the objectionable features of this bill.

The Military Committee knows from legislation discussed in the Senate for the betterment of conditions for naval officers—and this includes warrant officers of the Navy—what the base pay of warrants in the Navy is, and a comparison of that base pay and that proposed for our branch will show a great reduction for us.

In closing we wish to state that we do not believe that after full investigation the Senate will approve this bill as it now stands, and we earnestly urge a readjustment of the base-pay scale.

Sincerely, yours,

FRANK H. BANNING,
Master U. S. M. P. "*Ringgold*."
A. E. GREENANS,
Chief Engineer U. S. M. P. "*Ringgold*."
HARRY E. LEIGHTON,
First Officer U. S. M. P. "*Ringgold*."
GEORGE G. TRAEHY,
Second Officer U. S. M. P. "*Ringgold*."
WILLIAM R. McLAUGHLIN,
Assistant Engineer U. S. M. P. "*Ringgold*."

May address Fort Stevens, Oreg., coast defenses of the Columbia River.

Rates of pay for transports and the cable ship "*Burnside*" on the Pacific coast.

	Per month.
Master	\$300
First officer	175
Second officer	140
Third officer	130
Fourth officer	117
Chief engineer	250
First assistant	190
Second assistant	150
Third assistant	125
Quarters and board in addition.	

Rates of pay of Puget Sound Tow Boat Co., Seattle, Wash.

	Per month.
Master	\$250
Mate	175
Chief engineer	190
Assistant engineer	145

This in addition to quarters and board.
Warrant officers in the Navy receive a base pay according to length of service the lowest base pay being \$1,500 per year and the maximum \$2,250 per year.

The pay of quartermaster harbor boats in this district.

	Per month.
Steamers <i>General Mifflin</i> and <i>Major Evan Thomas</i> :	
Master	\$240.00
Chief engineer	190.00
Gas steamer <i>L-35</i> , steamer <i>Anton Springer</i> , and steamer <i>Lieutenant J. A. Gurney</i> :	
Master	152.50
Engineer	152.50

Proposed pay for warrant officers of the Coast Artillery.

	Per month.
Master	\$150.00
First mate	110.00
Chief engineer	141.66
Second mate	81.00
Assistant engineer	100.00

Present pay officers of mine planters.

	Per month.
Master	\$240
Mate	100
Chief engineer	225
Second mate	140
Assistant engineer	175

Rates of pay, U. S. A. M. P. "Ringgold."

In accordance with authority contained in letter of the Quartermaster General of the Army, dated June 21, 1917, the rates of pay for the crew of the mine planter *Ringgold* are fixed as follows, effective July 1, 1917, and payment should be made accordingly:

	Per month.
Master	\$240
First mate	190
Second mate	140
Chief engineer	225
Assistant engineer	175
Oiler	110
Fireman	105
Deck hand	95
Steward	100
Cook	90
Pantryman	75

Rates proposed in bill.

	Per month.
Master	\$150.00
First mate	110.00
Second mate	81.00
Chief engineer	141.66
Assistant engineer	100.00

[Extract from letter Np. 231, S 322, Hq. West. Dept., Aug. 3-17.]

Those drawing less than \$1,200 per annum receive 10 per cent additional.
Those drawing between \$1,200 and \$1,800 receive 5 per cent additional.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN subsequently said: Mr. President, again referring to the suggestion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] about the comparative pay of the men who are engaged in the Army Mine Planter Service, the amounts received by them before the passage of this proposed law and the amounts to be received under it, I now have that information, and I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD directly after the remarks of the Senator from Washington, so that it may be all together.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the matter will be inserted in the RECORD at the place indicated. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over was, on page 102, Chapter X, amending the Articles of War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment was passed over at the instance of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have examined the language contained in that amendment, and I think it is reasonably safe as it is.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over was, Chapter XI, beginning on page 106, in line 5, "Method of determining quotas for military service."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from California desires to address himself to that amendment, and I do not see him in the Chamber just at the moment. I therefore ask that the amendment be passed over for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over was, Chapter XVI, which is found on page 117, "Aircraft Production Corporation."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this provision was adopted, as indeed the entire bill was passed upon, while the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee in charge of the investigation of the aircraft situation was absent from the city upon the business of making that investigation. I wish to say now that I do not think the bill ought to have been reported by the committee while members of the committee were absent on the business which they were charged by the committee to conduct. I say that, not for the purpose of making complaint, but I certainly do not want to be charged with any part of the responsibility as a member of the committee when the bill is passed upon in that way.

I desire to call particular attention to Chapter XVI, which relates to the Aircraft Production Corporation. I think that at least that part of this bill ought to be referred to the subcommittee for their examination. We have spent over two weeks in investigating the aircraft situation. Speaking for myself, I am not content to grant the powers provided for in Chapter XVI unless I shall have some explanation of what is proposed. I know of nothing that has been done by Mr. Ryan

that warrants me in concluding that we ought to give him the authority provided in Chapter XVI.

I have tried to reach the chairman of the subcommittee this morning, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], in order that there might be some consultation among the Senators who have been particularly engaged in this business; but up to this moment we have not been able to have any kind of meeting. I should like to have this matter lie over until there can be a consultation, if it is not going to delay the bill. If it is going to delay the bill, I am going to ask to have this amendment rejected.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Of course, the committee would not have any objection to the amendment going over for a reasonable length of time in order that the Senator may advise himself fully about it. I suppose the Senator could do that some time during the day?

Mr. REED. I think we could get together and have a talk about it. I have been looking around the Chamber for the Senator from Colorado, but he has been called out.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Of course, if that can be done, the committee is perfectly willing to let the amendment go over for a while.

In reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, Mr. President, that the bill ought not to be acted upon in the absence of some members of the committee, I will say that the subcommittee had this bill under consideration for nearly three weeks, and at the time when the five members of the subcommittee on aircraft production were here the doors were always open for any of the members of the committee who wanted to be present. There was no desire at all to be discourteous to members of the subcommittee, for they are doing splendid work in investigating the situation of aircraft production. However, the War Department was so insistent and the needs of the country were so great just at this crisis that the committee did not wait for the return of the subcommittee in order to take the matter up. I hope Senators will not think that there is any purpose to be discourteous at all to those Senators.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, the chairman of the committee could not be discourteous; it is not in his nature. I realize the fact that this is a day of haste; that everything gives way to haste. I only think that there might have been a delay long enough for the full membership to have arrived and have voted; but I will make no complaint about that. I know that no discourtesy was intended; but I ask that this matter be laid over until the subcommittee on aircraft production may consult about it. I do not know whether they will feel like making any suggestions or not, but the subject of aircraft was committed to their care—not the subject of this legislation—and the subcommittee has given very earnest work to it. If the amendment can go over during the afternoon, I will try to see if I can get the subcommittee together.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does that request require unanimous consent, Mr. President?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No, indeed.

Mr. REED. I think it does not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If it does require unanimous consent, I object.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I hope the Senator from Mississippi will not object. It is a very reasonable request which the Senator from Missouri makes—that the matter go over for a while this afternoon, until the subcommittee on aircraft can look into it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does it require unanimous consent, Mr. President? If it does, I object.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think it does require unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think it requires unanimous consent. The Senate can pass over a provision of this kind. I was with the committee when the provision was considered, and regretted that the other members of the subcommittee on aircraft were not also present. I sought to investigate it so far as I could, and the subcommittee, consisting of myself, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], was appointed to consider this particular amendment. Still, although I agreed to it—and a further study of the amendment has made me more strongly for it than I was when it was considered by the committee—I join in the expression of the hope that the Senate will permit this provision to go over until to-morrow. I think it is due the other four members of the subcommittee on aircraft that they should have an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if this request involves unanimous consent, I object. If it does not, of course I can not help it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In view of the objection, of course the Senate will have to determine the matter. The question raised is, Shall the item be passed over temporarily?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, it has been usual here for the chairman of the committee to join in such a request; I never knew it to be opposed; but I do not think it requires unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair submitted the question; but, in view of the objection, the Senate should be required to determine the matter. The question is, Shall the item be passed over temporarily? [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it, and the item will be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments, except the two passed over, to wit, Chapter XI and Chapter XVI.

Mr. FALL and Mr. McCUMBER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico rose first and is recognized.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I understand amendments are now in order to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments are now in order from the floor.

Mr. FALL. On yesterday afternoon I offered an amendment, but in view of the fact that the bill was then about to be laid over I simply requested that the amendment be printed and taken up in due course. I now offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 120, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the age limit fixed in said act is hereby changed and shall be and is hereby fixed at 18 and 45 years in lieu of 21 and 31: *Provided further*, That those registered under the age of 21 shall not be drafted nor used for service upon the firing line until they shall have reached the age of 21.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think this is a tremendously important proposition, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hale	McKellar	Shields
Baird	Harding	McNary	Simmons
Bankhead	Hardwick	Martin	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Henderson	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Calder	Hitchcock	New	Smoot
Chamberlain	Hollis	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Johnson, Cal.	Nugent	Sutherland
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Swanson
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Thomas
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Thompson
Fall	Kellogg	Polinder	Tillman
Fernald	Kendrick	Pomerene	Trammell
France	Kenyon	Ransdell	Vardaman
Frellinghuysen	King	Reed	Wadsworth
Gallinger	Knox	Robinson	Walsh
Gore	Lenroot	Shafroth	Watson
Gronna	Lodge	Sheppard	Williams
Guion	McCumber	Sherman	Wolcott

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] is detained on official business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is detained on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question.

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I note that the maximum age limit that the Senator places in his amendment is 45. I want to ask him if he would have any objection to making that 55?

Mr. FALL. Personally I have no objection at all to making it 58, which would cover my own age by about a year.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Would the Senator have any objection to making it 41?

Mr. FALL. I do not care to accept the amendment to make it 41, because despite the objections which I know exist in this body and among a great many of the citizens of the United States to either increasing or decreasing, and particularly de-

creasing, the age limits, in my personal judgment the age limits now existing under the laws must be both decreased and increased before we win this war. We are going to face it sooner or later, and we realize now some of the difficulties which we have incurred in the past by virtue of not being fully prepared for contingencies as they arise. There is nothing compulsory in this amendment except that the age limits would be decreased and increased, and the compulsory feature of the proviso that the President shall not put upon the firing line any of the boys under 21 years of age.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FALL. I yielded to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. THOMPSON. I simply want to ask a question. The amendment proposed by the Senator involves two propositions, one of lowering the age limit and the other of increasing it. Would there be any objection to having those propositions voted upon separately? I am in favor of one proposition, but I am opposed to the other, and I think many Senators are in the same position.

Mr. FALL. Of course, even if I were to object the proposition is possibly divisible. I think it is possible that the Senator would have a right to divide the question. I will say very frankly, Mr. President, that in so far as I am concerned personally, to the best of my judgment, the last proviso is one which should not be adopted. In other words, I believe that, as has been the case in all other wars, it is going to be necessary for us to take the boys from 18 and men up to 45 years of age before we conclude this war. That has been the history of our country in every other war, and in my judgment it will be now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. FALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks. Am I recognized?

Mr. FALL. The Senator asks recognition to make a few remarks. I will yield the floor in a very short time, as my remarks will not be extended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator, of course, can reassume the floor whenever he pleases. Now, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has not yielded the floor except for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized for a few minutes.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I can not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield. That ends the matter.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I shall not extend my remarks to any great length. The amendment speaks for itself.

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

Mr. FALL. I yield for a question.

Mr. PENROSE. I will ask the Senator from New Mexico whether, up to to-day, the War Department made any recommendation on this proposition?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the War Department certainly has made none to me, and I have no knowledge of its having made any to the Senate or to the Congress.

Mr. PENROSE. I did not know whether the department had made some suggestion to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FALL. I am not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, Mr. President, and I can not speak for the committee. This amendment is one drawn not even in concert with my colleagues in the Senate, but simply expressing my own view.

Mr. President, of course there is objection to decreasing the age limit. The fact remains, however, that practically a million men of the forces now under arms in the United States are in the service under the provision of the law providing that they may enlist from 18 to 45. I have reference to the Regular Army, to the National Guard, and to the marines and sailors of the United States. Of course, these are volunteers. This would simply extend the draft provisions to the same ages.

Mr. President, the provision that the boys under 21 years of age shall not be placed upon the firing line is one which I have said I personally do not favor. The history of our former wars shows that they were won by boys under 23, and that the majority of the soldiers who fought in the Civil War were under 21. Under the provisions of the draft act as it is the law now, the President has the power not only to exempt certain classes, but to summon into the semimilitary service each of the men or classes whom he exempts, if in his judgment he desires to do so.

He has not availed himself of that power or authority vested in him now by the law. I desire to read the provision, or at least a line of it:

The President is hereby authorized to exclude or discharge from said selective draft and from the draft under the second paragraph of section 1 hereof, or to draft for partial military service only from those liable to draft as in this act provided, persons of the following classes—

Enumerating them. The enumeration of the classes whom the President may exempt is also the enumeration of the classes whom he may call into the semimilitary service. Therefore, to-day every man in the United States who is not drafted for purely military service, every man between the ages of 21 and 31, is subject, in my judgment, under the provisions of the law as it is now, to draft for semimilitary purposes. What those semimilitary purposes are must be discovered by any legislative conclusion upon that subject as drafted into law or by the Judge Advocate General, I presume, or those who are called upon to enforce the provisions of the draft law.

So far as the legislative opinion upon the subject has been expressed in the various bills which have passed this body from time to time practically every business in the United States has become, by legislative expression, a war necessity, or at least a semimilitary duty, so that without any attempt to stretch the powers directly conferred upon the President of the United States by the draft act itself, in my judgment he now has the authority to draft into the semimilitary service for farm employment or for any other employment connected with the war or with the creation of a military necessity all those whom he may exempt between the ages of 21 and 31.

There are, of course, many men over the age of 31 who have no dependents whomsoever upon them. It is much more just to take these men into the service for purely military service now than it is to go into a second class and take those between the ages of 21 and 31 who to-day have dependent wives or dependent children or dependent families.

This, it seems to me, is a matter of justice which speaks for itself. There is no reason whatsoever why the President should not have the power to go into the class between 31 and 45 and to take from that class for military service those who have not dependent families rather than that he should be compelled—as he will be compelled, I understand—in increasing the armed forces under the draft act, to go into the second, third, or fourth classifications and take those in actually necessary employments or those with dependents upon them.

The only question meriting discussion, as it appears to me, is the question of decreasing or lowering the age limits. As I have said, in our past history we have started at 18, always. To repeat myself, with reference to practically a million men now in the military service we have started at the age of 18. It is true that it is a hardship upon the mothers to take from them their boys between 18 and 21. It is true, of course, that some of these boys will be taken from their schools if this provision is adopted. Nevertheless, Mr. President, the country is going to be compelled, in my judgment, notwithstanding the good news that we have had in the past two days, to use all its manhood to win this war. We are face to face with the proposition and we might as well settle it. If in the President's discretion he sees fit not to draw the boys from 18 to 21, or if he sees fit to classify them into the third, fourth, or fifth classes, or any other class which he may designate, he has the power to do so. He is not compelled to draft them, to take them away from their farms or their schools or their mothers or their families. He is simply authorized to do so. There is not a direction in this entire bill, in the original draft bill, or in the present bill. There is nothing compelling the President to do anything whatsoever. Authority is simply vested in him, in his discretion, to do certain things in the event he desires to avail himself of such authority.

As I have said, I have very little to say on the subject, Mr. President. I hope the amendment, as drawn and offered, will be adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, so far as the boys who are 20 years old are concerned, I have no quarrel with this amendment, because they can receive one year's training before they go into actual service, and at the end of one year's training they will be better fitted to serve the United States Government than any of the troops we now have; but, so far as I can learn by sizing it up, with our population each additional year involves a million men going to the front. I am therefore going to move to reduce the maximum of this requirement from 40 to 35 years. That will give us 3,000,000 more soldiers, most of whom will have no home dependents, and most of whom will cost the United States Government nothing except for themselves.

I offer, Mr. President, an amendment reducing the age limit from 45 to 40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi proposes an amendment to the amendment, which will be stated. The SECRETARY. On line 3 of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico it is proposed to strike out "45" and insert "40."

Mr. WILLIAMS. That gives us nine more years, or something like 9,000,000 more of men.

Now, Mr. President, speaking for myself and the class and the age to which I belong, we can not do very much. I see the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] down there below me. He can not do much, and I also can not do very much, except in the words of a recent poem that has come back to me from France, "Helping Bill to win the war." "Bill" is an impersonal character. He is my boy; he is the boy of the Senator from Utah; he is the boy of the Senator from Minnesota; he is the boy of the Senator from New Hampshire; he is my boy. His name is Bill, in general terms. Of course, all we can do is to pay and praise, and praise some more and then pay some more, and see the boys through.

Mr. President, men between 40 and 45 generally are the men whose domestic relations have been fixed. It will cost the United States a great amount of money, under the allowance and the allotment and the insurance legislation which we have passed, to make these people fight for the United States. If we raise the 31-year limit to 35 years, which is my motion, we bring in 4,000,000 more men.

Now, in regard to these 19-year-old boys, when you say that a 19-year-old boy has got to be trained for two years before he can even go into the Army, that is foolishness; so I move to put that age at 20. That will give a boy 12 months to be trained for military service.

That is enough if he has any brains at all or is a real American boy; he can be trained in 12 months for any service anywhere on the surface of the earth. If he can not be, he is not a real American boy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] to the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Can we have the amendment read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 2 of the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico strike out "18" and insert "20," and in line 3 strike out "45" and insert "40," so that it will read:

That the age limit fixed in said act is hereby changed and shall be, and is hereby, fixed at 20 and 40 years in lieu of 21 and 31.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand the Senator, the original amendment was to strike out 45 and insert 35, but did not include in that striking out 21 or 18 and inserting 20; and that is not a part of the amendment, I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be but one amendment. Mr. NORRIS. If the Chair holds that that is a part of the amendment, then I demand a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. NORRIS. Personally, I am in favor of the amendment as far as it fixes the age at 45 as a maximum, but I am not in favor of the amendment when it provides for taking boys who are 18 years of age instead of 21. If I had my way about it, I would increase it to more than 45. The proviso, of course, takes away a good deal of the harm of fixing the age at 18, because it provides that they can not be used in actual service until they have become 21. While I would favor an amendment striking out 18 and inserting 20, and if it is not moved by some one else I expect to move it, I do not want to mix the two amendments together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to separate the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I think we should have a separate vote on each branch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Do I understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that he is in favor of reducing the age limit from 21 to 20?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I stated just the opposite. I am opposed to reducing the age limit, but I am in favor of increasing the maximum over 31. If I had my way about it, I would make it 60.

Mr. VARDAMAN. In that statement the Senator expresses my own thoughts and desires. I would rather see the minimum limit fixed at 20 than 18, but I prefer 21 to either.

Mr. NORRIS. So would I, and I am going to favor that kind of amendment.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am satisfied with 21. I shall vote against any change of the present law fixing the minimum or lower age limit. In the first place, I shall not vote to conscript

a man for service at the front who has not reached 21 years of age. That is, I shall not do it at this time. From 18 to 21 years of age is the formative period in a man's life. During those years he lays the foundation of a life's work—builds the substratum upon which character is erected. He is not consulted about the laws of the country; he is not permitted to go to the polls and settle with his Congressman for the blessings or the damage that that Congressman by his vote may have imposed upon him, and since he is not permitted to participate in the affairs of his Government I shall never vote to compel him to render service such as is contemplated in this amendment. There are enough older men who under the draft system can be selected—men capable of rendering efficient service in the Army, who have had their "swing around the circle"—and if they happen to be killed they have not lost as much as a boy who has had no chance at all.

I shall not take by conscription the mother's boy; I shall not break the ties that bind to a mother's heart this child who to her is yet a child until he reaches the age of maturity or manhood. This, Mr. President, is sentimental, it may be said, but the world is controlled by sentiment, and not even the armies, the cannon, the shot, and the shell will contribute more to winning this war than sentiment.

There is another reason why these boys should not be taken as proposed under this amendment. They are needed on the farm and in the industrial pursuits of life. Many of them are the stay and support of the home, and if they are taken and put in training it will materially, I fear, reduce the yield of the farms and the products of the factory which are needed to support our armies, our women and children at home, and our allies abroad. The man above 31 years who will be taken under this draft will not have the home ties and responsibilities which usually devolve upon a boy, especially among the middle or laboring class of people between the years of 18 and 21.

I repeat, Mr. President, I have no objection to raising the age limit to 40, 45, 50, or 60, if necessary in order to raise an army which will overcome our enemy across the waters, but I can not, I will not, vote to reduce the age limit below 21, and I sincerely, from the depths of my heart, trust that the amendment may be disagreed to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this increasing of the age limit to 55 and 60 looks to me like providing an asylum for home guard. The best men we had in the Civil War, and the Civil War was fought by men of that age, were boys who enlisted when they were 18 and 19 years, very many of them 17. Three-fourths of the Army who fought the Civil War on the part of the North were boys 18 and 19 years old, and they make by all odds the best soldiers.

If Senators want an effective Army that can render efficient service, that can stand the test of warfare, they will take the basis from 18 to 35 or 45, I do not care which. I think ordinarily when a man has passed 40 he does not make a very good and effective soldier. There may be some part of the work he may be able to do.

I have been getting in these recent times a lot of letters from men who say, "I want to do my bit for this war. I am anxious to get in. Can you not find me a place at Washington in some of the departments, or can you not get me a commission?" One man wrote me, "If you only will extend the age limit to 60 years, I might get into the Army." To my mind, for effective military service, after a man has passed 40 years, or at the utmost 45 years, he is of little or no value to stand the stress of a campaign.

Now, let us not be fooled by any maudlin sympathy in this matter. We are at war and at war with a powerful enemy, and we shall need an army, and we want the best kind of an army. If we extend the limit from 18 to 45 a greater opportunity is given to the Government to grant exemptions in industrial lines to those of the older age. Is not a man when he is 35 or 40 a good hand to work on a farm? Can he not stand farming much better than military service? A man might work in a factory, where they work only 8 hours a day, instead of working in the trenches 24 hours a day in rain and flood and mud and everything else.

If you want to carry on this war successfully, why resort to any maudlin sympathy? Make the age limit from 18 to 45, or 35 if you please. If you want good soldiers, take the young men. They are the most effective.

As to this story about taking young men out of school, Mr. President, it was my lot to serve in the Army as an enlisted man, a private, and a noncommissioned officer, and I regard my Army service as the best part of my education. I feel confident I would never have gotten along as well in the world as I did if I had not gotten my diploma as a noncommissioned officer in the Fourth Wisconsin Regiment of the Union Army during the war.

Let our boys go into the Army. It gives them a training, a discipline, which they can get nowhere else. If you want to carry on this war successfully do not let this maudlin sympathy about keeping the boys on the farm and in school restrain you from giving us the best material we need for an effective Army.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President—

Mr. FALL. Before the Senator proceeds, will he yield to me for just a moment to suggest a correction in the phraseology of my amendment?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. FALL. On line 5 of the printed amendment, after the word "drafted," the words "nor used" should be stricken out, so that it will read "shall not be drafted for service upon the firing line."

The words "nor used" might be construed to prevent boys from being registered or volunteering for service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Before the Senator from Oregon proceeds, with his permission I should like to ask for an explanation as to the idea the Senator from New Mexico intends to convey by the use of the term "drafted." You reduce the age, and I suppose that is the age subject to the draft, from 21 to 18. Do you provide that those registered under the age of 21 shall not be drafted? If it means anything it means that they can not be called even into training, because you can not train men until you draft them. It would seem to me, if the Senator wishes to make it convey the meaning that they shall not be used upon the firing line until they have reached the age of 21, it would be far better to strike out the words "drafted nor," so that it would read:

That those registered under the age of 21 shall not be used for service upon the firing line until they shall have reached the age of 21.

That it gives the Government the right to bring them in and train them and prepare to put them upon the firing line.

I am not agreeing, Mr. President, that we should exempt them even from the firing line. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] that the boys from 18 to 21 will make the very best soldiers. But the point I want to make is that if you include the words "shall not be drafted" it means you can not even call them into the service, and in that respect you are not changing the law from what it was before.

Mr. FALL. The Senator from Oregon has the floor, but the Senator from North Dakota has asked me a question.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. I suggest to the Senator that for the purpose of perfecting this language I have just asked that the words "nor used" be stricken out, so that it will read "shall not be drafted for service upon the firing line." They may be drafted for any other purpose whatever, but not for service upon the firing line.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator from Oregon will yield to me, I want to say that that provision is an insult to the boys. It is an insult to tell them "we will make baby soldiers of you; keep you at home for parading and drilling, and we will not let you do any real fighting." On behalf of the young men who have patriotism and want to fight I protest against that provision.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the Senate knows very well that the provisions which are now in the draft law as to age were compromise provisions. The Senate and the House had come to an impasse in reference to the age, and we fixed the ages between 21 and 30 after a good deal of discussion and after conference.

Mr. President, I am in thorough sympathy with the view of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. I believe with him that the age limit ought to be fixed between 18 and 45, because aside from the sentiment which is involved there is no reason in the world why young men between 18 and 21 should not be called upon to serve their country.

I think the records of the Civil War will show that most of the Army on both sides was composed of young men under 21 years of age, and not only between 18 and 21, but they went in from 13 and upward. I know in the neighborhood where I lived young men did not dare to stay at home beyond the age of 16, because if they did they were practically ostracised from the society of all good people. So the Army on both sides was composed of young men between 14 and 21.

But feeling as I do about it, we have got to meet a situation. This war can not be waged, Mr. President, unless we have the sentiment of the country behind us, and I am satisfied from what I have seen that the country will not stand for the drafting of young men into the active service under 21.

The matter has been more discussed within the past year than it ever was discussed before the American people in times past, and I believe, favoring universal military training, as I

have at all times, if we put the minimum at 20, to be trained until they are 21, and then raise the age limit to 45, to be classified after they have registered, we will have done a great deal and will have put upon the statute books a statute which may possibly find advocates in the House as well as in the Senate.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Does the Senator make that as a motion or a suggestion?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have not the power to accept it on behalf of the committee, but it is an amendment of first impression. As far as this bill is concerned, I am only stating my views as an individual.

Mr. FALL. In drawing the amendment I have only stated my views as an individual. Of course, I do not seek to have them carried out in opposition to the wishes of the majority, and I defer in these matters to the chairman of the committee, who is so constantly at work in trying to shape our affairs for this war. So far as I am concerned, I certainly would not insist upon my personal views as opposed to his, and I would be inclined to accept a suggestion to strike out "18" and put "20" in lieu.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will be glad to see that done, and I will give the measure my support. In view of the fact that the committee has not acted upon the subject at all, I feel at liberty to exercise my own personal preference in the matter.

Mr. POMERENE and Mr. KIRBY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Excuse me for a moment. I believe there will be some chance to get the House to agree to that amendment, but I am sure that the House would never consent to a reduction of the age to 18. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Is there any reason, from the standpoint of man-power, why we should reduce the age below 21 now?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would say yes, for this reason: Even if the age is reduced to 20, we will have a trained army of men who will reach 21; while, as it is now, we have to take them for training, and it takes from six months to a year to train them.

Mr. POMERENE. As I understand it, we have over 10,000,000 men since the last registration—probably 11,000,000 men—between 21 and 31, and of that class there have been only about a million and a half called to the colors. What is the need of reducing the age below the present limit?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. For this reason, Mr. President: If the Senator will examine the testimony of Gen. Crowder before our committee, he will find there is a reason for changing the age limit. I do not care to state it here now, but unless we do change the age limit we will find ourselves in other classes than class 1 pretty soon, and that interrupts the whole of the social fabric, both of industrial and commercial life. When we get out of class 1 we go into the class of young men who have families—young men who are established, young men who have dependents—and it is better, from my viewpoint, to step over the line of 30 and take the man who loafs around the barroom, if you please, and the billiard parlor, and has no dependents. We might just as well take such a man as a young man between 21 and 30.

Mr. POMERENE. I can understand why there might be a necessity for raising the age limit; I qualify that—not a necessity, but perhaps it might be the part of good policy to do it—but the reason which would suggest the raising of the age limit does not appeal to me when it comes to the lowering of the age limit.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have stated to the Senator my personal view as to those between 18 and 21. I do not believe Congress will pass a law that will reduce the age to 18. Yet we need not deceive ourselves about what the enemy knows. The enemy knows our military situation just as well as we do, if not better than many of us do. America ought to go to work, and she will have to go to work before this war is over and serve notice on the world that every man in this country, even if under 18, America stands ready to put to be trained, if not put to the front, for the protection not only of our own country but of civilization as well.

In the present emergency and as the conditions are to-day we do not need to go down to 18, but we ought to go down to 20, so that the young men may be classified and put into military training and come out of it at the age of 21, when they may be called for service prepared to fight the battles of the country instead of taking them into cantonments and then training them.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. For information only. I believe in reducing the age to 18. I will say that in the beginning. But my question is, whether it is not true that more than 200,000 boys between 18 and 21 have enlisted since the war began?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Absolutely.

Mr. CUMMINS. I say you can not keep them out, and you ought to do something, in my opinion, to relieve the obloquy which rests upon these boys if they can not get in.

Mr. NELSON. You can not keep the boys out if they have got the right patriotic American spirit. They will keep on volunteering; and as to these slackers, what is the use of protecting them? The moral effect of letting Europe know that we have extended the law to reach all classes of our population and bring them into the Army is worth a great deal.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is just what I was trying to say, although the Senator from Minnesota has said it more emphatically and said it better. But we will have to recognize the attitude of the boys from 18 to 21. They will not stay at home and be charged with being slackers and indifferent to the war or unable to carry on the war.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me suggest to the Senator that we are now taking steps by this very bill to let men into the service who are under 21. Here we have provisions for reorganizing the National Guard. We are making appropriations for young men to go into the National Guard between 18 and 21, and when they are trained in the National Guard they can be drafted again into the Federal service.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator how he would put into operation this last provision in the amendment:

That those registered under the age of 21 shall not be drafted nor used for service upon the firing line until they shall have reached the age of 21.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think—

Mr. McCUMBER. Now, just a minute, so that I can explain the proposition. You call upon these men, and they enter your Army before that age. There will be in the company boys of 18 and men of 30. They will drill together. They will come from the same State, generally from the same county and the same township or town. Are you going to segregate those men and put them in a class by themselves and drill them longer when they have had just as much drilling as those who are above 21? Are you going to separate them from their associates and scatter them all over in other units? Are you going to have certain units where none will be above 21 years of age, or how will it operate?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think that is entirely a matter subject to regulation and adjustment by the Provost Marshal General's office. They may be segregated or they may not. That will be entirely covered by the regulations. I do not think it will require legislation to regulate that matter.

I have said more than I intended to say. I merely wanted to express my views on the age limit. I should like to see the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico amended as I suggested.

Mr. SHIELDS. I desire to ask the Senator a question before he yields the floor. We all recognize that food production is absolutely necessary to win this war. We have to furnish not only our own people and our own Army but the allies and their armies. Has the Senator any statistics showing how many of these boys would come from farms where they are badly needed for the cultivation of crops and in producing food? Has the Senator gone into the question as to how that would cripple the farmers who are already short of labor?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that that is one of the very reasons why I favor raising the age limit. It is to place those men within military control and let them be detailed for agricultural work. If the age limit is raised, they can be classified by the War Department, and they can be detailed for duty if need be.

Mr. SHIELDS. I was not speaking about raising the age limit. I was speaking about taking the boys who are on the farm, assisting their fathers, as members of his family, in producing crops. I agree with the Senator in raising the age limit to reach men who are just as able-bodied and make as good soldiers as those under 21, say to 35, but it is the question of taking the young boys we are now discussing. They are on the farm, and they are needed there. They are now being educated. They are right in the most important part of their youth in that respect. It would be far better to have men already mature, who are already educated, and who in many cases have left the farms, and allow these young men to stay and be educated and be producers of food, which is indispensable to the winning of this war.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I do not think this amendment to the amendment ought to be adopted. Just now it seems to

me the question asked by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] is the only one that needs to be considered. Is there any necessity for extending the age limit within the provisions of the draft law at this time? If there is such a necessity, I want to say it has not been brought to my attention as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I wish to say further that the War Department itself is not making any such demand and it is not considering making such a demand at this time. That is the condition so far as it actually exists and is known to me.

The same question is presented by this amendment to the amendment that has been fought out once and determined adversely. It provides, if it shall be adopted, that these men shall be registered at 18 and shall not be called to fight until they reach 21. You put these 18-year-old men in the cantonments and in the camps where men are needed to be trained now who are going to fight when the training period is over. We have not enough officers, and we have not enough places for training, and we have not enough money to train 3,000,000 men three years, when you can not make soldiers out of them until the end of the three-year period.

We established that at one time to such an extent that the Senate almost unanimously refused to agree to that amendment. Now, why should we impose this burden upon our Military Establishment at this time when we need trained soldiers and need them over in France? We first had over 10,000,000 men registered, and then from 800,000 to a million under the last registration, and we have only about a million and a half with the colors now. What becomes of the other 10,000,000 men? Why shall they not be required to bear the burden of the country now and fight its battles, if it is necessary that they shall do so?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. Was the evidence of Gen. Crowder given before the Military Affairs Committee in confidence, and am I at liberty to quote it?

Mr. KIRBY. So far as I know, it was not given before the Military Committee but only to a subcommittee, and it was Gen. Crowder's individual opinion and was not approved by the War Department.

Mr. CUMMINS. Am I at liberty to quote it?

Mr. KIRBY. I do not know. I am not a member of the subcommittee. It was not given before the general committee, of which I am a member.

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course, I do not want to do anything that is improper.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator from Arkansas will yield to me for a moment—

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I did not understand that Gen. Crowder's testimony was confidential; but later, after he left the stand, the Secretary of War asked the committee to withhold from publication the first part of his testimony with reference to the different classes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Did that include also secrecy with regard to his opinion touching the advisability of increasing the draft age?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think so—only as to the first part.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will not speak of that. It is true that Gen. Crowder appeared before the committee and gave some views sufficient to him, at least, for the increase of the draft age. I do not say the decrease but the increase of the draft age, under 45 years or more.

Mr. THOMPSON. Does the Senator from Arkansas know how many men are available under the first draft between the ages of 21 and 31?

Mr. KIRBY. I understand that about six million or more have been accepted for service.

They are, however, in different classifications and in deferred classifications. There are nearly 600,000 more men under the last class.

Mr. THOMPSON. Less than a third of them are now in the service.

Mr. KIRBY. Less than a third in the first class are in the service. It is said these other men are in different classifications. That may be true, but a man who is 18 years old to-day will be needed in this country 10 years from now as much as or more than the man who is 23 or 25 or 30 years of age. So the country must keep on. We have determined that men shall not be registered and shall not be called on to fight for the country until they are at least allowed to vote; until they are grown. That has been determined upon. We have use for all of our facilities, all the men who are capable of training, and

all of our money to train the men who are within the draft age who are subject to call and who are fit to fight.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KIRBY. I do.

Mr. FALL. Do I understand the Senator from Arkansas to say that this proposition has been affirmatively disapproved by the War Department?

Mr. KIRBY. I said it had not been approved by the War Department.

Mr. FALL. I misunderstood the Senator, and I asked so that I might be informed. There is quite a difference between not being approved and being disapproved.

Mr. KIRBY. But it has been disapproved by the Senate, because we fixed the age at 21 years.

Mr. FALL. No; but I asked about the War Department, Mr. President. Has this proposition been disapproved by the Secretary of War?

Mr. KIRBY. I do not know that it has been disapproved. All I know is that it has not been approved.

Mr. FALL. Has it been disapproved by the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy?

Mr. KIRBY. I do not know whether the President, the Commander in Chief, is familiar with this sort of a proposition or not. It has not come to me that he is in favor of or against it; but I do know that the War Department, whose business it is to consider these matters all along the line and the necessity for increasing the Army or the draft age at this time, has not approved it.

Mr. FALL. I should like to get at just exactly what the situation is. The way the Senator now puts it, it would make the impression upon me that the War Department, in the opinion, at any rate, of the Senator, is opposed to the adoption of this provision.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, it has not come to me in such a way as that, but I do know that the War Department has not approved this sort of policy; I do know that the War Department is not of opinion at this time that this is necessary.

Mr. FALL. The Senator knows that—that the War Department is of opinion at this time that this legislation is not necessary?

Mr. KIRBY. Well, it is not of opinion that it is necessary, I know that. I do not know what it might be along the other side; but the War Department is supposed to be in closer touch with this matter than is anybody else; it is the War Department's business to raise the Army, to train the Army, and to win the fight with the Army after it shall have been trained.

Mr. FALL. The Senator from Arkansas, of course, does not mean to say that it is the War Department's business or the business of the administration to raise the Army or to train it under its own rules and under its own regulations for this war?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly not. It is only its business to train the Army after provision is made for raising the Army, as has already been done.

Now, it seems to me that under this condition we ought not at all to fix the age from 18 to 21 and to provide that these soldiers can not be used after they are trained, because we need all the facilities, we need all the money, we need all the use of the training capacity now of the men who are to be used the minute they are trained and ready to fight. Now, let us not clutter it up; let us not burden this legislation with something that can not possibly be of any benefit.

As to the age of 45, that is an old proposition. I do not think it is necessary to go up to that age yet; but if it is, I do not care how far up in that direction you go. Men when they have passed 20 years of age and on up to 45 have enjoyed all the blessings of this life which they could enjoy under the civilization of this time, and it is more their duty to fight, in my opinion, than it is that of the 18-year-old boy, who has not yet been allowed to vote.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. FALL. The Senator from Arkansas certainly has not read the amendment, or he would understand that there is nothing whatever in it that requires the boy to be trained for three years, or which requires him to be drafted at all, or which requires him to be drafted for any service at all of any kind or character.

Mr. KIRBY. Well, what is the use of providing here about drafting them, if you do not expect to use them and can not use them under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. FALL. I am pursuing my usually consistent course, and am simply leaving it to the President of the United States, in

his discretion, if he needs any of the boys who are between 18 and 21 years of age to call them.

Mr. KIRBY. I understand the Senator's position thoroughly, but since we are not expecting to call, and under the terms of the amendment which the Senator proposes can not call, these men to fight until they are 21 years of age, what is the use of registering and training them now at the expense of the Government, which expense must be maintained?

Mr. FALL. Why, Mr. President, they are simply registered. There is no compulsion upon the President or upon the Secretary of War as to drafting them. They are not compelled to draft them at all; they may not draft one of these men until he is 20, but they may draft him for three months' service, they may draft him for five months' service, or may draft him for any service whatsoever that they require. The only provision of a directory character is that they shall not be used for the firing line until they reach their present draft age of 21 years.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, if it were desired to leave that feature of the legislation out, since these men can not be used as soldiers, and all our efforts must be directed to the training of men who can be used, this amendment could very easily be amended to provide that the age limit might be extended to 45 years; but since there is no necessity apparently for that as yet, I do not see why this bill should be burdened with this sort of an amendment.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield again?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. FALL. We are now registering and drafting boys as soon as they reach the age of 21 under the present law. Would the Senator from Arkansas see any objection to the suggestion of the chairman of the committee that if this amendment were again amended by raising the age to 20 years by striking out "18 years" and inserting "20 years," would the Senator see any objection to the training—

Mr. KIRBY. I certainly would.

Mr. FALL. To the training of these boys prior to the time when they are drafted for service upon the firing line? Might they not well be trained three or six months prior to the time they reach 21 years of age?

Mr. KIRBY. That would be all right if it were necessary to do so; but I do not see any such necessity, for you might train them a whole year before you could use them.

Mr. FALL. There is no compulsion to train them for one month.

Mr. KIRBY. Then do not let us do it if there is no compulsion about it.

Mr. FALL. If we are going to need any more soldiers and are simply going to take away the father from his child and the husband from his wife—all those who have been exempted under the present draft provisions and regulations—if we are going to take them in lieu of taking those over 31 who have no dependents, or those under 21 who have no dependents, if we are going to continue this practice, if we propose to use all the material, before we go outside of the arbitrary limits fixed by the Congress, there is no doubt that we have something like 10,000,000 registered under the first registration.

I want to say to the Senator that it is a matter of common knowledge—whether it is before the Senate committee or not—that we shall not get our next 500,000 men until we go among the exempted classes and take the husbands away from their wives and the fathers away from their children, at a time when we have millions of men here in the United States who are just as fit for military service who have not those ties upon them.

Mr. KIRBY. Why should not the husband be taken from his wife and the father from his children if that is necessary in order to defend the country in which that wife and those children live? Why should such a man have any exemption above the boy who has had no opportunities here?

Mr. FALL. Well, why should there be any exemption, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has stated? Why should not every able-bodied man in the United States, as I have suggested time and time again, be drafted into the service of the United States and be placed by the President of the United States in the position in which he can best serve?

Mr. KIRBY. I think, as the Senator from New Mexico does, that when we were providing for this draft system we should have drafted every man of military age, according to the old requirement, from 18 to 45.

Mr. FALL. That is just what I am trying to get at—to include those from 18 to 45 years of age.

Mr. KIRBY. But we did not do so.

Mr. FALL. We are proposing to do it now.

Mr. KIRBY. And until the War Department thinks it is necessary I do not think we should go ahead here and burden our-

selves with the three years' training of men who can not be used until the end of that period.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted, or, if it is adopted, if we want to extend it up—I do not care for that—after the word "and," on line 2, let us strike out everything else and so extend the age limit to 45 years; but as the amendment stands it ought to be defeated, and I hope it will be.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate in approaching this subject should take into consideration how large an Army the United States should have in this war, how it can be supported, and, incidentally, to what uses it should be put.

As Senators know, under the present system of drafting men between the ages of 21 and 31, inclusive, a questionnaire has been arranged under which the men liable to draft under the registration are classified, and that in class 1 are placed those men who are unmarried and also those men, I think, who, while married, are not in the slightest degree depended upon by their families for support. It has been the ambition of the War Department, as I understand, to recruit the Army of the United States from men of class 1.

A good deal of discussion has taken place in the last few months as to the size of the Army which the United States must put into the field in order to bring our weight to bear in this war in such manner as to bring it to a conclusion in the shortest possible time. Three million men have been mentioned by some as a minimum; others have said 4,000,000 men, and others have said 5,000,000 men. The President of the United States has said there should be no limit, that not even 5,000,000 men should be set as a limit.

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

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. FALL. I gave notice several days ago that I would offer an amendment providing that during this fiscal year not less than 3,000,000 men should be drafted and trained under the provisions of the draft act and used in this war. I shall offer such an amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I remember the fact that the Senator has given notice of such an amendment. Men may differ as to the size of the Army which this country should put into the field. Of course, there is a limit to the annual increment; there is a limit to the number of men which the recruiting machinery and the training machinery can absorb and turn into soldiers in a year's time; but if we are to project our vision toward the future, and a future not very far away, we might just as well make up our minds that we will need at least three million men, and, in all probability, will need 5,000,000 men in arms in the war zones at a given time before this war is ended.

Mr. President, that can not be done by relying solely upon the men in class 1 of the draft with the age limits fixed at 21 and 31. I venture to say to the Senate that if the present program of drafting new soldiers into the Army of the United States is carried on at the rate now proposed and now upon the program of the War Department, class 1 will be exhausted before November 1 next; and if the age limits are not extended both up and down the Provost Marshal General will have to invade class 2 and class 3, in all probability, and take married men whose families are dependent upon them for support, and the skilled workers, whose presence in the munitions factories is essential to the successful conduct of those factories, which, in turn, supply the men in the Army with weapons.

If we fail to raise the age limit, and also to lower it at least two years during this session of Congress, class 1 will have been exhausted before the needs of the Army for the year 1918, both for actual service and for training service, shall have been met; and we will have to disrupt to a greater or less degree—and I believe it will be to a great degree—the industrial and economic organization of the country, including agriculture, by taking married men and men essential in trades and industries in order to get the number of men required by the military situation.

I am in hearty sympathy with the comments made by the Senator from Minnesota—

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. Is there anything in the law which prevents an 18-year-old man voluntarily joining the Army, if he desires to do so?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is nothing to prevent it; that is true.

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under that system, however, under which men under 21 may volunteer, but under which no obligation is placed upon all the men under 21, we have the same old distinction, which to my mind is vicious, that those men, we will say, of 20 years who feel it a duty to serve their country go and do it, while those who do not feel it their duty do not do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator a question. We have now a little more than 10,000,000 men who have been registered and who are subject to draft.

Mr. THOMAS. Nearer 12,000,000 men.

Mr. McKELLAR. My friend from Colorado says "nearer 12,000,000 men." The number is certainly in the neighborhood of 11,000,000 men. We have actually drafted about 2,000,000. Now, does not the Senator suppose when it comes to a question of fair treatment that the 2,000,000 men sometimes have some thoughts in their minds about where the other 9,000,000 men are and how they happen to be in excepted classes? And does not the Senator think we had better make the requirement of service apply first to the whole 11,000,000 who are physically fit?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, of course, operating upon that theory—and I will admit that it is plausible—we could draft all of the 11,000,000 men, but the instant we did so we would have to stop waging the war because we would absolutely wreck our industries. It is all very well to say that every man must serve in the Army as a matter of principle; but if it were attempted, we would be "all army," and would have no industrial organization back of it. It is the very purpose of the selective draft, which so many people seem to forget, namely, to select the men best fitted in every respect, not only on their own account but as citizens of the Republic, to serve in the field, and to let those men who are best fitted to serve in the munitions plants and in other occupations stay and serve there. I would not be at all surprised, Mr. President, if we eventually brought into being and into operation some power which would so arrange things that those men who are in munition plants and who can do their best work in munition plants and similar undertakings should stay there and work, just as we say that the soldier once in the Army shall stay there for the duration of the war.

But, Senators, if we are to have the armies that we are talking about and which are being discussed in the public press and by public men, we have got to raise, and, in my judgment, also lower, the age limit. There are several phases of this matter which I think are well worthy of discussion, and I wish to enter into one or two of them very briefly.

Senators will remember that the Provost Marshal General has sent out an order to the local draft boards, if I remember correctly, instructing them to put into class 1, and make liable for immediate military service thereby, all men who are not usefully employed. The application of that order, of course, is confined to men not usefully employed between the ages of 21 and 31. Its influence will be beneficial. It will compel some men to undertake a useful job or else serve in the Army, and most of those men must undertake a useful job under those circumstances because they have families to support. That order has, however, a very limited application, because there is not a very large percentage of men between the ages of 21 and 31 who are not usefully employed; but when you pass the age of 31 and extend it to the age of 45 and apply that same order of the Provost Marshal General, you will find thousands and thousands of men who are to-day not usefully employed and who, under that order, being subject to the draft and subject to being placed in class 1 and liable to immediate military service, will quickly find, in defense of their own families, some useful employment; and you will thereby add to the available labor supply of the country, which every Senator knows in some parts of the country is scarce at the present time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator's opinion of an amendment to the present military law providing that all persons between the ages of 30 and 40 who have not families to support shall be called into the service before those between the ages of 20 and 30 having families to support shall be drafted.

To make myself clear, at the present time if we continue to raise very large armies—and I think everybody is in favor of that; I know I am—and we raise them out of the limited number of men between the ages of 21 and 31, I am fearful we will soon reach fathers of families and take them even though families are dependent upon them. At the same time there will be a large number of men between 30 and 40 who have no families whatever dependent upon them and who are capable of military service. Now, the suggestion which I have to make, and which I may embody in the form of an amendment, is as to the propriety of calling unmarried men between 30 and 40 for military service before we call upon the married men between 20 and 30 for military service. When I say "married men" I mean those whose families are dependent upon them. I should like to get the Senator's opinion upon that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am in entire sympathy with the Senator from Missouri on that proposition, but let me say to him that that is exactly what the questionnaire system, under which all registrants are classified, does; and that same questionnaire system and that same classification would hold good in its operation among the men between the ages of 31 and 40 as it now holds good among the men between the ages of 21 and 31. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico makes no suggestion of a change in the classification, and if it is adopted, or if its provisions are approximately adopted, the first men to be called and, in my judgment, the only men who will be called, unless most unlooked-for events overtake us, will be those men who are put in class 1.

They are the unmarried men; and, regardless of their age, so long as they are, as the Senator from New Mexico suggests, between 18 and 45, if they are unmarried and have no dependents, they will be equally liable to service. I think that is the system under which we must operate so long as we can, and I think we can raise and maintain a most impressive Army under such a system.

Mr. REED. I was obliged to leave the Chamber while the Senator was speaking. Did the Senator state the number of men whom it is estimated we can raise under the present law?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, my knowledge of that is not absolutely definite; and, in addition to that, I have some hesitancy in discussing it and the source of my information. I doubt if those figures should be discussed in public. I think some of them have been discussed.

Mr. REED. I do not think we need to be sensitive about that, because statements concerning the figures have been made from time to time, but they have escaped me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps I do not understand the question.

Mr. REED. The question I am asking is how many men we can put into the Army under the present law?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In addition to the number now in the service?

Mr. REED. Yes. I was going to follow that with a further question as to how many of them there were in class 5, which, I believe, embraces married men with families dependent upon them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My understanding is that from class 1 as now registered we can get approximately 500,000 in addition to those in the service to-day.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator. I shall try to get the exact figures. I thought perhaps he had them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that that estimate may vary from the truth somewhat; it is merely a rough estimate.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many men is it estimated we can get from the new registration that took place on June 5 last?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been suggested that there are fully 700,000 men who would come in under that registration. That would give us 1,200,000 more men subject to draft at this time without going any further.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator must remember that it is very easy to say that we have 700,000 soldiers in addition to our present force by reason of the fact that 700,000 men have registered, but he must remember that there is quite a percentage of physical defectives—

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I understand that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Men who are not fit for military service. In that connection, may I say that I am in sympathy with what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has said. The percentage of those who are physically unfit for military serv-

ice amongst those men under 21 and down to 18 is considerably less than the percentage unfit for military service amongst those, we will say, around 30. I sympathize with the Senator from Minnesota in his estimate of what the young man does in the way of campaigning. The man between 18 and 25, generally speaking, is the man who can fight on or work on with little or no sleep; who can lie down for an hour or two hours, get a nap, awake refreshed, and resume his work. It is for that reason, I believe, more than any other, that all the armies in all the great wars that have lasted any length of time have turned out to be at the conclusion of those wars largely made up of men around 20 years of age. They are the men who survive; they are the ones who stand the work best; they are the ones who suffer least; and they make the best soldiers. I think any Army officer of broad experience in the training of men will admit that the men under 25, and preferably around 21 or 20 or even 19, are the men who make the best soldiers, and of whom the greater percentage survives until the conclusion of the war in which they are engaged.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the question propounded by the Senator from Missouri was either misunderstood or the Senator from New York has some reluctance about answering it. I think it ought to be answered, unless there is a real reason for not having the facts before the Senate.

I have given some study to these figures of the work of the War Department. There were about 9,600,000 men registered between 21 and 31, I believe. About 20 or 25 per cent of them have been found, under the rules, physically unfit for service; so that if the entire number of men between 21 and 31 were put into the Army we would have an Army of about 7,000,000 men. We have already called probably a million and a half of them; so that if we should exhaust all the classes arranged for by the Provost Marshal General we would have about five and a half million who might yet be put into the Army. But to take them without regard to their occupations or their dependents would dislocate not only the social but the industrial life of the United States; and in the very nature of things, in my opinion, we are bound not only to go above 31 but to go below 21. I shall have some figures to present on that point presently.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The argument the Senator from Iowa has just made is the one I have been trying to emphasize. Senators, if we do not raise and lower these age limits we can not put into the field an army worthy of our strength and worthy of the obligations that we must carry in this war without disrupting the industry and the agriculture of the country behind that army; and I am one of those Senators who believe that this is indeed a world war. We speak of it as such, but a great many of us are inclined to direct our attention solely to one phase of the war. A good many people in the United States, a good many of us in our discussions here in the Senate, direct our entire attention to the western front. Of course it is the most important front, and I think no one would deny that.

But, Mr. President, this ought to be, in fact as well as in name, a world war; and if America can do it, if America can supply the surplus of men and material, of soldiers and weapons, over and above what is actually necessary to establish a clear preponderance of weight upon the western front, then, indeed, America should use that surplus of men and materials in combating the Germans, no matter where they are found on this earth—the Germans and their allies—and by that I mean Bulgaria and Turkey, just as we classify Austria. Make it a world war, Senators, and we will end it sooner.

Of course, we should place our first and greatest emphasis in France. No one will deny that for a moment. We must establish there a clear preponderance, so that the Teutonic powers will never again enjoy the offensive upon that front, but shall be subjected to an offensive on the part of ourselves and our allies which they will be unable to resist and which will eventually crush them, even if we do not attack them from any other quarter. But I believe that this country is big enough and strong enough and rich enough to do more than that. We should help the Italian Army. Senators, would it not be a blessing if there were an American Army corps along the Piave River this very day to help drive home the defeat that the Italians are inflicting upon our enemies, the Austrians?

I am not complaining that they are not there, Mr. President. Perhaps it could not have been done by this time—the sending of a considerable American expedition to help the Italians—but it ought to be done just as soon as possible. We should attack the Teutonic powers from every quarter in which we can find any facilities for attacking them, even if it be through Siberia. True, it will be a difficult undertaking; but should that stay us

from attempting it if we can thereby add to the difficulties of the Teutonic powers? We should attack them, if we can, in Palestine, reinforcing the British, and by the elimination and crushing of Turkey prevent Germany from developing and possessing the oil fields in the Batum Province of the Caucasus, whose resources will soon be used against our men in France.

It is part of the war for America—and I believe she can do it—to bring every influence that she possesses to bear in the fight against these people, wherever they may be found, wherever they are organizing or working for the undoing, eventually, of the United States; and, Senators, we can not do it unless we have clearly in mind the raising and the maintenance of a great American Army. Yes; make it 5,000,000 men if it is necessary. As the President says, why limit it? When it is raised, use it wherever it can be of service—not only in France, but in Italy; in the Balkans, if need be; in Asia Minor, helping out the British, who have already done such remarkable work there in Palestine and Mesopotamia; and even in Siberia, where there are many, many thousands of Russians who would rally around an American force and prevent the organization, for military purposes, of that great country by the Germans. Let us reestablish the eastern front, renew and rebuild the iron ring that surrounded Germany and Austria up to a year ago.

The collapse of Russia in many respects made this a new war. It completely changed the picture, and the picture was changed to our disadvantage. We lost something like 8,000,000 soldiers when the Russian Army disbanded, not as a result of a military victory on the part of Germany, but as a result of German propaganda. Can America do something to restore that situation? Can America do something, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] said so eloquently a few days ago, to attack Austria, that empire that contains within its borders such a tremendous element of discontent and rebellion? I believe she can; and if at first we accomplished only a little in those far-away regions of the earth, our influence would in the end be decisive. We must look forward to these efforts and lay the foundations now.

That is one of the reasons, Mr. President, why I support the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, because I believe that only by such an amendment, or something closely approximating it, can America put an army into the field big enough to undertake these great tasks and carry the obligation and meet the opportunities that this great country of ours ought to carry and ought to meet, and, God willing, will carry and will meet, before this war is over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, whenever it is necessary, or, indeed, whenever it is expedient, I am willing to vote to raise the age limit, or, possibly, to lower the limit somewhat. I am opposed to this amendment as now proposed. I am rather inclined to think that 18 years is too low a limit, but whenever it becomes necessary I will vote to lower the limit or to raise it. Indeed, I will vote for any measure that will mean early victory against Germany. But before we adopt this particular amendment we ought to give it very careful consideration. The proviso to the amendment is all wrong and can serve no useful purpose. It simply ties up and renders ineffective three classes of boys to the number of some 2,500,000 or 3,000,000.

This particular legislation has been considered neither by the War Department, so far as I am advised, nor by the Committee on Military Affairs, whose province and duty it is to consider this kind of proposal. I am not one of those who believe we ought to follow whatever a department recommends; but, Senators, we must remember that we have turned over to the War Department the duty of executing the laws that we make about this war. We must remember it is not an original proposition. It is a proposed addition to a system that we have already put in the hands of the War Department to execute. We have already given the War Department registered men in the number of about 11,000,000. They have actually drafted about a million and a half men, and the remainder are still registered and still subject to the draft. Under this state of facts who would know whether the limits fixed in that draft law should be changed better than the department that is now executing this very law? The officers charged with the execution of this law know whether or not they have the men there; they know whether or not the limit ought to be changed; and it seems to me we ought to have some recommendation from that department before enacting this very important amendment to the legislation. There are so many things to be considered in connection with this kind of legislation—the question of subsistence, the question of clothing for the additional men brought under the draft, the question of guns, the question of training, the question of officers. All these things have to be considered,

and primarily they have to be considered by the department that is executing this law.

Why should we, without any advice as to what men are needed, without any advice that there is a deficiency or likely to be one, change this law at this time? Why should we change the law when there are, according to the undisputed evidence, some 9,000,000 men registered in this country and subject to draft between the ages of 21 and 31 years, but who have not as yet been actually drafted?

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Of course, the Senator does not want to leave a false impression.

Mr. McKELLAR. Surely not.

Mr. REED. The Senator has stated that there are approximately 11,000,000 men within the draft ages. A million and a half have been called to the service, and that leaves approximately nine and a half million. Now, of course, the Senator knows, if he will stop to think, that there is no such number liable to military duty, because the million and a half that have been taken have been the perfect men; that is, they have been the men who have qualified for military service. A very large number of rejections took place in order to get that million and a half men. A very large number of rejections necessarily will take place among the others that may be called hereafter.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. REED. So that we can not use the figures the Senator is using.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, on the contrary, we can use those figures, though, of course, we must always take into consideration the fact that there are some exemptions under the draft law. The physically unfit are exempted. Some are exempted because engaged in industry or in agriculture and some few others for the other causes set forth in the act. The fact remains, however, that of 11,000,000 registered only about 1,500,000 have actually been drafted into the service, and everybody knows that this is a very small percentage of soldiers of those registered. Undoubtedly there is still a large number of soldiers to be secured from those already registered—probably many more than can be trained this year.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. A very great many have enlisted and gone into the Army through enlistment.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, too, and those are to be taken into consideration; but the fact remains that we have not actually drafted 20 per cent of the men who are registered between 21 and 31, and the other fact remains that the War Department has not furnished any data or statistics showing that there is a lack of men to go into the Army from those already registered.

Whenever it does—whenever there is any evidence, whether it comes from the War Department or not, that we are short of men, or that we are likely to be short of men—I am willing to get those men wherever we can get them. But in the absence of that kind of evidence, on the floor of the Senate, without any consideration by the committee—the committee has not had the question before it—without deliberation, without knowledge of the facts for the most part, without any recommendation from the War Department, it seems to me that we ought not to run roughshod over that department and force on them a registration that evidently they do not want at this time. If we were putting into operation an original system, perhaps we would not need any information from the department. But we are undertaking by this amendment to add to a system which the department is now engaged in carrying out without waiting to see whether the proposed amendment fits in with the department plans or not.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. The Senator, of course, sees the casualty lists published in the morning papers, and he knows that our military force is being rapidly decreased.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do. I regret very much that that is the fact.

Mr. FALL. Of course, the Senator further realizes that in so far as the War Department is concerned the only work that would be placed upon the War Department by the adoption of this amendment is not one of providing for subsistence, and not one of providing for munitions or arms or anything of that kind, but is simply the additional burden of registration until the Commander in Chief of the Army sees fit to draft these men.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to his own amendment:

Provided, That those registered under the age of 21 shall not be drafted nor used for service upon the firing line until they shall have reached the age of 21.

That means this, that the War Department must take these 2,400,000 young men or thereabouts—it is estimated that about 800,000 to 1,000,000 of them come of a fixed age each year—and the War Department must do something with them. There can be but one purpose if the amendment is to do any good, and that is that they must be trained. By implication, at least, the department is directed to train them. They have to be put into units; they have to have officers; they have to have guns; they have to be put in cantonments; additional cantonments must be built for them.

Mr. FALL. What are we doing with the 10,000,000 men now registered? How many of those are we training?

Mr. McKELLAR. Apparently there are some seven or eight million—75 or 80 per cent of them—with whom nothing is being done. They have not been called to the colors. They are registered, ready to be called whenever the department calls on them; and why should they be excused at this time?

Mr. FALL. Why? That is precisely the point. There is no more compulsion in regard to calling the entire 100 per cent of these men than there is in regard to calling the entire 100 per cent of those now registered. Mr. President, this is merely a direction to extend the ages for registration. In so far as the drafting, use, subsistence, training, or handling of those men is concerned, the discretion is left absolutely in the Commander in Chief, exactly as it is with reference to the 10,000,000 men now registered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator intend that those now registered and subject to military duty shall be called before any classes of those between 18 and 45, as provided in his amendment, are called?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator does not intend to do anything whatsoever except to bow his head in obedience to the action of Congress before investing discretion in the Commander in Chief of the Army. If the Senator from New Mexico could enforce his views upon the Senator from Tennessee and his other colleagues here, the Senator would see engrafted into legislation a direction to the President—the Commander in Chief—the Department of War, the Judge Advocate General, and others as to how this Army should be raised and what should be done with it under the Constitution. But the Senator bows himself to the will of the majority, as expressed, and simply provides for additional registration and leaves the discretion entirely in the hands of the Commander in Chief.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as a matter of fact the Commander in Chief has authority now. He has control of the situation. He has these millions of young men between the ages of 21 and 31 that he has not called out. He has not asked that that number be increased. He has not said that the number now registered will soon be exhausted. Whenever he does, as Commander in Chief, it is our duty to give him the necessary men. Whenever he says that he believes that that list of men is not sufficient, that we need more men, then it is our duty to give him the men and uphold him in the prosecution of this war, and we will do it without delay whenever he, or his military representative, makes the request. But the Commander in Chief is not making any such request of us now, and we surely have ample men already registered at this time. There is one thing I can say for this country, whatever else may be said of it, and that is that its man power is all right. There has been no trouble about getting men. We can substantially get all the men we need at any time.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Tennessee said a few moments ago that the committee had given no thought or examination to this subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, Mr. President, so far as my knowledge of it goes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why did it not do so?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was not called to our attention. We had registered some seven or eight or nine million of young men—somewhere in that neighborhood—between the ages of 21 and 31 and not yet drafted. We saw no reason to exempt these young men, whether they were in deferred classes or not. It was the purpose of the law to make it bear equally on all. This legislation in the proposed amendment can have but one purpose at this time, and that is to let men in the deferred

classes be exempted, and I do not think they ought to be exempted.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not speaking about the merits of the proposal. I am speaking about the consideration the committee gave to the subject. Something like two weeks ago I introduced a proposed amendment to the military bill which is in effect the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico. It was printed, and it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I asked for an opportunity to be heard upon that amendment; but the committee, I assume, were so much occupied with other affairs that it never became convenient. But the amendment was before the committee proposing this identical thing; and the Senator from Tennessee knows that the very man who is in charge of the administration of the draft law, who knows more about it than any other man in the country, believes, and so told a subcommittee at least of the Military Affairs Committee, that the draft age ought to be increased in order to meet emergencies that will occur not later than the early part of the year 1919.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not present at the meeting to which the Senator refers and I do not personally know of such evidence. I was not a member of the subcommittee, and I did not hear the testimony of Gen. Crowder. I want to indorse all that the Senator says about Gen. Crowder. I think he is one of the most capable and competent officers of this Government. I think he has rendered a service to our Army and to our Government that is not surpassed by that of any other officer in the Army. There is no one who could have performed the great task of organizing the drafted forces of this country better than Gen. Crowder has done. I indorse every word the Senator has said about him; but, as a matter of fact, whatever views Gen. Crowder may entertain have not matured to the point of his formally bringing them before the Military Affairs Committee, and they have not been brought before that committee, and the matter has not been considered or debated before that committee, so far as I know. I think, in all fairness, that a matter so important as this ought to be carefully considered by the committee, especially when we have at least some seven millions of men to draw from, already registered, that we can call out at any time we want to, and when there is no demand for it by the proper authorities. If Gen. Crowder made the demand, he has evidently yielded to the views of others to some extent, because no demand has been made in our committee for this legislation, and I think it ought to come before the committee and be carefully considered by it before the legislation is enacted. Now, mind you, I do not object at all to increasing the age limit or even to lowering it to a limited degree, but I do not think it ought to be done now, in this hasty way.

Mr. CUMMINS. I assume that Gen. Crowder has made no demand, nor would any other officer of the Government make a demand, upon Congress for particular, specific legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether the Senator is correct about that or not. I think there are a great many who make distinct demands on us for legislation.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not speaking now of the President of the United States—

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not speaking of the President, either.

Mr. CUMMINS. Because the President has a perfect right to recommend legislation to Congress. I am not now going into the realm of secrecy. I do not find it necessary to go to the testimony given by Gen. Crowder before the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR. The subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CUMMINS. But I go to the public press, in which it was stated that Gen. Crowder entertained certain views on this subject; and I say again, and I am glad the Senator from Tennessee agrees with me, that I think his administration of the draft law is a monument of industry, intelligence, and patriotism, and there is no testimonial that I would not gladly bear for his work in this great and important matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. And if the Senator will excuse me one minute I will go a little bit further than that, and I will say that I think it is the duty of Congress properly to recognize officially the splendid work Gen. Crowder has done for the country in this hour of its trouble. He has made such a splendid success of the draft law that, in my judgment, Congress should grant him specifically some fitting mark of its appreciation of his great service. He is a man of unusual ability and marvelous aptitude for the particular work intrusted to him.

Mr. CUMMINS. I agree with the Senator. Three weeks ago or more some one published in one of the newspapers in Wash-

ington a statement indicating that this officer of the Army was in favor of increasing the draft age so as to enlarge the authority of the President in calling men into the service. It was stated in that newspaper, as I recollect, that the Secretary of War was not yet ready to insist upon legislation of this character, but that he released Gen. Crowder from any obligation to further keep his own views a secret, and they were published; and it is now as well known as any fact can be known that this eminent officer believes that this legislation is necessary, not only for the good of the Army but for the good of the industries of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I, of course, do not keep up, I am sorry to say, with the newspapers like I ought. In the tremendous rush of work now falling on all of us, I simply do not have time. I do not think I am able to recall that, but I accept what the Senator says was published in those papers.

I want to say this about it: We have intrusted to the military department of the Government the execution of the draft act. We have given them already ten or eleven million names to draw from. They have never complained that they have not enough. When they do, then we must give them additional men. We must give them every man they need. We must go to the last limit to win this war. There is no limit—age or any other kind of limit, to which we will not go. I accept, of course, what the Senator says—that Gen. Crowder expressed some such views when he appeared before the subcommittee, but what I mean to say is that neither he nor anyone in his department has sent official notice to Congress that the law already passed is not sufficient for the present.

Now, in all good common sense, is it not wise to let them mature their plans? Let Gen. Crowder, in whom I have the greatest confidence, and in whom the Senator has the greatest confidence, mature his plans for getting additional men, and let us have the advantage of the department's plan when we pass upon the kind of legislation provided in this amendment.

We do not have to accept any advice or plan offered by the department. It may be a plan that I would not subscribe to and that the Senator would not subscribe to; but at all events, they have the execution of these plans within their power and judgment and they ought to be consulted before passing such drastic legislation. It seems to me that we ought to have their advice; that we ought to consult them; and it ought to be worked out in the way Congress has given the authority to work out these things, and not have it come before the Senate by offering an amendment on the floor which may or may not fit the plans of those who are executing the laws.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will be delighted.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has not the situation changed somewhat? The House bill, which is not modified by the Committee on Military Affairs, gives the President unlimited authority to call for all the men he thinks necessary for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. CUMMINS. Heretofore we have given the President no such authority. I am not protesting against that authority, although it might be helpful for Congress to keep it in its own hands. But, however that may be, we are giving that authority.

Now, does not the Senator think when we give this broad, unrestricted authority to draw men from civil life into the military forces of the country we ought also to broaden the field from which he may draw the men?

Mr. McKELLAR. I feel quite sure that that will come. If it had been thought by the Commander in Chief, when he asked for that broadening of authority, that it was wise to increase the number of men who could be drafted he would have said so. He is in touch with the situation. His Secretary of War is in touch with the situation. They know what their plans are, and I am glad to say that they have progressed splendidly with those plans. It seems to me that they are progressing well enough with those plans to-day for us to have reasonable confidence in them. They have gotten practically a million men in Europe at this hour, and it seems to me before we pass a radical measure of this kind we might give that department credit enough for their good work to consult them. We have not consulted them. They have not recommended this legislation to our committee. When they do, it seems to me we ought to consult among ourselves and report to this body the best bill we know how to frame along those lines in accordance with the plans which the department is now carrying out so well.

Mr. CUMMINS and Mr. WATSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator from Indiana soon, but I will yield immediately to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Tennessee must have observed that under this amendment the President still has complete, absolute discretion. He can draw men from the ages of 21 to 31 before drafting a single man either below the age of 21 or above 30.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will excuse me a moment, I know he does not want to make a mistake about that. The President is given no authority to deal with men under the age of 21.

Mr. CUMMINS. Absolutely. In my judgment there is nothing to interfere with the President's existing authority to classify these men in any way he sees fit.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, of course, to classify them, but if the Senator will excuse me, we are in a war now. We are not preparing for war. We have a war on our hands and under this proviso in the amendment the President would be powerless to use young men under 21 years of age for actual service in fighting for our country. They are taken out of his power completely for a period of three years, and we ought not to do it. I think if we are going to reduce the age limit we ought to give him power to call on those just like he calls on any other drafted men. We ought not to make classes among drafted men.

Mr. CUMMINS. It enlarges the power and gives him power to deal with men above 30.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does so far as men above 30 are concerned, but so far as men below 21 are concerned it limits his power.

Mr. CUMMINS. He has no power to deal with them now at all?

Mr. McKELLAR. He certainly has the right to accept them as volunteers now and many of them are entering the service that way.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am about to yield the floor. I have talked longer than I should have.

Mr. FALL. I was going to ask the Senator a question. I will say to him for his gratification that I expressed my views upon this proviso when I offered the amendment, and I agree with him exactly. I shall perfect the amendment by striking out the proviso.

Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that my idea in offering this amendment and providing that the ages between 18 and 21 should not be used on the firing line, except that the discretion is left to the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, who has just as much sense as the Senator from New Mexico or the Senator from Tennessee, as to what he shall do with these boys between 18 and 21 years. I will be very frank with the Senator. If I had the enforcement of a provision of this kind, during a vacation I might call out all these boys for one or two months and train them and send them back.

Mr. McKELLAR. Where would the Senator get the officers to train them?

Mr. FALL. Every noncommissioned officer—does the Senator mean to say that he does not anticipate enlarging the present Army?

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly do expect our Army to be increased. I think it ought to be increased as fast as we can train and ship the men—increased to 3,000,000, to 5,000,000, or even to 10,000,000, or to any number necessary to whip the Germans; but noncommissioned officers are not available to train these boys, but are used to train men who are going to France.

Mr. FALL. We can get noncommissioned officers as every other military country has done. Then in training them, if we are going to enlarge the Army, we have officers to train men under 21.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I disagree with the Senator entirely on the subject of having ample officers to train these men. We are having great trouble in securing competent officers to train the men to go to France.

Mr. FALL. Suppose—

Mr. McKELLAR. Just one moment. We are training them as rapidly as we can. We are making splendid headway with this training. I know it must be a source of pride and gratification not only to the Members of the Senate but to the people of the United States that we are making such headway with the training of our forces in getting them on the battle line. Now, when we are just getting in our stride, pressing forward, making tremendous headway in this fight, why dissipate our forces by in effect making schools for these young men under 21 years of age and preventing them from going into the Army until they are 21? What we ought to do is to centralize our efforts upon winning this war at this time, and then later on we

can talk about universal military training and other kindred subjects which are in substance incorporated in this proviso.

I hope the Senator will not only perfect the amendment by withdrawing the proviso, which he suggests he will do, but that he will leave it to the War Department now to conduct and to carry on this war in the way they have set forward. They have the plans and know what the facts are; they know what their abilities are to get officers and equipment with which to train the men, and I think it ought to be left to that department, at least, to suggest changes in the draft law.

The proviso in this amendment should by all means be withdrawn or defeated, and I believe it would be better to defer action on the whole subject until we have all the facts before us. The Congress will at any time enlarge the limits of the draft law when it is made manifest that an enlargement is necessary. There will be no trouble on earth about getting a bill or resolution for such a purpose through at any time that it may be asked for by our military authorities.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. Can the Senator give us anything like an accurate estimate of the number of men under the operations of the present selective-service law who have been actually put on the battle line?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been informed that there are about a million and a half or a little more than a million and a half who have been drafted out of the number of between nine and ten million in the first registration.

Mr. WATSON. What per cent of those are in fighting units, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know what per cent. The Senator will recall that recently resolutions have passed asking for the number, and I believe the number has not yet been ascertained and given to Congress. I can not furnish those figures to the Senate, but I know that less than 20 per cent of all those within draft age and registered have been actually drafted up to this date, and I think there must still be a very large number, probably many more than can be trained this year, still subject to draft and fit for service under that first registration. In addition there remains the 800,000 registered in June, 1918, of which probably 75 per cent, or 600,000, are fit for service.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish simply to answer the question which was asked by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] as to what per cent are in fighting units. I wish to call attention to the fact that the evidence before the committee, as I am informed, was that 58 per cent are within fighting units, and, of course, that would leave 42 per cent who are not.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the purport of this amendment is to substitute for the ages 21 and 31 in the existing law the ages of 18 and 45. If in the enactment of that law the limit of the draft had been fixed at 18 and 45 instead of 21 and 31, then the law would have been, and would still be, precisely as it will be if this amendment to the amendment is adopted.

It was stated many times here in the discussion of the present draft law that the 10-year limitation which it fixed as the basis of coercion would bring within its provisions upward of 11,000,000 men, and that, making allowance for defective physical conditions and for express exemptions and for exemptions which would be permissible under the discretion of the statute, there would remain an available force fit for military duty of something more than 5,000,000 men. I may be inaccurate in some of these statements, but such is my recollection. It was also insisted that within the limitations of the law there would be found an ample force of men for the great emergency confronting the people of the United States.

I opposed that measure largely because I did not believe in substituting the draft for the volunteer system, and incidentally because it seemed to me that if we were to go to the draft system we should abandon the volunteer system. I had no reason then, Mr. President, and certainly I have none now, to question the accuracy of the estimates which were made concerning the force available under the law. I believe, and still believe, that inasmuch as they were carefully made by experts along that line we could rely upon them substantially.

Now, Mr. President, it appears in this discussion that we have taken from this available force approximately one and one-half millions of men, a number, however, which includes a very considerable proportion of volunteers under and over the age limitations. So it is safe to say that there could be an avail-

able force of three and one-half millions, plus the number covered by our amendment to that law and enacted at this session of Congress, for our immediate need.

If I am correct in my recollection concerning these estimates, then it would seem unnecessary to resort at this time to so sweeping a measure as the one now under consideration, which extends from 18 to 45 and embraces a period of life nearly three times as great as that which is covered by the existing statute.

If I thought it were necessary, if the time ever comes when the department determines that it is necessary to extend this limitation even beyond that proposed by the amendment, I should not hesitate to vote for it if I should be in the Senate at that time. But, Mr. President, until we are semiofficially informed that it is essential I doubt the wisdom, I doubt the expediency of the enactment of this proposed extension.

Something has been said about the moral effect this amendment would have upon our enemy. I think it was stated by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] that in the event this amendment was enacted the population of the central empires would feel that we had taken this step expressive of our resolution and determination in this war and possibly weaken their own. Of course, I do not pretend to use the exact phraseology of the Senator, but such, in substance, was its intent.

Mr. President, in my judgment, if there should be any consequent effect upon the minds or the morale of our enemies through the enactment of this measure, it would be precisely to the contrary.

Another Senator has said that Germany knows our military condition as well, if not better, than many of us. I have no doubt that is true; but if within one year and two months after the enactment of a conscript law, which was then declared by its advocates to be all that was necessary for the mobilization of such man power in this country as the war required, we should follow it by extending that age limitation from 18 to 45, the inference would logically be that we had exhausted our efforts to secure the service of men within the first limitation and were therefore compelled as a military necessity to extend the law so that it would be commensurate with the volunteer age fixed in that or some other statute and which is the law of the country. If, therefore, our object is to appall the enemy with the magnitude of our potential preparations, it will, in my judgment, fail of its purpose, although, of course, I know the author of this amendment had no such purpose in view. He has been consistently from the commencement of this gigantic struggle an advocate of an enormous military force, a believer in the mobilization of every resource of the country, and in making every possible effort within our power against the enemy.

I believe so, too, Mr. President, but I differ very materially as to the manner in which it is to be done, and I differ also, perhaps, in my conception of the extent to which we can do it.

I have heard a great deal recently from those in high authority and those in lower authority, and from those who are not in authority at all, about the importance of mobilizing and placing at once upon the front an American Army of 5,000,000 men; that before the war shall have been ended it will be necessary to have such an army there. I hope such will not prove to be the case. If it does, Mr. President, we will endeavor to meet the necessity and provide for it even before it shall appear upon the horizon.

But we are apt in this country to use large figures and make large statements, sometimes without a due conception of what they involve. It has required us something like 14 months to place upon the French front an army of nearly a million men, or, speaking more correctly, I should say a force of nearly a million men, of which about 60 per cent are effective. In doing that we have made the greatest possible draft upon our transportation capacity, not only upon the seas but upon the land. During the last three months the accomplishment of the War Department in the mobilization of troops 3,000 miles across the sea has no parallel in the history of the world. And yet during that period, at a time when we had to strain every nerve at our command, we have not moved, I think, to exceed 250,000 or 300,000 men.

It is all very well to talk about striking the German wherever you can find them, to send an army to Mesopotamia, another to Macedonia, and another to Siberia, and thus mingle our troops with the troops of the allies wherever there is an objective point. The conception, Mr. President, is a noble one. The possibility of its execution is another question entirely. We can not do it, or at least we can not do it at present, because forsooth, Mr. President, we are doing all that our present capacity will permit in peopling the war front with a great army of American soldiers.

I do not think that I betray any secrets when I state that it requires about 9 tons of capacity per annum to supply each

American soldier in France with the equipment necessary to sustain him physically and in a military sense. His clothing, his food, his munitions, his gun, his artillery, his aircraft equipment—all the paraphernalia of modern warfare—require 9 tons per annum, or 9,000,000 tons for 1,000,000 men. Of course, perhaps one-third of that is sufficient for the reason that more than three round trips may be made by the same vessel during that period of time, but when we consider the enormous demand upon the tonnage of the world for other purposes, for furnishing food for our allies, for supplying them with war materials and all other material for which they are dependent on other sections of the world, the wonder is that we have been able to secure tonnage sufficient to make the record of the last three months. We are building ships. Thank God they are coming now with reasonable rapidity, and I trust will soon cross the line between the amount of tonnage sunk and the amount of tonnage created. Yet they are not building one-third, perhaps, of the number that could be used. We can not get them too fast, and some one must build them. We may have five million, seven and a half million, ten million effective troops, but the enemy is across the sea, and we must cross the sea to get at him.

When we are talking about an army of 5,000,000 men across the sea, we should think of the 45,000,000 tons of carrying capacity that will be essential for their sustenance and support. To transport an army to France or anywhere else and then leave it unprotected and unprovided for is unthinkable; it is impossible.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I will yield in a moment. Where are the men coming from, Mr. President, if we are to subject everybody from 18 to 45 to the draft? Where shall we look for the human material necessary for the construction of that one tremendous item so absolutely and unavoidably essential to a successful prosecution of the war? I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator has made the statement that it takes nine tons of material per annum to supply a single soldier, and that 5,000,000 troops, therefore, would require 45,000,000 tons. He does not, I take it, however, mean that that signifies that we must have a ship tonnage of 45,000,000?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, no; not for that purpose.

Mr. REED. But that is, because each ship would make several trips during the year?

Mr. THOMAS. Each ship would make several trips.

Mr. REED. How many tons does the Senator estimate it would take in tonnage of vessels? How much would we have to increase our floating tonnage?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think it would be safe, Mr. President, to rely upon less than 15,000,000 tons. It is true also that faster vessels can make more than three turnabout trips, as they are called, per annum; but when you consider the necessity for repairs, the danger from the submarines, and the other accidents that may, and generally do, interfere with the regularity of such voyages, you must have something of a margin, and count, say, three trips to each vessel per annum between America and Europe.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I read in a morning newspaper a day or two ago that there were 89 ships to be launched on the 4th day of July next. I will ask my colleague whether his investigation, which has been recently made, confirms that or whether it does not?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, Mr. President, our investigation, which has been made recently, had reference to another sort of ship. I wish to God I could say there were going to be 45,000,000 tons of airships, or an amount proportioned to 45,000,000 tons of shipping in position to aid our troops and help win the victory within the next nine months.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to inquire of his colleague [Mr. SHAFROTH] if he read at the same time that there had been 640,000 gross tons of shipping sunk during the month of May?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, at the time I read both accounts I do not recall having seen a statement of the tonnage sunk so large as the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota; but I will accept his statement.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota whether that 640,000 gross tons, which was stated to have been sunk during the month of May, does not comprehend the shipping of all of the nations? The 89 ships which are to be launched on the Fourth of July next, however, contemplate only what this Nation alone is doing.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; the Senator from Colorado is correct; it refers to the shipping of all nations; but there are only two

nations that are building ships which amount to anything, and those are the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator from North Dakota should add Japan as doing pretty well now.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I desire to ask the Senator from Colorado what amount of tonnage we now have in operation, if he knows?

Mr. THOMAS. I am unable to answer that question. Both on account of the sinkings and on account of additions, the amount of our shipping is constantly changing. I was going to attempt to approximate, but I shall not try to do so, as I have but little knowledge upon the subject.

I may say to my colleague, however, that the 89 ships which are to be launched upon the Fourth of July next, if I remember the account correctly, do not aggregate quite a million tons; most of them are of small size; so that their aggregate tonnage, while very considerable and very creditable, is a very small proportion of the amount of tonnage that is so badly needed at the present time.

Mr. REED. It is to be a Fourth of July spurt; it does not mean that we are going to get that much on the 2d of July or on the 3d, but only on the Fourth.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. President, that is a very timely suggestion. We are going to make on the Fourth day of July, the natal day of the Nation, a special effort to launch more ships than perhaps we shall launch for a good many days succeeding. So in determining how many troops we are going to send to France, we must not lose sight of our capacity to send them. I am not at all sure that it is a proper policy to equip, discipline, and train more soldiers than we can send or more soldiers than we know, with a reasonable degree of accuracy, that we can send within the next 6, 8, or 10 months.

Mr. President, I do not believe that I minimize at all the tremendous task confronting this Nation. I believe that I feel and realize quite as keenly as do any of my colleagues or any of my fellow citizens, that if we are to succeed in this great struggle we must mobilize and utilize every resource of the Republic; that, if the world is to be made safe for democracy and if Anglo-Saxon civilization is to be preserved, we must not fail in any direction or at any time to make the winning of the war the business of the Nation and the business as well of every one of its citizens.

But, Mr. President, it has been well said that this is not a war of armies, but a war of peoples; not a conflict between military forces, but a conflict between the industrial, social, moral, political, and military elements of all the nations engaged in it. Germany's successes have been quite as much due to her recognition of that mighty fact as to the superior excellence of her armies. Her conquest of Russia was not effected by her legions, but by her propagandist policy, which began years ago, and which has been developed with a fiendish perfection, so that when the hour came, it could be utilized for Russia's destruction. We must carry on a similar warfare.

We must also remember that the man upon the farm, the boy at school, the workman in the shop, the constructor of war materials, is as much a factor, each is as much a soldier enlisted in this great conflict and performing his duty as fully as though he were in the trenches at the front; and that, unless he continues to perform that service, the man in the trenches can not perform his duty there.

I believe, Mr. President, in some draft system which will take under governmental supervision the man power of the country, not so much for the purpose of increasing our armies, but for the purpose of increasing the forces in our factories and upon our farms.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] has introduced and has several times advocated a measure of that sort. I believe it is his intention to offer it as an amendment to this bill. That, Mr. President, in my judgment, is the sort of amendment to the draft law which the present exigency requires.

The men who strike in the factories, the men who fail to work their eight hours a day and to give the Government or their employer due consideration, and therefore the men who interfere with the general progress of development and of production in this country, should be under the military arm of the Government and be subject to the infliction of the military code just as much as the soldier who wears the uniform of his Government and who stands before the hail of bullets of the enemy. So believing, Mr. President, I am unable to support this amendment. I do not believe that it is necessary at this time.

It has been stated here that more than 200,000 young men under the age of 21 and over the age of 18 are in the Army as

volunteers. One of the predictions made of the conscript law, one of the things which, in theory at least, it sought to do away with, was that system of volunteering which deprived the Nation of the best and most enthusiastic blood of its youth and depleted the country of its finest material of young men; yet it appears that, notwithstanding the conscript law, the volunteer system is quite as effective as it was before we had a conscript law, and that, instead of being a substitute for, it is merely a supplement to that old and better volunteer system which, supported by patriotism, like hope, "springs eternal in the human breast," and marches in the great human army which in a Republic may always be relied upon when the Government needs the services of its citizens.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The volunteers who have been mentioned are young men who went into the National Guard system before the draft law was enacted; so that the volunteers in the service now have probably reached the age limit, unless some go into the new National Guard organization which is now provided for.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator from Oregon is mistaken in the statement that they all enlisted in the National Guard before the draft law was enacted.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Practically they all were.

Mr. THOMAS. The draft law, as I remember—the Senator from Oregon will correct me if I am wrong—expressly recognized the right of volunteering between the ages of 18 and 45 in the Regular Army and in the National Guard.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think so.

Mr. THOMAS. I know personally of many instances where men less than 21 years of age did volunteer in the National Army after that law was passed.

I am not finding fault with that law, Mr. President. I opposed it conscientiously and unsuccessfully, but since its adoption it has had my undivided and constant support. I think, however, it is well enough to call attention to the fact that, inasmuch as it does permit volunteering, we shall get, as we have got, plenty of volunteers, the most of them beneath but many of them above the age limitation.

Mr. President, this is too important a matter, in my judgment, for Congress to pass upon affirmatively as an amendment to the military appropriation bill. It is a question of Nation-wide importance; it is one which affects every calling, every man with the age, the family of every man within the age, and every industry and pursuit of the Nation. It is a matter which should be made the subject of a separate bill just as much as the draft law was made the subject of a separate bill. It should be introduced as a separate item of legislation; it should be considered by the appropriate committee; we should have the best information that can be acquired from the highest military sources. We should also inquire the extent to which our industries may be affected. Then, with that wealth of information before us, coupled with such recommendations as the administration may see fit to make, we can act wisely, intelligently, and permanently.

Of course, there has been a good deal of discussion both official and unofficial regarding the raising of the age limit. I am quite aware of the sentiment of Gen. Crowder regarding it; and I wish, Mr. President, to add my own to the encomiums which have here been pronounced upon the work of that splendid officer. He has discharged the duties which the Executive called upon him in a time of great stress to administer, and he has wisely, efficiently, and successfully administered a great military law. Under it he has built up a magnificent Army, and is entitled to the highest praise that a grateful Nation can bestow; but, Mr. President, we must remember, nevertheless, that it is a part of the military training to urge increases in the Army and increases of the limits of service. A soldier would hardly be a soldier if he did not develop such an attribute. The general wants a large Army; his reasons may be of the best; I am not criticizing them; I merely state the tendency of all things military toward a larger and a yet larger establishment; indeed, if I had the time, I believe I could demonstrate that this war was due to the expansion of that spirit, beginning perhaps in low degree, but so developing itself as finally to engulf a great people, and convert a great empire from one of the finest monuments of modern civilization to the most brutal and dominating force ever known to man. But even he, Mr. President, so far as I am aware—and I am now referring to Gen. Crowder—even he has not been before the Senate committee, nor do I think before the committee of the other House, urging upon them or upon us an immediate consideration and enactment of this measure or anything like it.

So that we only have unofficially his view; which, however correct it may be, is not sufficient, in my mind, to justify us in affirmatively passing upon this very important amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I present a proposed amendment to the bill and ask to have it printed. I wish to say in reference to it that I expect to offer it as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

In further explanation, I desire to say that we seem to be confronted in this bill with the need of amending our draft law in order to comply with the desires and relieve the embarrassments of the Department of State. The present draft law provides for the drafting not only of American citizens but of those aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens. When an alien of Great Britain or Italy or France has declared his intention to become an American citizen and is drafted, there is no objection to that on the part of his country; but when we attempt to draft the citizens or subjects of neutral countries we have been confronted with the fact that we are violating treaties, and to some extent are violating international comity. The representatives of those countries have appealed to the State Department in thousands of cases to secure immunity for those declarants. It seems to be necessary, therefore, in order to relieve the State Department of that embarrassment, to amend the law by giving absolute immunity to these declarants. At the present time the War Department, under the interpretation of Gen. Crowder, has construed the act of Congress as repealing the treaties, and although the State Department is unable to take that view of it, so long as the War Department holds that view and sends these men to Europe against their will and in spite of protests we are likely to be embroiled in very serious embarrassment. I think, therefore, we must amend the law.

In the amendment I propose that where the declarant is drafted and sets up his immunity he shall be at once released; but when he is released under those circumstances his declaration to become an American citizen is automatically canceled and recalled, and he can never thereafter become a citizen of the United States. I have inserted that provision with the idea that that will restrain men from setting up the claim of immunity, and if they do set it up they will lose their right to become American citizens. I come from a State in which there are a good many so-called declarants—that is, men who have declared their intention to become citizens—and it would cause a good deal of ill feeling and a good deal of indignation on the part of American citizens whose sons are subjected to the draft to have their neighbors released from the draft and to stay at home to do the voting while their sons go to the war.

I therefore am going to offer this amendment—I hope it will not come up until to-morrow, and in the meantime it can be printed—as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. In it I have placed the ages from 20 to 40 years, with the impression that I can in that way concur with the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if his amendment is of much length?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; and I shall be glad to have it read.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to have it read if it is not a long amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. As a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. FALL, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the second sentence of section 2 of an act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, be amended to read as follows:

"Such draft as herein provided shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens between the ages of 20 and 40 years, both inclusive, and also such male residents of the United States as are the nationals of countries cobelligerent with the United States in the present war or are the nationals of countries neutral in the present war and have declared their intention to become citizens and failed to assert any claim to immunity as foreign nationals: *Provided, however,* If such claim to immunity is asserted, it shall be recognized and shall operate automatically as a withdrawal and cancellation of the declaration to become an American citizen, and the individual shall forever be debarred from becoming one."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, some figures have been given this afternoon that ought to be corrected. The country has been misled often enough by loose and flamboyant figures. I read the other day a statement made by a Representative in Congress as to the number of fighting planes we had on the other side which had no relation whatever to the facts. Statements have been made this afternoon that we can draw an army of eight or nine million men from those who are now within the draft age, and the impression would go to the country that all we have to do is to keep calling men just as we are calling them

now, and we can have eight or nine million men out of those within the draft age. If the Senate will bear with me a moment I will give them the best figures obtainable, and Senators will be astounded, I think, at the smallness of the Army we are to have from those now covered by military draft law.

Mr. President, the total number of men who were registered and who were required to file questionnaires was 8,689,437. They were placed in five classes. Class 1 included 2,428,720 men; class 2, 509,666; class 3, 427,870; class 4, 3,483,326; and class 5, 1,839,856.

What are those classes? Those embraced in class 1 are as follows:

- A. Single man without dependent relatives.
 - B. Married man, with or without children, or father of motherless children, who has habitually failed to support his family.
 - C. Married man dependent on wife for support.
 - D. Married man, with or without children, or father of motherless children; man not usefully engaged, family supported by income independent of his labor.
 - E. Unskilled farm laborer.
 - F. Unskilled industrial laborer.
- Registrant by or in respect of whom no deferred classification is claimed or made.
- Registrant who fails to submit questionnaire and in respect of whom no deferred classification is claimed or made.
- All registrants not included in any other division in this schedule.

That is class 1, and you will observe that it is very broad. I come now to class 2:

- A. Married man with children or father of motherless children, where such wife or children or such motherless children are not mainly dependent upon his labor for support for the reason that there are other reasonably certain sources of adequate support (excluding earnings or possible earnings from the labor of the wife), available, and that the removal of the registrant will not deprive such dependents of support.
- B. Married man, without children, whose wife, although the registrant is engaged in a useful occupation, is not mainly dependent upon his labor for support, for the reason that the wife is skilled in some special class of work which she is physically able to perform and in which she is employed, or in which there is an immediate opening for her under conditions that will enable her to support herself decently and without suffering or hardship.
- C. Necessary skilled farm laborer in necessary agricultural enterprise.
- D. Necessary skilled industrial laborer in necessary industrial enterprise.

It is getting pretty dangerous when you begin to take the skilled industrial labor and the skilled agricultural labor, and it is getting to be a pretty great hardship when you take the married man with children, and take him simply because there may be some other means of support outside of him, not in the way of his fortune, but from some other source; and it is getting to be a very great hardship when you take the husband of the wife because she can go out and get a job and go to work.

Now I come to class 3:

- A. Man with dependent children (not his own), but toward whom he stands in relation of parent.
- B. Man with dependent aged or infirm parents.
- C. Man with dependent helpless brothers or sisters.
- D. County or municipal officer.
- E. Highly trained fireman or policeman, at least 3 years in service of municipality.
- F. Necessary customhouse clerk.
- G. Necessary employee of United States in transmission of the mails.
- H. Necessary artificer or workman in United States armory or arsenal.
- I. Necessary employee in service of United States.
- J. Necessary assistant, associate, or hired manager of necessary agricultural enterprise.
- K. Necessary highly specialized technical or mechanical expert of necessary industrial enterprise.
- L. Necessary assistant or associate manager of necessary industrial enterprise.

Mr. President, you can not take those men, or any one of those classes of men, without striking at the very roots of our production which is essential to the war.

Now, I read class 4:

- A. Man whose wife or children are mainly dependent on his labor for support.
- B. Mariner actually employed in sea service of citizen or merchant in the United States.
- C. Necessary sole managing, controlling, or directing head of necessary agricultural enterprise.
- D. Necessary sole managing, controlling, or directing head of necessary industrial enterprise.

Why, when you go out and take the heads of the great factories and skilled labor, what will remain to back up our armies in the field?

Now, see how far class 5 reaches:

- A. Officers—legislative, executive, or judicial of the United States or of State, Territory, or District of Columbia.
- B. Regular or duly ordained minister of religion.
- C. Student who on May 18, 1917, was preparing for ministry in recognized school.
- D. Persons in military or naval service of United States.
- E. Alien enemy.
- F. Resident alien (not an enemy) who claims exemption.
- G. Person totally and permanently physically or mentally unfit for military service.
- H. Person morally unfit to be a soldier of the United States.
- I. Licensed pilot actually employed in the pursuit of his vocation.

Out of the 2,428,729 men in class 1 certain deductions must be made of delinquents, Emergency Fleet employees, limited-service men, remediable defectives, and cases pending and not physically examined on date of last report; so that we now find that there has actually been called out under the 1917 registration a total of 1,575,572 men to date, and there remains yet uncalled in class 1 of the draft 475,000 men who will be called some time between now and the middle of September, making a total of 2,050,572 men, or the whole of class 1, who will be called by the middle of September, this year. From the date of the first registration, June 5, 1917, to June 5, 1918, there were 740,000 men who became of age and registered. Out of this number it is estimated that 400,000 can be called to the colors. In addition to this we have an army composed of the National Guard and enlisted men of 800,000, making a grand total of 3,350,572 men in our Army when all available men in class 1 of the drafts have been called.

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

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Has the Senator in his calculations considered the wastage that is constantly going on?

Mr. REED. I have not considered the wastage. Of course, any great battle might make a difference. I am simply speaking of the total. I am not taking into account deaths. It is the best military opinion that none of the classes except class 1 should be touched. They embrace the married men who are heads of families and have families dependent upon them. They embrace the men who are engaged in the management of great factories and institutions essential to the war. They likewise embrace those skilled workmen who must be kept in the shops of the country in order that we may produce enough for the war. In other words, they embrace a class of men that the best military opinion holds are essential to the industries of our country, or else they are the heads of families actually supporting their wives and children, and hence, if taken, the wives and children will become a charge upon the country. So that, counting this matter up and reducing it to figures as nearly as I am able to do in a somewhat hasty examination of figures which are accurate, we are about in this situation:

We have from the present draft, and will have from the draft when we have exhausted all of class 1, approximately 2,600,000 drafted troops. We will have from other sources—that is, the National Guard, the Regular Army, and so forth—approximately 800,000 men; so that we will have an Army of approximately 3,400,000 men, and then the present draft will have been exhausted, unless we go into classes 2, 3, 4, and 5, which it is thought ought not to be called.

The object of my observations thus far is simply and only to get accurate figures before the Senate and let us have done with this—I will not say nonsense—but this mistaken idea of boastfully saying to the world that America can raise out of her present draft eight or nine million troops. That can not be done practically. If we are going to raise an Army much beyond 3,400,000 men, then we must either go into classes 2, 3, 4, and 5 or we must extend the age limit, either raising it up or lowering it down, or extending it in both directions.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Where are those figures taken from? I was not in the Chamber when the Senator began his speech.

Mr. REED. I was asked not to disclose the exact source of them. I will say that they are correct.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Are they official figures from the Judge Advocate General's Department? The only reason why I ask the question is that Gen. Crowder has just made the statement to me that the entire strength of the Army will be two million and a half of men in three months, and I am surprised at the Senator's statement that it will be 3,400,000.

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to give the Senator, in confidence, the source of my information. It has been suggested to me that the mistake may come in this way: My figures of 3,400,000 include the Regular Army, the Volunteers, the National Guard, and then include all that we have obtained by the draft or those that we will get from the draft unless we invade classes 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator a further question, assuming that the same rules of physical qualification are enforced as to the lower classes, how large an Army could we raise?

Mr. REED. From the other classes?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. REED. I could not answer that. I assume that the other classes are no more physically unfit than the class that we have spoken of.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did the Senator say, in the course of his remarks—I had to leave the Chamber—how many men are in the Army now?

Mr. REED. Yes; that is included.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator say what the number is?

Mr. REED. Yes; I can say to the Senator approximately. You will have 3,400,000 in September, and if you will take out of that the 875,000 that are yet to be called under the old and new drafts you will have substantially the present Army. The Senator can make the subtraction himself.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then I understand that that is the limit of our increment, certainly within the year?

Mr. REED. Yes.

These figures have been handed to me in the Senate Chamber. I have not had time to digest them, and I apologize for taking so many words to present a matter that I could have placed before the Senate in shorter compass if I had had a little time to collate my facts. But I rose only to submit these figures in order that we might get our feet on the ground and know what we are talking about, and quit talking about eight or nine million men within the draft age, just like we ought to quit talking about 3,000 airplanes on the front. If we had 3,000 good fighting airplanes on the front at this time, the Germans would be in retreat. If we had 500 great fighting Caproni machines on the Italian front, the probabilities are that the Austrian troops would retreat entirely from Italian territory, and likely enough the Austrian Empire would fall to pieces, because men who know say that a few bombing machines over the capital of Austria would break the morale of that people at the present crisis. We do not have them, and we do not have them because there has been a good deal of talk about flying machines that have never flown and never will fly except in the imagination of gentlemen who have been entertaining the country with dreams.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator tell me how many we have?

Mr. REED. I can not tell the Senator accurately. We have a very small number, with a very large number coming on, I am happy to say; but we have no bombing planes at present. That, however, is another matter, and I do not want to go into it, because the committee has been investigating it, and I wish to let them report.

So I think the problem that is now confronting us is this: Are we content at this time to allow the law to remain so that the maximum of our Army next fall will not exceed 3,400,000, and so that when that time shall have arrived—which is only 60 to 90 days from now—we will then be without any law under which any other troops can be drawn, unless we go into classes 2, 3, 4, and 5? And then if we do desire a larger Army than 3,400,000 to be constructed by that time, or to be in process of construction by that time, is it better to increase that number by changing the age limit or is it better to go into these classes 2, 3, 4, and 5 in order to get the additional number? Let us assume that we ought to have an additional Army in creation of 1,000,000 men—that is, 1,000,000 more than the 3,400,000—and that we ought to be preparing now for that. The problem then would be, Shall we get that from classes 2, 3, 4, and 5 or would we better get it by changing the age limit? Which will be the greatest injury to the country? Which will give us the best Army? Which will involve the least expense?

We do not have the figures, or, at least, I do not have them in my possession, as to the number of men unmarried and without dependents between the ages of 30 and 40; but it does seem to me that it would be very much better to call the unmarried men without dependents between the ages of 30 and 40 than it would to call the men from classes 2, 3, 4, and 5. I think, therefore, that we ought to take time and get the information and know what we are doing, and not guess at it.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is wise for us to take men out of the industries of this country faster than we can take them into the Army, digest them—if I may use that term—and transport them. I agree in a large measure that the remarks of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] along that line were very wise. That is undoubtedly true. It would be a mere wastage to take a lot of men from industries where they are needed to put them out in military camps and keep them there

if they can not be there utilized. That, of course, is true; but, Mr. President, what are the facts?

Let us take the question of transportation. The fact is that every 30 days we are sending about 200,000 troops to Europe. If we have the boats to do that now, we will have as large a number of boats in the future. We hope by this time that we have overtaken the destruction of the submarine, so that the production is equal to the destruction, and that in a very short time the production will outrun the destruction, so that our ability to transport troops must be on the increase; and yet, at the rate of present transportation, we shall have sent our entire Army abroad in a very few months of time. In a very few months of time, therefore, we can transport more troops; and the question that we ought to be considering, it seems to me, in all solemnity, is the creation of additional troops if they are going to be necessary. The preliminary steps ought to be taken. There should be no time lost. There should be no interregnum between the completion of the present draft, the creation of the present army, and the bringing into the service of additional troops in such numbers as may be necessary to meet the great emergency that now confronts the world.

I am heartsick—and I say this with as much sorrow as I ever said anything in my life—when I contemplate what has been done, at the frightful chances that we have taken by reason of being behindhand with our work. We are behindhand in many respects. There is no use in complaining about a thing that is water over the dam. The question is, What are we to do in the future? If we had proceeded according to the best possible means we would have had airplanes in large numbers before this time; we would have had more ordnance before this time; we would have had many more things in the nature of necessary equipment, and I believe every man in the Senate will agree that those mistakes never ought to be repeated. I say this without any bitterness, without any desire to criticize anybody. They are the mistakes that other countries have made. They may be mistakes that are almost incident in a situation, and yet we ought to avoid them in the future.

So far as I am concerned, I am thoroughly convinced of the fact that if the United States is to emerge from this war with honor, with a glorious victory that will in part compensate for the fearful price in blood and treasure we are compelled to pay, the sooner we get men and metal in overwhelming amounts upon the European battle fields the sooner the struggle will be over and the less will be the expense. While I do not want to force my views upon the War Department, and recognize that it would be useless for me to attempt to do so, I do believe that the Congress of the United States is warranted in so amending this law that the President may, in his discretion, call for troops as rapidly as they can be absorbed into the great Military Establishment and transformed into soldiers.

In this connection I cite a fact that is so well known that it can not be regarded as a military secret. Many troops are being sent to Europe to-day with a very short course of training. That I do not criticize, because I believe we ought to do it, but I regret that we have to do it. I hope that we will keep on collecting troops in these cantonnments and training the troops, so that when our men go across they will go well fitted for the task that is before them.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is an able member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I want to know for my own satisfaction whether the War Department has sent any estimates or whether he has from any source an estimate sent to the committee stating how many men there ought to be and what the ages ought to be?

Mr. REED. The only way I can answer that question with propriety, I think, is to say this: There seems to be an opinion on the part of some of our officers that for the present we do not need any increase; that until we have absorbed all the men in class 1, at least, we do not need to amend the law. Mr. President, one of the officers who has been most persistent in that opinion is no more a military man than the Members of this body. I do not reflect upon him at all; I entertain for him a very great respect; but he has made mistakes in the past. He will make some in the future. We all make mistakes. As far as I am concerned, I am utterly unwilling to see the creation of this Army cease on the 15th day of next September with an Army of only 3,400,000 total. If we are going to need more men after the 15th day of next September, it is now late enough to begin calling them. We can scarcely get out the papers between now and the 15th day of next September to call the men for a new draft which might be authorized to-day. It seems to

me that there is going to be a great lapse here. This is a grave situation.

Let me say this to the Senate in conclusion; let me appeal to your judgment on this point: Before we had sent a soldier to Europe, if the battle over there had gone against us, we could have lined our troops and massed our cannon on our own shores and stood here and fought the Huns forever and a day. Even if all Europe collapsed we could have defended ourselves. I believe, against all kinds of attack. Therefore until we sent our soldiers the issue was different from that which is presented to-day.

Now, we have 900,000 of our boys in Europe, and every one of them is a hostage for victory. If the European line should be broken, if a great disaster should befall, if these 900,000 men of ours should be killed or captured, then we can not stand on our shores and defy Germany. The injury has already been irremediable and our boys would be captives in German prison pens. They are our hostages for an effort that will exhaust all the resources of this country. Back of them we are pledged by our action, our fortunes, and our lives and all that we possess. Having put 900,000 men in this position of peril, I deem it my duty to do all that lies within my power to see to it that they are backed up not by sentiment, not by speeches, not by bombast, but by other men and other guns and other ships, so that they shall be secure because of their numbers and invincible because they represent the strength of the entire Nation.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator has referred to the time that will be required in the preparation of papers. I should like to ask the Senator whether if this amendment should be adopted as it is now framed the men coming within the new ages would be considered as acceptable as the men within the present draft age?

Mr. REED. I assume that those within the present draft are already registered. There will be a registration of the new men.

That I may not be misunderstood, let me state that I do not want to be understood as advocating, in what I said, the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico. I do advocate some extension of the draft.

Mr. FALL. If the Senator from Missouri will yield to me for a moment, or if my colleague will yield to me—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I simply rose to ask the question, and perhaps my colleague can answer it.

Mr. FALL. I can answer it very definitely. Under the rule I have a right at least to perfect my amendment. If I am recognized for that purpose, or in the time of my colleague and he yields for that purpose, I shall ask leave to perfect the pending amendment by striking out in line 2 the word "eighteen" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty"; in line 3 by striking out the word "five," after the word "forty," and striking out all of line 4, so that it will read:

Provided, That the age limit fixed in said act is hereby changed and shall be, and is hereby, fixed at 20 and 40 years in lieu of 21 and 31.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to ask my colleague if that would permit the exhaustion of the present age limit before bringing in the additional ages. In other words, I ask my colleague whether the adoption of this amendment would bring about a confusion in the operation of the present law as applied to the present ages.

Mr. FALL. It could not bring about any confusion. It would simply increase the number of men under 21 in class 1 and over 31 in class 1.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me? In making those changes in his proposed amendment does the Senator strike out the proviso?

Mr. FALL. I strike out the proviso entirely. I will say that I do that after hearing the debate and after consultation with a large number of Senators, including the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. GALLINGER. I thought of offering an amendment in the exact terms of the Senator's amendment as amended, but I shall not offer it.

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, at the end of the line, insert "but those between the ages of 19 and 21, exclusive, shall be called for education or training, nonmilitary, military, or both, or for other forms of noncombatant national service during a portion or all of each year."

Mr. KING. I offer an amendment, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. MARTIN. I present a report of the conferees on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and ask for its adoption.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10358) "making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The minimum of daily hours of labor required of all clerks and other employees of the several executive departments and independent establishments, prescribed by section 7 of the act of March 15, 1898, as amended, is increased during the period of the existing war from seven hours to eight hours under the same authority and conditions specified in the said act as amended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS S. MARTIN,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
O. W. UNDERWOOD,
F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
JOHN M. EVANS,
WILLIAM H. STAFFORD,

Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations? I understand that the Senate conferees agreed to the House provision relating to the extension of the working time for clerks to eight hours.

Mr. MARTIN. They did, and it made an eight-hour day. The House insisted on that, and in order to reach an agreement and to have this bill passed, which it is vitally important shall go into effect the 1st of July, the Senate conferees receded on that amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a matter of regret to me that the Senate conferees felt obliged, as I understand they did feel obliged, to do so, or possibly lose the bill, and that they agreed to the so-called Borland amendment. I think it is a mistake, but under the circumstances I take it for granted it could not be avoided.

Mr. MARTIN. I fully agree with the Senator. We have to make concessions in order to accomplish legislation, and we did recede from that amendment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., Tuesday, June 25, 1918) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 26, 1918, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of June 24), 1918.

ASSISTANT TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

Charles B. Strecker, of Boston, Mass., to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States at Boston, Mass. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

William U. Hews, of Idaho, to be receiver of public moneys at Hailey, Idaho, his term having expired May 3, 1918. (Reappointment.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be second lieutenants with rank from June 12, 1918.

Cadet John Paul Dean.
Cadet Patrick Henry Timothy, jr.
Cadet Hugh John Casey.
Cadet Robert Earle Hamilton.
Cadet Patrick Henry Tansey.
Cadet Hans Kramer.
Cadet Albert Gordon Matthews.
Cadet Amos Blanchard Shattuck, jr.
Cadet Leland Hazelton Hewitt.
Cadet Michael Charles Grenata.
Cadet Preston Wood Smith.
Cadet Thomas Francis Kern.
Cadet Ralph Edward Cruse.
Cadet Lewis Tenney Boss.
Cadet Roland Stenzel.
Cadet Charles Francis Baish.
Cadet Clarence Lionel Adcock.
Cadet Keryn ap Rice.
Cadet Charles Stuart Ward.
Cadet Henry Morehead Underwood.
Cadet James Bryan Newman, jr.
Cadet James Marshall Young.
Cadet James Creel Marshall.
Cadet Walter Ernest Lorence.
Cadet Meyer Loshie Casman.
Cadet Lucius Du Bignon Clay.
Cadet Lloyd Ernst Mielenz.
Cadet Pierre Alexander Agnew.
Cadet Alexander Murray Neilson.
Cadet Hoel Smith Bishop, jr.
Cadet Charles Emmett McKee.
Cadet Robert Habersham Elliott.
Cadet Samuel Davis Sturgis, jr.
Cadet Thomas Hay Nixon.
Cadet Anderson Thomas William Moore.
Cadet Reginald Whitaker.
Cadet Eugene Mead Caffey.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

To be second lieutenants, with rank from June 12, 1918.

Cadet Roland Mac Gray.
Cadet Robert Johnson Horr.
Cadet John Loughlin Grant.
Cadet Paul Ludwig Deylitz.
Cadet Leo Myron Kreber.
Cadet Edwin Luther Sibert.
Cadet O'Ferrall Knight.
Cadet Charles Clifton Blanchard.
Cadet Paul Eleanor Hurt.
Cadet Henry Winston Holt.
Cadet Clarence Page Townsley, jr.
Cadet James Hubert Roemer.
Cadet John Mesick.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be second lieutenants with rank from June 12, 1918.

Cadet Julius Joseph Mussil.
Cadet James Milligan Gillespie.
Cadet Milo Benson Barrigan.
Cadet Oscar Alfred Axelson.
Cadet George Bicker Aigeltinger.
Cadet Joseph Stubbs Robinson.
Cadet James Faulkner Pichel.
Cadet Roy Douglas Paterson.
Cadet John Lawrence Hanley.
Cadet Albert Edwin Marks.
Cadet John Arthur Weeks.
Cadet Fred William Gerhard, jr.
Cadet Jacob Gunn Sucher.
Cadet Howard Harvey Newman, jr.
Cadet Ernest Lenwood Stephens, jr.
Cadet Nevins Dorsey Young.
Cadet Benjamin Franklin Manning.
Cadet Paul William George.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants with rank from June 12, 1918.

Cadet Henry Milton Alexander.
 Cadet Clyde Beauchamp Bell.
 Cadet John Magruder Bethel.
 Cadet Francis Parker Tompkins.
 Cadet Cornelius Comegys Jadwin, II.
 Cadet Donald Coray.
 Cadet William Frederick Holford Godson, jr.
 Cadet William Lillard Barriger.
 Cadet Frederick William Fenn.
 Cadet Elmer Quillen Oliphant.
 Cadet Jonathan Lane Holman.
 Cadet Francis Earle Rundell.
 Cadet George Baird Hudson.
 Cadet Edmund Bellinger Bellinger.
 Cadet Harry Clay Mewshaw.
 Cadet Joseph Perry Catta.
 Cadet Maxwell Michaux Corpening.
 Cadet Peter Lee Atherton Dye.
 Cadet Frank Thorpe Turner.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be second lieutenants with rank from June 12, 1918.

Cadet Charles Ellicott Hoffman.
 Cadet Hugh Ambrose Murrill, jr.
 Cadet Paul Bernard Malone, jr.
 Cadet Ernest William Gruhn.
 Cadet Edwin Hunter Crouch.
 Cadet William Crosby Coogan.
 Cadet John Haleston.
 Cadet Robert Hilton Offley.
 Cadet John Paul Zachman.
 Cadet Elton Thomas Cobb.
 Cadet Edward Alvin Grupe.
 Cadet Francisco Cintron, jr.
 Cadet Richard Gray McKee.
 Cadet Julian Kitchen Miller.
 Cadet Joseph Charles Kovarik.
 Cadet Wynot Rush Irish.
 Cadet Royal Adam Machle.
 Cadet Leonard Randall Nachman.
 Cadet Clark Hazen Mitchell.
 Cadet William Maynadler Miley.
 Cadet Duncan Hodges.
 Cadet Wayne Wallace Wells.
 Cadet Alfred Armstrong McNamee.
 Cadet Francis Joseph Achatz.
 Cadet Harold Strong Kelley.
 Cadet Leon Calhoun Boineau.
 Cadet Harold Wilbert Gould.
 Cadet Howard Parrill Richardson.
 Cadet George Bittmann Barth.
 Cadet Harry Benham Sherman.
 Cadet Albert Francis Ward.
 Cadet John Templeton Newland.
 Cadet Carroll Tye.
 Cadet Benjamin Ransom McBride.
 Cadet Thomas Quinton Donaldson, jr.
 Cadet Philip Edward Gallagher.
 Cadet Carroll Kimball Leeper.
 Cadet Edward Nathaniel Jones, 3d.
 Cadet Herbert Benjamin Williams.
 Cadet Harold Berkeley Lewis.
 Cadet Charlie Quillian Lifsey.
 Cadet Hugh McCalla Wilson, jr.
 Cadet Dwight Terry Francis.
 Cadet William Nimmons Davis.
 Cadet Dorr Hazlehurst.
 Cadet Robert Trueheart Foster.
 Cadet Robert Edwin Bagby.
 Cadet Edwin Davis Dando.
 Cadet Frederick von Harten Kimble.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY PROMOTION, IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

To be captains with rank from January 21, 1918.

First Lieut. Sidney F. Mashbir.
 First Lieut. William P. Scobey.
 First Lieut. William C. Moore.

To be captain with rank from February 24, 1918.

First Lieut. Albion Smith.

To be captain with rank from February 28, 1918.

First Lieut. Edwin D. Patrick.

To be captain with rank from March 15, 1918.

First Lieut. Herman F. Kramer.

To be captain with rank from April 4, 1918.

First Lieut. Clarence P. Evers.

To be captain with rank from April 9, 1918.

First Lieut. William H. Coacher.

To be captain with rank from May 9, 1918.

First Lieut. Edward S. Johnston.

To be captain with rank from June 7, 1918.

First Lieut. John T. Henderson.

These nominations were submitted to the Senate January 31, 1918, and were confirmed by that body on February 13, 1918. This message is submitted for the purpose of correcting errors in dates of rank of the nominees.

TRANSFER TO THE ACTIVE LIST OF THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

To be major with rank from May 15, 1917.

Capt. Harry S. Howland, United States Army, retired.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918:

Charles A. Pownall,
 Earl A. McIntyre,
 Milton H. Anderson,
 Edgar R. McClung,
 Wells E. Goodhue,
 Harvey S. Haislip, and
 Rivers J. Carstarphen.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) George H. Fort to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1918.

Passed Asst. Surg. Willard G. Steadman, jr., to be a surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 15th day of October, 1917.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 22d day of April, 1918:

Foster H. Bowman,
 William W. Wickersham,
 Charles W. Depping,
 William A. Stoops, and
 Talmadge Wilson.

Machinist Oscar D. Parker to be a chief machinist in the Navy from the 17th day of January, 1918.

Pay Clerk William H. McKenna to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 2d day of September, 1917.

Pay Clerk Leroy Moyer to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 10th day of April, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Roman J. Miller to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1918.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Joseph J. Clark to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 24th day of April, 1918.

The following-named temporary warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of June, 1918:

George Paille,
 John P. Hildman,
 Louis B. Raper,
 Walter F. H. Nolte,
 William H. Mann, jr.,
 John M. Schmissrauter,
 Franklin E. Cook,
 Dougald E. Martin, and
 Fred A. Hauser.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of June, 1918:

Froebel A. Lawrence,
 Harry L. Hill,
 Truman E. Ayers,
 George W. Travis,
 Lewis E. Shaw,
 Meares B. Cartmell,
 James F. Jeter,
 John J. Dem,
 Francis F. Martin,
 James L. Freese,
 Myron T. Grubham,
 Charles F. Adams,
 Richard L. Jones,
 Edgar J. Hayden,

Werdebaugh Ramsay,
Christopher Bell, and
Hafford C. Southall.

Ensign Thomas R. Jones, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of June, 1918.

The following-named citizens to be acting chaplains in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 14th day of June, 1918:

John C. Ely, jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania,
Simon A. O'Rourke, a citizen of Massachusetts, and
Frederick Schweitzer, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of June 24), 1918.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Frederick C. Peters to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C.

James H. Fry to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind.

POSTMASTER.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Thomas M. Reed, Frackville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, June 25, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our hearts go out in gratitude to Thee, our Father in heaven, for the deep and abiding patriotism which has ever characterized the American people and which insures the perpetuity of our Republic; for the alacrity with which our young men have sprung to the call of the colors in this hour of danger.

Encourage, strengthen, and maintain them, with our allies, that victory may crown their efforts and bring a lasting peace to the weary, worn world, and all praise shall be Thine, in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

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

RANK OF MEDICAL OFFICERS.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for not to exceed three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to address the House for not to exceed three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I notice in this morning's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the principal committee amendment to the Army appropriation bill adopted in the Senate yesterday is that straightening out the dispute over the lack of rank in the Medical Corps of the Army. Substantially it contains the provisions of the Owen bill.

Complaint has been made that because of the inferior rank among medical officers they were unable to compel obedience to their orders affecting sanitation and health. Under the amendment adopted yesterday one additional major general and three additional brigadier generals are allowed to the Medical Corps of the Regular Army and three major generals and six brigadier generals provided for the Medical Corps for each million men of the National Army.

It is often said, and truly so, that this is a war of science and experts; therefore let us hope that the death rate from disease in this war shall be reduced from what it was in our past wars, especially the Spanish-American War, which is still fresh in our minds, in which we lost 14 men from disease where we lost 1 from bullets.

Without minimizing for a moment the splendor of Japan's victories on land or sea—Mukden, Port Arthur, Liaoyang, and the Korean Strait—of which two are among the bloodiest battles in history, it remains true that the greatest conquests of Japan have been in the humanities of war and the stopping of the needless sacrifice of life through preventable diseases. Longmore's Tables, which are accepted as reliable statistics of war, and which are based upon the record of battles for the past 200 years, show that there rarely has been a conflict of any great duration in which at least four men have not perished from disease to every one from bullets. All the statistics of the past were studied with the minutest care and detail by the Japanese.

Their authorities recognized that in order to be victorious over a foe like Russia this great silent enemy that slaughtered 80 out of every 100 that fell had to be overcome. Japan sent her students all over the world to study army systems in every land. With the knowledge thus gathered she evolved a system of her own. The result was shown after their war with Russia. Japan lost in killed and died from wounds 52,946; died from all diseases, 11,992; more than four deaths from bullets to one from disease as against a record of centuries of four from disease to one from bullets, or 800 per cent better than the average of history. Only 1.2 per cent of the entire army died of sickness or disease. Only 1.5 per cent died of gunshot wounds, although 20 per cent were wounded. This record, I believe, is unparalleled in the annals of history.

This should be a lesson for us in this war, and we can do as well, if not better, provided our medical officers have more executive and less advisory privileges in matters of hygiene and sanitation in barracks and field. In Great Britain they have given very much more important recognition to the officers in the medical department, and the same thing is true with regard to France and Italy. This legislation is not only in the interest of the soldiers, but it is also a recognition of the valuable services rendered by the medical fraternity and in keeping with the high purposes and efficiency of the profession. I therefore trust that when this matter comes before the House it will receive careful and due consideration and that the amendment will be enacted into law.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12441) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the sundry civil appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair announced the following conferees: Mr. SHERLEY, Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, and Mr. MONBELL.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On June 19, 1918:

S. 4445. An act granting the consent of Congress to Marion and Horry Counties, S. C., to construct a bridge across Little Peedee River.

On June 20, 1918:

H. R. 11284. An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 10843. An act 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;

H. R. 11658. An act 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;

H. R. 9641. An act 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;

H. R. 10924. An act 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; and

H. R. 9506. An act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 12441) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

SENATE RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following resolution (S. Res. 266) was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 24, 1918.

Whereas H. R. 9248, a bill "To prevent extortion, to impose taxes upon certain incomes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," duly passed by the House of Representatives March 12, 1918, was considered in the Senate and passed with a reported amendment in the nature of a substitute May 11, 1918; and
Whereas on said May 11, 1918, a conference was asked and managers on the part of the Senate were appointed thereon; and
Whereas on June 14, 1918, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives called said bill from the Speaker's table, and made thereon certain remarks seriously reflecting upon the honor and integrity of the Senate, as appears on pages 8452 to 8457 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and
Whereas subsequently on said June 14, 1918, managers were appointed on the part of the House of Representatives, of whom said chairman of said committee was one; and
Whereas said chairman of said House committee subsequently sent to each manager on the part of the Senate under date of June 19, 1918, the following letter:

"COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
"Washington, D. C., June 19, 1918.

"DEAR SIR: I write to advise you that on the 14th instant the House agreed to the request made by the Senate for a conference on H. R. 9248, the antiprofitting rent bill, and that Messrs. CROSSER, of Ohio; CARY, of Wisconsin; and myself were appointed conferees on the part of the House. And further, to advise you that we will meet the Senate conferees at such time and place that will be most agreeable to the Senate conferees.

"In order to facilitate matters I am inviting the attention of each of the Senate conferees to some of the more important questions of difference which will arise in conference by sending in advance a list of questions inquiring as to the attitude of the Senate conferees concerning each. The questions mentioned are herewith inclosed.

"Very truly, yours,

(Signed) "BEN JOHNSON.

"1. Are you unalterable in your purpose to create a rent administrator?

"2. If so, are you unalterable in your purpose not to intrust the work with anyone unless he be a resident of the District of Columbia?

"3. Are you unalterable in your purpose not to permit the President to select a rent administrator for the District of Columbia just as he selected a Food Administrator and Fuel Administrator, i. e., without your consent and approval?

"4. Are you unalterable in your seeming purpose to permit profiting in house rents by imposing a fine less than the amount of the profiting, or will you accept some plan like that recently suggested by the President in his message to Congress, whereby all the money taken in a profiting transaction shall be surrendered?

"5. Are you unalterable in your adherence to that part of the Senate bill which would compel the tenant to leave his work as often and as long as it would be necessary for him to leave it in order to prosecute or defend the several appeals allowed?

"6. Are you unalterable in your purpose not to fix a gross return to the landlord, but instead to give him a 'net' return, notwithstanding the fact that thereby the landlord would have no interest whatever in keeping down the operating expenses of the premises?

"7. Are you unalterable in your purpose to saddle upon the tenant the cost of permanent street and similar improvements to the real estate alone, notwithstanding the fact that the erstwhile tenant enjoys the building alone?

"8. Are you unalterable in your purpose to compel the tenant to account for 'vacancies' in the house and 'depreciation' of the house; and not allow himself to offset that by the growing increase in the value of the land upon which the house stands?

"9. Are you unalterable in your purpose to permit a landlord to profiteer with a business house because it may once have been used as a residence?

"10. Are you unalterable in your purpose to fasten the present annual rates of rental on the tenant by fixing the rates in effect on the 1st day of last October as a basis?

"11. Are you unalterable in your purpose that the rental for furniture shall be as much as 30 per cent of its value?

"12. Are you unalterable in your seeming purpose not to punish profiting corporations to the same extent that you would individuals who profiteer?

"13. Are you unalterable in your seeming purpose to exempt 'the original landlord' from all the provisions of the bill by your definition of 'landlord'?

"14. If you are unalterable in your seeming purpose to adhere to the remedy of 'fine' instead of that of 'taxation,' as set out in the bill passed by the House, would you be in favor of having a fine levied on all those who violate any provision of the act, or would you insist upon limiting it to those only who 'evade or attempt to evade its provisions'?"

And
Whereas on June 21, 1918, said chairman of said House committee sent to each of the managers on the part of the Senate the following letter:

"COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
"Washington, D. C., June 21, 1918.

"To the SENATE CONFEREES ON H. R. 9248
(the antiprofitting rent bill),
"Washington, D. C.

"GENTLEMEN: The Washington newspapers of yesterday contained the statement that at least some of the Senate conferees on the antiprofitting rent bill contemplated having me denied the privileges of the Senate floor because of the criticism made by me of the Senate amendment which has come to be known as the 'Pomerene bill'."

"I do not care a continental about that—run along and get through with it, and then permit the Senate to vote on a measure that will prevent the profiteers from driving nearly a thousand war workers

out of Washington every week. I am not interested in the least in your undertaking to deny me the privileges of the Senate Chamber, but I am deeply concerned for the war worker, who is being robbed and then sent out of Washington, and because of which our boys in France must suffer.

"The newspaper articles referred to state also that at least some of the Senate conferees may decline to go into conference because I am one of the House conferees. May I not suggest that by such a course, either intentionally or unintentionally, you play right into the hands of the profiteers, as delay in the passage of a good bill is what they seek?"

"May I not also suggest that your skins should be thicker or your bill better? I not only invite the severest criticism of all my official acts, but I am quite anxious, indeed, to have the acid test applied to my endeavors in this particular matter, and you will not only not offend me but you will do me a favor by wading into both me and it without gloves, since I, and not the landlords, am its author.

"This is not a time for 'senatorial dignity' but one for action. Rearing back on your 'pastern joints' don't get the oppressed tenants anything. I do not intend to permit your attitude toward me, because of my criticism of your 'rotten' bill, to in the least deter me in my efforts to prevent the profiteer from fattening off of your country's needs.

"Your amendment—the Pomerene bill—had to be criticized, 'senatorial dignity' to the contrary notwithstanding.

"My contempt for such of you as may resort to pretext to evade full responsibility for not giving our war workers protection from the miserable profiteers is just as great as yours may be for me; but, as I said, that shall not stop me from following my plain duty in the premises.

"Let us get to work on the bill, and then you can have your revenge on me to your hearts' content. You have my full consent to deny me the privileges of the Senate Chamber, or even to take your spite out of my side, if you will only go ahead and let the Senate vote on a good bill instead of a subterfuge.

"While I am sending this letter to each of the conferees, it is really intended for those only who are responsible for the article in yesterday afternoon's local newspapers.

"Very truly, yours,

(Signed) "BEN JOHNSON."

And

Whereas on June 22, 1918, the said chairman of said House committee presented the foregoing letters to the House of Representatives, and in presenting them used the following language:

"I take it for granted that the thought of 'ousting' me from the Senate Chamber is the result of a close association with those who have been 'ousting' the Government workers from houses in the District of Columbia."

Therefore be it

Resolved, That the conferees on the part of the Senate on said bill be, and they are hereby, excused from further service as such conferees until otherwise ordered by the Senate; and that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the House of Representatives.

Attest:

JAMES M. BAKER, Secretary.

To the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it for the purpose of reading something or for really speaking?

Mr. RAKER. I expect to do both.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

OMNIBUS PENSION BILLS.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up conference reports on the bills H. R. 9506, 9641, 10843, 10924, and 11658, all bills granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio calls up the conference reports on the several omnibus pension bills mentioned by him. The Clerk will read the conference reports.

The conference reports were severally read and severally agreed to, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 684).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9506) 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 14, and 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"The name of Fred O. Hamilton, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN A. KEY,
EDWARD KEATING,
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

HENRY F. HOLLIS,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9506) 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 and dependents of such soldiers and sailors, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference as to each of said amendments, namely:

On amendment No. 1 (George W. Rathman): Strikes out the provision for pension.

On amendment No. 2 (Andrew S. Pope): A correction.

On amendment No. 3 (Theodore J. Kountz): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 4 (James F. Connell): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 5 (Lory H. Powell): Grants \$12 per month in lieu of \$17.

On amendment No. 6 (Mack Rittenberry): Strikes provision for pension.

On amendment No. 7 (Charles F. Russell): Restores \$17 rate in lieu of \$12 as amended by the Senate.

On amendment No. 8 (James E. Norman): Strikes provision for pension.

On amendment No. 9 (Charles D. Skirdin): A correction.

On amendment No. 10 (Fred O. Hamilton): Provides for restoring the item to the bill with a rate of \$24 per month instead of the \$50 rate approved by the House.

On amendment No. 11 (John Dowdy): Strikes provision for pension.

On amendment No. 12 (Seaborn A. Frost): Strikes provision for pension.

On amendment No. 13 (Peter F. O'Brien): Strikes provision for pension.

On amendment No. 14 (Stephen Eill): Restores to the bill the stricken item at \$12 per month.

On amendment No. 15 (Richard Gurney, jr.): Strikes provision for pension.

On amendment No. 16 (Charles V. Bradford): A correction.

On amendment No. 17 (James A. Kelly): Strikes provision for pension.

On amendments Nos. 18, 19, and 20 (Sallie Spear Signor): A correction.

On amendment No. 21 (Joseph Whitney): Dead. Strikes provision for pension.

On amendment No. 22 (Herschel Spainhour): Restores provision for pension.

JOHN A. KEY,
EDWARD KEATING,
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 685).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9641) 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, and 5, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed insert "\$17"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN A. KEY,
EDWARD KEATING,
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

HENRY F. HOLLIS,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9641) 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 and dependents of such soldiers and sailors submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees as to each of said amendments, namely:

On amendment No. 1 (James O. Carroll): Strikes out the provision for pension.

On amendment No. 2 (Jesse G. Frier): Restores provision for pension stricken out by Senate.

On amendment No. 3 (Michael P. Connaughton): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 4 (Sommers J. Love): Provides a rate of \$17 per month as amended by the Senate in lieu of the \$24 as approved by the House.

On amendment No. 5 (Charles A. Walters): Strikes out the provision for pension.

JOHN A. KEY,
EDWARD KEATING,
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 681).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10843) 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 6, 11, 12, and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

JOHN A. KEY,
EDWARD KEATING,
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

HENRY F. HOLLIS,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10843) 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 and dependents of such soldiers and sailors, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference as to each of said amendments, viz:

On amendment No. 1 (William L. Snider): Restores provision for pension stricken out by the Senate.

On amendment No. 2 (Thomas J. Harris, jr.): A correction.

On amendment No. 3 (Pauline A. Randt): A correction.

On amendment No. 4 (Andrew E. Younginer): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 5 (George H. McCauley): Allows \$12 per month, as amended by the Senate, in lieu of \$17, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 6 (Howard A. Littlejohn): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 7 (Lemil S. Darr): Allows \$12 per month in lieu of \$17 proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 8 (John E. Root): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 9 (Joseph Harris): Allows \$12 per month, as amended by the Senate, in lieu of \$17, proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 10 (John F. Smoot): Allows \$12 per month, as amended by the Senate, in lieu of \$17, proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 11 (Walter L. Jewell): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 12 (Howard P. Hare): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 13 (Charles F. Schiller): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 14 (Hulbert O. White): Strikes out provision for increase of pension.

On amendment No. 15 (Richard Thrash): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 16 (Olaf H. Heiele): Allows \$12 per month, as amended by the Senate, in lieu of \$17, proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 17 (James Manning): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 18 (Christine Cook): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 19 (William C. Crockett): Allows \$12 per month, as amended by the Senate, in lieu of \$17, proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 20 (Mary Leahy): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 21 (Mart Bradshaw): Allows \$12 per month, as amended by the Senate, in lieu of \$17, proposed by the House.

JOHN A. KEY,
EDWARD KEATING,
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 682).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10924) 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, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

JOHN A. KEY,
EDWARD KEATING,
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

HENRY F. HOLLIS,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10924) 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 and dependents of such soldiers and sailors, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference as to each of said amendments, namely:

On amendment No. 1 (John Groth): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 2 (Margaret C. Fargo): Strikes out provision for increase of pension.

On amendment No. 3 (T. McElvany): A correction.

On amendment No. 4 (Mary Diven): Strikes out provision for increase of pension.

JOHN A. KEY,
EDWARD KEATING,
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 683).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11658) 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, having met, after full and

free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 10, 11, 14, and 15.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, and 16, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"The name of Clarence L. Wimer, late of Company A. Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN A. KEY,
EDWARD KEATING,
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

HENRY F. HOLLIS,
REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11658) 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 and dependents of such soldiers and sailors, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference as to each of said amendments, namely:

On amendment No. 1 (John McMahon): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 2 (Wilbur S. Chapman): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 3 (John Hammons): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 4 (Clarence L. Wimer): Restores provision for pension, but at \$12 per month in lieu of \$17 proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 5 (John W. Hamilton): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 6 (Freda Burow): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 7 (James Green): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 8 (Margaret A. McAdoo): Restores provision for increased pension.

On amendment No. 9 (Oliver P. Jackson): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 10 (Elmer D. Hopper): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 11 (Mary F. Kenaday): Restores provision for pension at \$25 per month as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 12 (Mary C. Shell): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 13 (John M. Hall): Strikes out provision for pension.

On amendment No. 14 (Dallas Mills): Restores provision for pension.

On amendment No. 15 (Amanda Foster): Restores provision for increase of pension.

On amendment No. 16 (William D. Harris): A correction.

JOHN A. KEY,
EDWARD KEATING,
SAM R. SELLS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I now call up the bill (S. 4542) 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. This bill has been on the calendar for about a month. Last Friday a week ago was pension day on the Private Calendar in the House, and our committee gave way in order that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] might consider his appropriation bill. I would like very much to have this and other bills considered at this time, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 4542, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let the bill be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of John B. Chandler, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Barker, late of Company D, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rolla King, late of Battery E, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John B. Raines, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John W. Ferris, late chaplain, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Emmett L. Warren, alias Alanson Warren, late of Capt. L. Buoy's Company B, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Roswell B. Van Wagenen, late of Company E, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Fitzgerald, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Green B. Riggs, late of Capt. J. Williams's Company N, Second Regiment Washington Territory Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Barnard J. Irwin, late of Company C, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura A. Workman, widow of Eddy J. Workman, late of Battery I, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Eddy J. Workman until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of George R. Hamilton, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Orval W. Hiatt, late of Company E, Fortieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Charles R. Walters, late of Troop D, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Agnes Swarts, widow of John L. Swarts, late of United States ship *Independence*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said John L. Swarts until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Mary Howard, widow of George Howard, late of Battery M, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Berlie Cross, late of the Fifty-first Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willis Hood, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John L. Daries, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Byard, late of Company H, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ada Johnston Cowles, widow of Walter Cleveland Cowles, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Florence M. Anderson, widow of James L. Anderson, late captain Company L, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Fred Boyd, late of Company F, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ellen H. Sharp, widow of Frederick D. Sharp, late captain, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of George W. Goodman, late of Capt. Robert Porter's company California Volunteers, California Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Jordan, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lanson O. Brown, late of Company H, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Louis H. Roberts, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Persis M. McKee, widow of Thomas McKee, late of Capt. Alfred's company, Nauvoo Legion, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary P. McIntire, former widow of William B. Skinner, late of Company I, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Feracane Paolo, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis N. Mallet, late of Company I, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of David M. Thompson, late of Company E, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

This bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 202. John B. Chandler.	S. 3763. Willis Hood.
S. 326. John Barker.	S. 3830. John L. Daries.
S. 338. Rolla King.	S. 3972. James F. Byard.
S. 608. John B. Raines.	S. 3989. Ada Johnston Cowles.
S. 665. John W. Ferris.	S. 4058. Florence M. Anderson.
S. 768. Emmett L. Warren.	S. 4082. Fred Boyd.
S. 964. Roswell B. Van Wagenen.	S. 4090. Ellen H. Sharp.
S. 969. John Fitzgerald.	S. 4150. George W. Goodman.
S. 1156. Green B. Riggs.	S. 4170. Edward Jordan.
S. 1441. Barnard J. Irwin.	S. 4191. Lanson O. Brown.
S. 1732. Laura A. Workman.	S. 4215. Louis H. Roberts.
S. 2568. George R. Hamilton.	S. 4286. Persis M. McKee.
S. 3302. Orval W. Hiatt.	S. 4291. Mary P. McIntire.
S. 3347. Charles R. Walters.	S. 4351. Feracane Paolo.
S. 3422. Agnes Swarts.	S. 4358. Louis N. Mallet.
S. 3688. Mary Howard.	S. 4418. David M. Thompson.
S. 3711. Berlie Cross.	

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman asked unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John W. Ferris, late chaplain, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The committee amendment is as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 11, inclusive.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Roswell B. Van Wagenen, late of Company E, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, line 19, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$17."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Barnard J. Irwin, late of Company C, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura A. Workman, widow of Eddy J. Workman, late of Battery I, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Eddy J. Workman until they reach the age of 16 years.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 3, strike out lines 4 to 13, inclusive.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Orval W. Hiatt, late of Company E, Fortieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 3, line 20, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$12."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Agnes Swarts, widow of John L. Swarts, late of U. S. S. *Independence*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said John L. Swarts until they reach the age of 16 years.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

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

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at that juncture I offered an amendment a while ago which was not in order at that time, which amendment was to restore that item. I sent a copy of it to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, lines 1 to 10, insert the matter stricken out by the committee amendment, which reads as follows:

"The name of Agnes Swarts, widow of John L. Swarts, late of U. S. S. *Independence*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said John L. Swarts until they reach the age of 16 years."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the proper procedure would be to vote down the committee amendment. You do not have to move to insert that. The committee has reported this bill with an amendment striking out the first item on page 4, and now I understand the gentleman from Ohio desires to have that item retained in the bill. The proper procedure would be to vote down the committee amendment. It is not proper to move to insert again in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the proceedings by which that amendment was agreed to be vacated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Now the question is on the amendment adopted a while ago.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mary Howard, widow of George Howard, late of Battery M, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Ada Johnston Cowles, widow of Walter Cleveland Cowles, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 5, line 4, strike out "\$50" and insert "\$25."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Florence M. Anderson, widow of James L. Anderson, late captain Company L, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 5, strike out lines 5 to 8, inclusive.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Ellen H. Sharp, widow of Frederick D. Sharp, late captain, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 5, line 15, strike out "\$25" and insert "\$20."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of George W. Goodman, late of Capt. Robert Porter's company California Volunteers, California Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 5, strike out lines 16 to 19, inclusive.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Lanson O. Brown, late of Company H, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 5, strike out lines 24 and 25, and lines 1 and 2, page 6.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of David M. Thompson, late of Company E, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 7, line 4, strike out "\$20" and insert "\$12."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman got any more bills?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I have three other bills to call up.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. GARRETT of Texas, leave of absence was granted to his colleague Mr. GREGG indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

PENSIONS.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill S. 3798.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman asks unanimous consent, I presume?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up Senate bill 3798.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3798. An act 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.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire whether this is another omnibus pension bill?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. It is a Senate bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. My inquiry is, What is the occasion of the gentleman calling it up on a day other than the day reserved for pension bills?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. These bills are Senate bills and have been on the calendar for four or five weeks. A week ago last Friday was pension day on the Private Calendar. The Committee on Pensions gave way in order that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] might take up an appropriation bill, with the understanding that we could bring this in at any time next week when there was not some important war measure on. I ask unanimous consent to take up this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not consider the census bill an important war measure?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I take it that every Member—

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the private calendar.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3798. An act 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.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 3798) 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.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Abel H. Hall, late of Company F, First Regiment Montana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Frankie Esselstyn, widow of Elton H. Esselstyn, late of Company L, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of the said Elton H. Esselstyn until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Samuel Breitigan, late of U. S. S. *Pennsylvania*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward Sweeney, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Arthur Rose, late of Company L, First Regiment Washington Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lucie Kellogg, widow of William R. Kellogg, late of Troop A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William P. Robinson, late of Company I, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William D. Harrington, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fannie H. Maffitt, widow of John W. Maffitt, late of Company A, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Minnie H. Wolf, widow of Herman P. Wolf, late of Company H, First Regiment North Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Herman P. Wolf until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Willis S. Harris, alias Charles E. Sanders, late of Battery C, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John M. Dikes, late of Troop H, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and Company A, Thirtieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. McKay, late first lieutenant Battery A, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Adam S. Bridgefarmer, late of Captain Hiram Wilber's Company B, First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Ferriss, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Van Ogle, late first lieutenant, Company B, Washington Territory Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reuben Waller, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas M. Woods, late of Company C, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George M. Spencer, late of Company F, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Katharine E. Bocoskey, widow of Michael Bocoskey, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Michael Bocoskey until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Thomas S. Millikin, late of Company L, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Campbell, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William J. La Rock, late of Company C, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Forty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Allen Russell, late of Captain Standage's Cavalry company, Nauvoo Legion, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar M. Dreibelbiss, late of Company M, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edmund G. Thompson, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph W. Gay, late of Captain O. Humason's company B, First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emmett W. Fitzsimmons, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Charles E. Matthews, late of Company A, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Martha R. Sutton, widow of Thomas J. Sutton, late of Captain John F. Miller's company, Oregon Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hildur M. Phillips, widow of George W. Phillips, late chief gunner, with rank of ensign, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said George W. Phillips until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Joseph M. Love, late of Company I, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leander Thomas, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Isaac F. Allen, late of Companies C and L, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of James M. Fitch, late of Troop F, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of John Ferris, late of U. S. S. *Ashuelot*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Esther Shields, former widow of Walter Rogers, late of General Mounted Service, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Elizabeth K. Cottman, widow of Vincendon L. Cottman, late rear admiral, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Francis J. Kearney, late of Troop B, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simeon Ely, late first lieutenant Captain Goodall's company Oregon Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. D. Tharp, late of the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Wesley H. Dick, late of Company B, Thirty-fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia Burger, widow of Peter Burger, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Florida Seminole Indian Wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leander Johnston, late of Company I, First Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura C. Slack, widow of William B. Slack, late second lieutenant, United States Marine Corps, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 73. Abel H. Hall.	S. 2138. William J. La Rock.
S. 139. Frankle Esselstyn.	S. 2172. Allen Russell.
S. 197. Samuel Breitigan.	S. 2195. Oscar M. Dreibelbiss.
S. 240. Edward Sweeney.	S. 2237. Edmund G. Thompson.
S. 331. Arthur Rose.	S. 2283. Joseph W. Gay.
S. 477. Lucie Kellogg.	S. 2391. Emmett W. Fitzsimmons.
S. 588. William P. Robinson.	S. 2424. Charles E. Matthews.
S. 675. William D. Harrington.	S. 2472. Martha R. Sutton.
S. 687. Fannie H. Maffitt.	S. 2492. Hildur M. Phillips.
S. 765. Minnie H. Wolf.	S. 2572. Joseph M. Love.
S. 882. Willis S. Harris, alias Charles E. Sanders.	S. 2586. Leander Thomas.
S. 912. John M. Dikes.	S. 2592. Isaac F. Allen.
S. 981. James W. McKay.	S. 2744. James M. Fitch.
S. 996. Adam S. Bridgefarmer.	S. 2763. John Ferriss.
S. 1174. Charles H. Ferriss.	S. 2955. Esther Shields.
S. 1177. Van Ogle.	S. 2981. Elizabeth K. Cottman.
S. 1242. Reuben Waller.	S. 2988. Francis J. Kearney.
S. 1443. Thomas M. Woods.	S. 3097. Simeon Ely.
S. 1526. George M. Spencer.	S. 3342. John A. D. Tharp.
S. 1569. Katharine E. Bocoskey.	S. 3343. Wesley H. Dick.
S. 1989. Thomas S. Millikin.	S. 3424. Julia Burger.
S. 2040. William C. Campbell.	S. 3500. Leander Johnston.
	S. 3591. Laura C. Slack.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Page 3, strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive (Minnie H. Wolf).

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 5, strike out lines 11 to 14, inclusive (William C. Campbell).

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 7, strike out lines 10 to 12, inclusive (Leander Thomas).

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 7, strike out lines 13 to 16, inclusive (Isaac F. Allen).

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 7, strike out lines 24 and 25 and lines 1 to 3, page 8 (Esther Shields).

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 8, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive (Elizabeth K. Cottman).

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 9, strike out lines 7 to 11, inclusive (Laura C. Slack).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. May I inquire of the chairman—on page 8, line 3, there is a denial of a pension to Mrs. Cottman, widow of Admiral Cottman. May I inquire why that is?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Page 8, line 3?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Page 8, line 3.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. What is it?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Why is the pension to the widow of Admiral Cottman stricken from the bill?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I can not say without looking up the report. The committee refused to give a pension in excess of \$25 per month for this reason, that when the House passed the war-risk insurance bill last fall it was practically the unanimous sentiment of the House when they gave all the widows in the present war \$25 per month that that was the last word from Congress on what the widows ought to have, because they had agreed to give the widows of the privates the same pension as the widows of the officers; that the widows of the officers should receive no more than the widow of a private. And inasmuch as that was the last word from Congress the committee took it we could use that as a guidance, and that if the rate of pension was \$25 to all widows it would be a maximum.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Would it be agreeable to the committee to have an amendment so that she should receive a pension of \$25?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I could not tell without reading from the report.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. My information is that she is in destitute circumstances and very much in need of a pension. That was the information given to me by Senator Jones, of my State.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Does she not get a pension now under existing law?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I think not; although I am not clear on that point.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I think the gentleman ought to get clear on it.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I suggest that this bill will very likely be in conference, and the gentleman from Washington in the meantime can get the facts and submit them to the conferees for their consideration.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I will be glad to get the information.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. And I shall be glad to consider it in conference.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

On motion by Mr. KEY of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill S. 4193.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio calls up the bill S. 4193, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 4193. An act 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.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. It is on the Private Calendar, the same as the other bill.

The SPEAKER. I know; but has the gentleman any request to make?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The bill was read for amendment, as follows:

An act (S. 4193) 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.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of William C. Black, late of Company B, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Golden, late of Company K, First Regiment Montana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elmer H. Martin, late of U. S. S. *Pennsylvania*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of Kathryn B. Steiner, widow of Charles J. Steiner, late of Company H, Forty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Charles J. Steiner until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Anthony W. Presley, late of Capt. C. Bennett's Company F, First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, and first lieutenant Capt. B. Miller's Company J, Second Regiment Washington Territory Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pyrrhus Williams, late of Battery E, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ellsworth E. Welch, late of Battery D, First Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward L. Frabe, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas S. Gher, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Thomas E. Cruess, late of U. S. S. *Supply* and *Independence*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Gray, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Stone, late of Sixty-seventh Company, United States Coast Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Bailey, late of Capt. Alcorn's Company G, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Harrison, late of Troops D and A, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Christensen, dependent mother of Harvey Christensen, late of Company I, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mamie E. Bridgewater, widow of Samuel Bridgewater,

late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Samuel Bridgewater until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of William Shoemaker, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Harry H. Hallock, late of Company C, Battalion of Engineers, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Aldrich, late of Company E, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Luther C. Wright, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert P. Ramsey, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Cook, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert L. McFarland, late of Company M, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George White, late of Troop C, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harvey Day, late of Company M, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Etta S. Jeffrey, widow of Howard F. Jeffrey, late first lieutenant Company E, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Martha H. Saers, widow of Charles O. Saers, late of Company D, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Charles O. Saers until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Abbie M. Peabody, dependent mother of James F. Peabody, late of Company L, Twenty-second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Richard McDermott, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Taylor, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lottie J. Miller, widow of Richard L. Miller, late captain Company L, Third Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Lawrence O. Loughlin, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter J. Hawthorne, late of Company I, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Murtha Doyle, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Israel Wood, late of Company K, First Regiment Oregon Rifemen, Cayuse Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Whittle, widow of Frank Whittle, late of Captain Warbess's company, Washington Territory Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Grace, dependent mother of John T. Grace, late of U. S. S. *Indiana*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Henrietta A. Forbes, widow of Theodore F. Forbes, late colonel Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and brigadier general United States Army, retired, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William W. Keyser, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Virginia A. Porter, widow of Sanford Porter, late of Company E, Mormon Battalion, Iowa Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edwin C. Gasque, late of the Eighty-second Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles H. Lufkin, late of Company A, Forty-fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sallie Hardwick, widow of Linus Hardwick, late of Company H, First Regiment Florida Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Linus Hardwick until she reaches the age of 16 years.

This bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 2054. Mamie E. Bridgewater.

S. 2241. William Shoemaker.

S. 2272. Harry H. Hallock.

S. 2338. John Aldrich.

S. 2448. Luther C. Wright.

S. 2580. Albert P. Ramsey.

S. 2603. William W. Cook.

S. 2612. Robert L. McFarland.

S. 2841. George White.

S. 3176. Harvey Day.

S. 3188. Etta S. Jeffrey.

S. 3192. Martha H. Saers.

S. 3228. Abbie M. Peabody.

S. 3441. Richard McDermott.

S. 3492. John M. Taylor.

S. 3598. Lottie J. Miller.
S. 3641. Lawrence O'Loughlin.
S. 3660. Walter J. Hawthorne.
S. 3695. Murtha Doyle.
S. 3844. Israel Wood.
S. 3846. Sarah Whittle.
S. 3867. Catherine Grace.

S. 3891. Henrietta A. Forbes.
S. 3912. William W. Keyser.
S. 4016. Virginia A. Porter.
S. 4027. Edwin C. Gasque.
S. 4029. Charles H. Lufkin.
S. 4128. Sallie Hardwick.

The following committee amendments were read and agreed to:

Page 2, strike out lines 4 to 9, inclusive. (Pension of Kathryn B. Steiner.)

Page 3, strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive. (Pension of Thomas S. Gher.)

Page 3, line 9, strike out "\$20" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17." (Pension of Thomas E. Cruess.)

Page 3, strike out lines 23 and 24, and lines 1 and 2 on page 4. (Pension of Thomas Harrison.)

Page 5, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive. (Pension of William W. Cook.)

Page 6, line 17, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24." (Pension of John M. Taylor.)

Page 7, strike out lines 22 to 26, inclusive. (Pension of Henrietta A. Forbes.)

Page 8, strike out lines 8 to 12, inclusive. (Pension of Edwin C. Gasque.)

Page 8, strike out lines 16 to 21, inclusive. (Pension of Sallie Hardwick.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

On motion of Mr. Kex of Ohio, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FOURTEENTH AND SUBSEQUENT DECENNIAL CENSUSES.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11984) providing for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, and pending that motion I would like to come to some agreement with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NICHOLS] as to general debate. There was a tentative agreement between the gentleman from Michigan and myself for two hours on a side. I understand the gentleman from Michigan has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] before adjournment last Saturday was recognized for one hour. I understand that he wants to consume only a very short time, not exceeding 20 minutes, and therefore I ask that general debate conclude in 30 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS from Michigan. That is satisfactory.

Mr. STAFFORD. How will the time be divided?

Mr. HELM. The gentleman from Michigan has 14 minutes, and I to control 16 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, is that in addition to the time for which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] has been recognized?

Mr. HELM. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, if he is content to have 16 minutes when he is entitled to an hour—

Mr. HELM. He is not making any objection.

The SPEAKER. What is the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, I will have to modify my request and ask that the time for general debate be extended 46 minutes, the gentleman from Michigan to control 14 minutes and myself 30 minutes.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. STAFFORD. That makes only 44 minutes instead of 48.

Mr. GILLET. I think it ought to be divided equally. Very likely we will not want to use it, and if we do not we will not use it; but I think it fair that there should be an equal amount on each side.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate close in one hour, the gentleman from Michigan to have 30 minutes and myself 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does that include the hour of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HELM. All time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky, pending his motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to one hour, half to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NICHOLS]. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman include in that request the statement that it includes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN], who has heretofore been recognized for an hour?

Mr. HELM. It is so understood. The gentleman from Georgia consents to it. It is at his suggestion.

The SPEAKER. And that it includes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN].

Mr. STAFFORD. All the other 434 Members of the House are left out.

Mr. WALSH. They have not been recognized.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill 11984, to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, with Mr. FORBES in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11984, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen oppose the passage of this bill saying no census should be taken during the war and that if one is taken it should be of population, strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

They would omit a census of agriculture, of manufactures, of forestry and forest products, and of mines and quarries, but would take a census of population, at a cost of \$10,440,000, which, if taken in conjunction with other matter provided for in the bill, would cost only \$7,100,000. They would take a census of population, intended primarily, as they say, to form the basis of distribution of representation in Congress, and omit a census of those industries and commodities absolutely necessary in times of war and highly essential in times of peace.

So careful were our forefathers as to the taking of the census that in the second section of the Constitution, adopted just at the close of the Revolutionary War, they provided that a census should be taken within three years from that date and that subsequent censuses should be taken every 10 years thereafter. I take it that all gentlemen are bound by an oath of office, the same as each and every other Member of this House, and that the Director of the Census and those other officials of the Government connected with this matter are also bound by their oath of office, and that this oath of office requires them to support and defend the Constitution.

Now, I would like to know how any man who has in mind the provisions of the Constitution could advocate the policy of not taking a census.

Gentlemen opposing the passage of the bill upon this ground might do well to reflect upon the history and scope of the legislation under which the previous censuses have been taken.

The First Census, provided for and taken shortly after the close of the Revolution, and at a time when our agricultural and manufacturing resources were meager, included only a census of the population. It was evidently not satisfactory to the people, for, strictly speaking, it was the only one of the kind ever taken.

The Second Census, taken in 1800, was an extension of the first, in that it gave information as to age distribution of the free white element of the population, and in that the distribution age was made to apply to females as well as to males. But even this extension did not meet the demands of the most thoughtful and reflective of those times. Previous to the enactment of the law governing that census two of the leading literary societies of America, the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, presided over by Timothy Dwight as its president, and the American Philosophical Society, presided over by Thomas Jefferson as its president, petitioned Congress and suggested that inquiry be made as to the number of births, the number of persons by sex in each of the various specified age groups, the number of native and foreign born citizens and of aliens, the number of persons in each of certain classes of occupations, and the number of married, single, and widowed persons.

The Third Census, taken in 1810, attempted to gather industrial statistics. So did the succeeding one of 1820, and also extended its inquiry to the number of foreign and naturalized persons and to the number of persons engaged in agriculture, commerce, and manufactures.

The census of 1830 omitted inquiry as to industrial statistics, but since that date no census has omitted such important information.

The census of 1840 marks the end of a complete census period of this Nation. The policy of that census and those preceding

It was to confine inquiries, as much as possible, to population. They resulted, generally speaking, in an effort to enumerate and to classify the population of the country, with little or no regard for the industrial conditions. It was not so much an effort to ascertain the amount or value of our agricultural or manufactured products as it was to determine the number of our population engaged in such enterprises. Yet in half of those taken even then, notably the census of 1810, of 1820, and of 1840, efforts were made to extend the scope of investigation so as to include statistics of industries.

Since the census of 1840 not one has been taken which has failed to make inquiry concerning our industrial resources, and in this respect our products of agriculture, mine, and manufacture have been given much consideration. The tendency has been to tabulate results of the various fields of activity and to show the quantity and value of such products rather than the various occupations in which our population is engaged.

If gentlemen are really serious in the contention that no census should be taken during the war, why do they not seek to amend the Constitution so as to obviate such an expenditure of both labor and money? Such a course would greatly emphasize their sincerity.

Certainly if our forefathers who framed the Constitution had possessed such forethought and wisdom they would not have felt justified in making such a census provision without providing a war-exception clause.

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

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. As a matter of fact, is anybody opposing the taking of the census in 1920—any Member of this House?

Mr. LARSEN. If you will read the Record I think you will find that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] made a statement authorizing such a conclusion.

Mr. COX. Oh, no. I am perfectly willing to have the population census taken. I so stated.

Mr. LARSEN. I did not so understand. At the time the gentleman from Indiana made the remarks I asked him if he would yield to me, in order that I might ask him a question on that point, and he refused.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] propounded the same question to me.

Mr. LARSEN. You did not yield to me when I sought to interrogate you on that line. You may have yielded later to the gentleman from Kentucky for interrogation along this line. I make no complaint, but I will quote your words from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page S160, which are as follows: "I read the hearings before the committee last Sunday instead of going to church, as I should have done. It has been said here that it is constitutionally necessary to take a census. I know of no provision in the Constitution or in any law now upon the books or of any law that Congress could pass that would hold anyone guilty in the event that the next census should not be taken at all."

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

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. What would be the penalty if Congress did not provide for the taking of the census?

Mr. LARSEN. Then it should be taken under existing law; but I think Members of the House, or anybody connected with the census department as a sworn officer, attempting to prevent it would be guilty of false swearing.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. They asked who opposed the taking of the census. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY], I believe, said the purpose of taking it was to give jobs to Democrats. You recall that, do you not?

Mr. LARSEN. I think that was the substance of his remarks.

Mr. HERSEY. I could not hear the statement of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand that the gentleman from Maine said it was to give a lot of Democrats jobs. Did not the gentleman say that?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but I can not yield further.

The census of 1860 was taken during the Civil War. The enumeration began June 1, 1860, some months after war began, and it was not completed earlier than the latter part of 1862. Among other things it included a census of population, manufactures, agriculture, mortality, and social statistics. No one seems to have even made an attempt to change the rule at that time, and I am of the opinion that the wisdom of the majority will prevent it now.

Prior to the census of 1830 the first Monday in August seems to have been the date for beginning the enumeration, but the law for the census of that year changed it to June 1. The law for the census of 1910 changed it to April 15. Thus it will be seen that the tendency, certainly since 1830, has been toward an earlier date of enumeration.

The present bill provides that it shall be taken as of the 1st day of January.

In the opinion of the committee and of many expert witnesses called before it, this date is better adapted to the requirements of an agricultural census, especially when taken in connection with the enumeration of population, which requires a house-to-house canvass. April 15, the enumeration date fixed by the previous census bill, is not a good date for the taking of a census of crops, on account of the lapse of time following the harvesting of the previous one; nor is it a reliable date for the taking of a census of live stock. January 1 is undoubtedly the season of the year when our population is most accessible. If climatic or other conditions prevent operations at that time, the director is clothed with discretionary power to postpone the work until such time as it can be performed.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] raves over the fact that we propose to take a census at such a season of the year, and take persons out of agricultural and other industrial pursuits to assist in making the enumeration. It will not take more than 30 days to make it; and I may say to the gentleman that if we take it on the 1st day of January it will undoubtedly be at the season of the year best adapted to taking a census of any kind. Generally speaking, parties engaged in agricultural industries will be used in the taking of the census, and they can be better spared from the farms at that season of the year than any other.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] waxed eloquent over a provision of the bill fixing the salary of the Director of the Census at \$7,500 per annum and that of the Assistant Director at \$4,500. May I say to him that the salary of the director in 1900, 20 years ago, was \$7,500, exactly the amount fixed in the present bill? May I also remind him that we now have no Assistant Director of the Census, and it is not contemplated that we will until the beginning of the Fourteenth decennial census period. The salary provided for such an officer when appointed will be \$500 less per annum than was allowed during the taking of the last census.

The salary and compensation fixed in the bill for other officers and employees in connection with the taking of the next census is the result of thoughtful consideration upon the part of the committee, whose only desire was to do justice by all concerned. In the discharge of this duty error may have been committed, but if so I trust it is not of a very serious nature.

The census of 1910 cost \$15,270,000. The one of 1920 will cover more territory, will embrace more resources, will give more information, and will contain at least 10,000,000 more in population. When it is considered that it is to be taken under war conditions, and at the estimated cost of \$17,987,000, I do not feel that gentlemen of the House can with good grace say the committee was extravagant in fixing compensation to be allowed those taking it.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], in the course of debate, gave utterance to words the import of which I am sure, was not well considered by him; otherwise he would not have given expression to them. Considering the character of the remarks and the eminent source from which they emanated I do not feel that they should pass unnoticed.

As I am the only member of the Census Committee coming from the locality where the remarks are perhaps calculated to do most harm, and the only member of the Georgia delegation whose present plans contemplate a discussion of the bill, it is deemed proper that I should make some reply.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, in a discussion of that portion of the bill providing for the appointment of supervisors, and incidentally a change of the date of enumeration from April 15 to January 1, used the following language:

But why was January 1 selected? I suppose that it was selected just for the very purpose of giving a basis of an excuse for not having the President appoint the supervisors. Now, the Director of the Census is a politician. This administration has not appointed to that office statisticians but politicians. The Director of the Census who was first appointed by the administration was Mr. Harris, from Georgia, who, if I recollect aright, was the chairman of the Democratic committee of that State; and I know he gave up much of his time, which ought to have been spent in the Census Bureau, to the pursuit of politics in his own State. I am told that the present Director of the Census was the campaign manager of Senator SIMMONS, of North Carolina.

These remarks, as I construe them, involve not only a criticism of Mr. Harris, now a private citizen of Georgia, but also

of the present Director of the Census and of the President of the United States.

Regardless of what views may be entertained by the gentleman from Massachusetts regarding Mr. Harris, of Georgia, I do not think it is fair to leave it as his impression that because the present Director of the Census was once, perchance, the campaign manager of Senator SIMMONS he would so far degrade himself and pollute the honorable position which he now holds as to appoint inefficient and unworthy supervisors on that account. [Applause.] If the gentleman draws his conclusions in this respect from experiences which he may have had with managers of his own campaigns, I would say he has indeed been very unfortunate. My impression of Mr. Rogers, the present Director of the Census, is that he is a gentleman of highest character, who can be trusted to do what he thinks is right and proper under any and all circumstances. [Applause.]

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

Mr. LARSEN. I do.

Mr. HELM. If the Director of the Census was appointed by the President, as he was, and the Secretary of Commerce was appointed by the President, as he was, and if he is subject to the strictures and criticisms that the gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber have imputed to him, is it not quite possible that the supervisors, if they were appointed by the President, would be equally as obnoxious to the gentlemen on the opposite side of the Chamber as the Director of the Census and the Secretary of Commerce, both of whom were appointed by the President himself?

Mr. LARSEN. I should say that would undoubtedly be true. As for Mr. Harris, I have known him intimately and personally for nearly 20 years. No one would dare say he is not a gentleman. Even the gentleman from Massachusetts, I suppose, concedes that. May I suggest to him that the good people of Georgia, who perhaps know more of Mr. Harris than he does, regard him as a business man rather than as a politician? But be that as it may, they would certainly be slow to believe that as Director of the Census he neglected important public business in order to pursue political matters in his own State. [Applause.] I may also say to the gentleman, in this connection, that the chairmanship of the State Democratic committee of Georgia has not in recent years imposed such onerous burdens on its chairman as cause him to neglect, certainly to any great extent, either public or private matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LARSEN. I would like about one minute more.

Mr. HELM. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. LARSEN. In order that the gentleman from Massachusetts might enlighten us as to just when and what business matters had been neglected by Mr. Harris in the pursuit of politics in Georgia, I requested that he yield to me for a question at the time he gave utterance to his remarks, but he declined to yield, and hence I was unable to ask for information at the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. I can not, in the limited time I have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I should like to ask the gentleman a question in that connection.

Mr. LARSEN. I have not time. If I had it I would yield.

Perhaps, inasmuch as I have suggested to the gentleman from Massachusetts the desirability of his specifying what public business was neglected by Mr. Harris, as Director of the Census, in order to look after political matters in Georgia, he will yet enlighten us along these lines. If he does not, we shall conclude that his charge was not well founded.

It is a matter of general knowledge that Mr. Harris administered the affairs of the Census Department so satisfactorily that President Wilson appointed him to a position on the Federal Trade Commission, of which he soon became chairman. [Applause.]

Now, if the criticism of Mr. Harris and the present Director of the Census is justified, in accordance with the words of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the responsibility for this criticism must necessarily rest upon our President. As for one, I do not feel that it is justified.

Certainly the President needs no defense or eulogy from one so unworthy as I, but I may be pardoned if I state my opinion of him, and in doing so say that it is my belief that when the impartial historian of the future writes the history of the nation he will record Washington as the father of our country, the author of our liberty, and as the one man who made possible the adoption of our Federal Constitution, that great beacon light of the world to which the succeeding generations of mankind

have looked for liberty and freedom; that he will also record Jefferson as our great political philosopher and intellectual genius; Lincoln as our greatest apostle of freedom and the preserver of our Union; Lee as our greatest military genius; and Woodrow Wilson as our greatest dynamic force, combining more of the great and good qualities of those whom I have mentioned than any other one man. [Applause.]

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desired to ask a question of the gentleman who has just spoken in regard to the political activities of the former Director of the Census, Mr. Harris, but the gentleman declined to yield. It seems, from what I heard the gentleman say, that it has been suggested during this debate that Mr. Harris may have neglected his duties as Director of the Census to take part in politics in the State of Georgia. I do not know anything about that, but a further charge has been made that Mr. Harris, while a member of the Federal Trade Commission, tendered his resignation, to take effect at a date far in advance, and then left his duties as a member of the Federal Trade Commission to go to Georgia to participate in politics.

Mr. LARSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I can not yield in the limited time I have.

Mr. LARSEN. That charge has not been made here in the consideration of this bill before the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will ask the gentleman not to interrupt me. The charge has been made that Mr. Harris, with his resignation on file, to take effect at some future date, went into the senatorial contest in Georgia, and I am informed that the main question in dispute, or one of them, anyway, is how much part Mr. Harris had, in his capacity as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, in authorizing the payment of a fee of \$30,000 to a prominent attorney, the question being as to whether there was any right to pay such a fee. That is politics in the State of Georgia, and the former Director of the Census seems to be in it; but according to the gentleman who has just spoken, Mr. Harris is regarded down there as a citizen rather than as a politician.

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

Mr. HELM. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LARSEN. May I say to the gentleman from Washington that it is a very easy matter to make charges that can not be substantiated. May I ask why it is that you have not submitted to the House some proof in substantiation of the charges that you now make, or say have been made by others? You repeat charges without saying who made them or vouching the truth of them. The gentleman must know or believe the charges are not well founded, otherwise as a citizen of the United States and as a Member of Congress he should have instituted an investigation and had the matter looked into long before the resignation of Mr. Harris. [Applause.]

I may say to the gentleman that I have known Mr. Harris for 20 years, and, while I am in no way concerned or interested in his campaign, I am sure that Mr. Harris stands as high in the State of Georgia and among the good people who know him as does the gentleman who criticizes him. In addition to this I may say that it is my belief that Mr. Harris has at all times discharged the duties of a public nature intrusted to him to the entire satisfaction of his constituents, and in many instances to much better advantage than has the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia seems not quite to have understood the statement that I made. It is not my purpose to make any charges against Mr. Harris in his capacity as a private citizen, but I undertook to state that in the senatorial contest for the Democratic nomination now raging in Georgia a large part of the row prevailing there seems to rage around the charges made by some of the candidates against the other candidate—a Democratic row pure and simple, the whole thing, apparently.

Mr. LARSEN. It is, as you make it, a Republican row. No-body is growling about it except you.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no. There are columns about it in the Georgia newspapers, as to whether Mr. Harris had any part, in his capacity as a member of the Federal Trade Commission—although his resignation was filed to take effect at some future date—as to whether he had any part in authorizing the payment of a fee of \$30,000 to an attorney for that Federal Trade Commission. Now, I do not belong to the party

in power. I am not in the councils of the party. It is up to those who are in the councils of that party to watch these commissions, to ascertain if fees are being paid in excess, and it is their own affair if their member of the Federal Trade Commission seeks to get out from his office, while still drawing pay, and go into a campaign.

I yield back any time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one-half minute.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, to-day our soldiers battle against a foreign enemy, and we rightly praise them for the great sacrifice they make for our common country. They are fighting for the principle of government by consent of the people.

It must not be forgotten, however, that the people here at home have also a high duty to perform if government by the consent of the people is to be secured. The consent of the people is given by their vote at the polls. If they fail to vote, or do not vote according to their own best judgment, they neglect their highest privilege and also one of their most sacred duties. If they permit those who seek special advantage for themselves to dictate how they shall vote, it is little, if any, better than allowing the few to govern as they please without a vote of the people. There has been a tendency toward this very evil. Those who seek for themselves some special privilege now try to accomplish their purpose by the control of certain newspapers and magazines for the purpose of molding public opinion, or they work through the "bosses." Generally they use both methods.

Because their motives would generally be apparent, they do not openly urge or oppose measures or policies affecting their special interests, but they raise a great cry about some unimportant question or resort to the use of abuse.

At the present time, while pretending a desire to avoid a division of public opinion, they are busily engaged in different parts of the country in trying to revive disputes which have been long settled, and also in making false issues.

The primary election system has done much in many communities to prevent the growth of bossism in politics. This system, adopted by most States in recent years, enables the voters of any party to vote at the polls according to their own best judgment, and for the men whom they prefer.

Under the old convention system, the political boss was to be found in every city. He controlled the delegates to the convention, and they usually voted as he ordered. The political bosses are trying in almost every State to-day to have the direct primary election laws repealed, in order to make their control of the political party complete. In the meantime, they try to dictate to every precinct committeeman and ward leader in the city, and tell him not only how he must vote, but try to compel him to have the party voters in his precinct vote the same way.

If they should succeed in their efforts, it is perfectly clear that the people will have very little opportunity for real choice as to public officials, because the candidates of the different parties will be named by the bosses, or as they like to call themselves, leaders, and the people would have the poor privilege of choosing between their selections. The candidate then owing his nomination to one or two political bosses must, in order to keep their favor, do what he is told by them. It is easy to see that the bosses will carry their demands as far as they can safely do so.

The only remedy for conditions such as these is the faithful performance by every citizen of his duty to vote. Every man should express his best and independent judgment by his vote on the primary election day.

A number of States hold primary elections during the months of July and August. On Tuesday, the 13th day of August, primary elections are held in two States, Alabama and Ohio. In the State of Alabama the people have practically gotten rid of bosses, and in Ohio, the State in which I live, I feel that it will only be a short time until there will be no such thing as political bosses.

In the State of Ohio the bosses still try to compel every precinct committeeman to vote as they order and to insist upon the other voters in the precinct doing likewise. In the city of Cleveland, however, where the people have the habit of thinking for themselves, many precinct committeemen resent the insult to their intelligence and independence and insist upon using their own judgment, as every man should do.

Let us hope that before long in every city and State in the Union the primary election will be decided by the free and independent vote of the people themselves. When the people realize the importance of voting at the primary elections and vote with-

out fear or favor of any man, then will machine politics be abolished and the humblest citizen in the land will have equal opportunity with the wealthy and powerful, and government by consent of the people will be secure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a census of the population, agriculture, manufactures, and mines and quarries of the United States shall be taken by the Director of the Census in the year 1920 and every 10 years thereafter. The census herein provided for shall include each State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. A census of Guam and Samoa shall be taken in the same year by the Navy Department and a census of the Panama Canal Zone by the War Department in accordance with plans prescribed or approved by the Director of the Census.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "Navy Department" and insert in lieu thereof "respective governors of said islands."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out the words "War Department" and insert in lieu thereof "Governor of the Canal Zone."

Mr. HELM. The purpose of these amendments is to simplify the work. Instead of the census being taken by the War Department it is to be taken by persons in control of the respective islands and the Canal Zone. The gentleman will observe that this is to be done in accordance with plans approved by the Director of the Census. I do not think that it was the purpose of the committee drafting the bill, or the intention of this committee, that anyone shall be sent to either the island of Guam or Samoa or to the Canal Zone for the purpose of taking this census, but that the schedules and outline of the work shall be forwarded to the governors of these respective political organizations and be conducted by the governors of the islands of Guam and Samoa and the Canal Zone, thereby saving the expense of sending men to these places so far distant from the Capital.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the amendment the Governor of the Canal Zone would have authority delegated to him to incur any expense that might be occasioned by the taking of the census in the Canal Zone.

Mr. HELM. The Appropriation Committee will provide for that when the proper time comes for making provision for taking it in these places.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood the gentleman to say that it was not the intention to have any census representative take the census.

Mr. HELM. It was the intention not to have any representative go to these places, but it is to be done in an economical way by competent men on the islands and in the Canal Zone.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I had 10 minutes under general debate and did not use it. I wish to say that I have had a number of inquiries made of me to furnish the Great Britain or people act of 1918; also the Dominion elections act, section 33a, inserted by the war-time elections act and the Canadian act known as "An act to confer the electoral franchise upon women"; also the translation of a bill introduced in the French Parliament in 1918. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing the several acts.

The acts referred to are entitled "Representation of the people act, 1918" (8 Geo. 5, c. 64, sec. 4); the "Dominion elections act," section 33a, inserted by war-time elections act, section 1 (d) (7-8 Geo. 5, c. 39, assented to Sept. 20, 1917); the Canadian act entitled "An act to confer the electoral franchise upon women," passed by the House of Commons April 12, 1918, amended and passed by the Senate May 3, 1918; and, lastly, the bill concerning woman suffrage introduced into the Chamber of Deputies January 24, 1918, by M. Emile Magniez, deputy.

These several laws relating to woman suffrage and the bill introduced into the French Chamber of Deputies are as follows:

GREAT BRITAIN.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1918.

(8 Geo. 5, c. 64, sec. 4.)

4.—(1) A woman shall be entitled to be registered as a parliamentary elector for a constituency (other than a university constituency) if she—

(a) Has attained the age of 30 years; and

(b) Is not subject to any legal incapacity; and

(c) Is entitled to be registered as a local-government elector in respect of the occupation in that constituency of land or premises (not being a dwelling house) of a yearly value of not less than £5 or of a dwelling house, or is the wife of a husband entitled to be so registered.

(2) A woman shall be entitled to be registered as a parliamentary elector for a university constituency if she has attained the age of 30 years and either would be entitled to be so registered if she were a man or has been admitted to and passed the final examination and kept under the conditions required of women by the university the period of residence necessary for a man to obtain a degree at any university forming, or forming a part of, a university constituency which did not at the time the examination was passed admit women to degrees.

(3) A woman shall be entitled to be registered as a local-government elector for any local-government electoral area—

(a) Where she would be entitled to be so registered if she were a man; and

(b) Where she is the wife of a man who is entitled to be so registered in respect of premises in which they both reside, and she has attained the age of 30 years and is not subject to any legal incapacity.

For the purpose of this provision, a naval or military voter who is registered in respect of a residence qualification which he would have had but for his service shall be deemed to be resident in accordance with the qualification.

CANADA.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, §33A.

(Inserted by war-time elections act, §1(d), 7-8 Geo. 5, c. 39, assented to Sept. 20, 1917.)

33A. (1) Every female person shall be capable of voting and qualified to vote at a Dominion election in any Province or in the Yukon Territory, who, being a British subject and qualified as to age, race, and residence, as required in the case of a male person in such Province or in the Yukon Territory, as the case may be, is the wife, widow, mother, sister, or daughter of any person, male or female, living or dead, who is serving or has served without Canada in any of the military forces, or within or without Canada in any of the naval forces, of Canada or of Great Britain in the present war: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the wife, widow, mother, sister, or daughter of a person no longer serving as aforesaid, unless such person has died in or has been honorably discharged from such service, or, in the case of an officer, has died in or has been permitted to resign from such service or has been dispensed by competent authority from further service, or in any case has died after honorable discharge, resignation by permission, or dispensation from further service as aforesaid.

(2) Such naval forces of Canada shall be deemed not to include members thereof engaged within Canada who may become members after the passing of this act.

AN ACT TO CONFER THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE UPON WOMEN.

(Passed by the House of Commons Apr. 12, 1918. Amended and passed by the Senate May 3, 1918.)

His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. (1) Every female person shall be entitled to vote at a Dominion election who—

(a) Is a British subject;

(b) Is of the full age of 21 years and upward;

(c) Has resided in the constituency in which she seeks to vote for a period of at least three months immediately preceding the date of the issue of the writ for an election in such constituency; and

(d) Is not disqualified on account of race, blood, or original nationality to vote at elections for members of the legislative assembly of the Province in which the constituency is situate in which such female person seeks to vote.

2. For the purposes of this act a female person shall be deemed to be a British subject—

(a) If she was born a British subject and is unmarried or is married to a British subject and has not become a subject of any foreign power; or

(b) If she has herself been personally naturalized as a British subject and has not since become the subject of a foreign power; or

(c) If, being a married woman and previously an alien, she has become a British subject by marriage or by the naturalization as a British subject of her father while she was a minor, and in either case has done nothing (other than in the second case by marriage) to forfeit or lose her status as a British subject and obtains and presents to the official or officials in charge of the preparation or revision of the voters' lists of the constituency a certificate under the signature of a judge or any court of record or of any superior court, under the seal of the said court, certifying that such female person is of the full age of 21 years, has resided in Canada a sufficient length of time, and is possessed of all requirements necessary to entitle her, if unmarried, to become naturalized as a British subject and that she has taken the oath of allegiance to His Majesty; or

(d) If, notwithstanding she is married to an alien, she was at the time of such marriage a British subject by birth and has not herself sworn allegiance to any foreign power: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to the wife of an alien enemy.

2. This act shall be construed as one with the Dominion elections act, chapter 6 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and the war-time elections act, chapter 39 of the statutes of 1917.

3. Notwithstanding anything in this act contained, it shall not be necessary by reason of any of the provisions thereof, to prepare new voters' lists for the purpose of any by-election to be held before the first day of January, 1919, and in the case of any such by-election any lawful lists available therefor may be used for the purposes of such by-election to the same extent and with the same validity as if this act had not been passed.

FRANCE.

TRANSLATION OF A BILL CONCERNING WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

[Introduced in the Chamber of Deputies Jan. 24, 1918, by M. Emile Magniez, deputy. Journal officiel, Doc. parl.—Chambre, annexe no. 4228 (Apr. 21, 1918).]

SECTION 1. The right to vote for municipal, cantonal, legislative, and senatorial elections is hereby granted to women.

SEC. 2. The age restrictions and other conditions of the possession and exercise of this right shall be the same as those applied to men, except as provided in section 3.

SEC. 3. Women who are keepers of houses of prostitution and of assignment and women enrolled on the list of prostitutes shall be excluded from the right to vote.

SEC. 4. At senatorial elections the municipal council of each commune shall appoint to the electoral college, in addition to the number of male delegates to which it is at present entitled, an equal number of delegates selected from among the women voters of the commune.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the several acts referred to? Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "population," strike out the words "agriculture, manufactures, and mines and quarries."

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, when the immortal Daniel Webster was nearing the close of an eventful life and while attending a banquet in his honor it was noted that he said, in a very serious mood, and when he was questioned he said, "The most serious thought of my life is the feeling of my own responsibility."

When the President of the United States, on April 2, 1917, nearing the close of his great war message to the Congress paused, and, thinking, no doubt, of his position as Commander in Chief, solemnly exclaimed, "It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war." He, too, felt his awful responsibility.

During this war Congress every one of us must have felt at times the great individual responsibility laid upon us in the part we play in the conduct of a world-wide war. To-day in another room of this Capitol sits the great Committee on Ways and Means to provide for the largest revenue bill ever enacted by any nation. The responsibility of the Democratic leader [Mr. KITCHIN] is tremendous, but the responsibility of the President or of a great leader is not so great and important as that of the humblest Representative who honestly attempts at this time to be "a watch dog of the Treasury."

I was much interested in the honest, straightforward remarks the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] made upon this bill. I have noticed during my short service in this House that the gentleman from Indiana has always been in favor of economy and has always stood for the cutting down of useless expenses of the Government as well as against the making of reckless expenditures and the passage of "pork-barrel" bills; and I agree with him in his unanswerable argument that there is no reason at the present time why this Congress should spend additional millions in the taking of a useless census, and that a census of the population only is all that is necessary to be taken in 1920, and that a census of everything else would be not economy but extravagance.

Now, I have offered an amendment to this first section striking out from this census bill everything but an enumeration of the population.

There is much of misconception and misinformation in regard to the necessity of taking a census of all matters outside of population in 1920. All that the Constitution requires is an enumeration of the population every 10 years, and the Constitution nowhere provides any method for taking even a census of population.

If the Constitution had not provided for a census of population every 10 years no committee of this Congress would have had the hardihood to present the present bill in this time of war or ask for a census of everything in sight. The present Census Bureau might take a census of population by mail by returns from town officers and mayors of cities, who all have up-to-date statistics of their own population, and such a census as that would meet the Constitution without any extra expense in this time of war.

Even if we should find it necessary and proper to take a census of the population by the same methods and expenses as was provided by the one taken 10 years ago, we ought at the present time to go no further than population. We can not go further without committing a great wrong against the people of the

Nation when we are so earnestly called upon for economy and to "save to win."

The present bill provides, in addition to a census of the population, that there shall be taken a census of manufactures in 1920, and there are some in favor of this bill who loudly proclaim that it is absolutely necessary that we have a full census of manufactures every 10 years as well as a census of the population. To take a full census of manufactures under the present bill would result in the publication in 1923 of many large volumes of statistics showing the state of our disorganized manufactures three years before that publication, to wit, in 1920. Such a census could be of no value to this Nation. The millions we would spend for such a census is very much needed at the present time, especially when this work has been supplanted by a census of manufactures recently taken by the Census Bureau.

I read from the Annual Report of the Director of the Census for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917. On page 16 of that report the Director of the Census says, under the subject "Census of manufactures":

The last quinquennial census of manufactures, which covered the calendar year 1914, was taken during the following year. * * * The work of compiling and publishing these press summaries, or preliminary statements, began in June, 1915, and was completed in August, 1916. The summaries gave * * * statistics as to number of establishments; proprietors, officials, and employees; horsepower; capital; salaries and wages; cost of materials; value of products; and other items.

* * * Tables were prepared and published in pamphlet form covering four census years and giving comparative statistics of manufactures for the United States by geographic divisions, States, and industries.

* * * The preliminary figures having thus been published, the clerical force of the bureau was concentrated, so far as possible, upon the preparation of the analytical tables and text for the final reports. These are being published first in bulletin form, a separate quarto bulletin being issued for each State and the District of Columbia and for 41 selected industries. These bulletins will later be bound together in three large quarto volumes. Of the 49 bulletins for the States and the District of Columbia, 33 have been published and the remaining 16 are in the hands of the printer; and of the 41 industry bulletins, 13 have been published, 24 are in proof, and copy for 3 more is now in the hands of the printer. In the case of the remaining industry, shipbuilding, the 1914 statistics will not be published separately, but will be issued together with those for 1916, which are now being compiled in connection with the census of transportation by water. * * * The work of preparing the State bulletins for publication in the form of two bound volumes is now in progress and analytical tables are being compiled for the report on industries, to be published in a similar volume.

The abstract of the census of manufactures was completed and published during the fiscal year. This is an octavo volume of 722 pages presenting in condensed and convenient form the more important statistics derived from the census of 1914. It contains 223 tables, with descriptive text giving brief comments on the statistics. This abstract is in some respects a new departure in census work and has proved to be a popular publication. It differs from the abstracts of the decennial censuses of 1890 and 1900 in that it contains analytical tables, comparative figures for earlier years, and text discussions; it differs from the abstract of the decennial census of 1910 in that it presents the statistics in considerably greater detail, and at the same time is of octavo instead of quarto size, and therefore more convenient for handling; and it differs from all former abstracts in that it contains statistics of manufactures only. Since the abstract will supply the needs of a great majority of those using the statistics of manufactures, it was the first volume of the final reports to be issued. There has already been a great demand from manufacturers and others for this publication.

The bureau has recently had a full census of all the factories, plants, and manufactories that in any way have been able and prepared to build ships, aeroplanes, guns, munitions of war, or war materials. Those having charge of the conduct of the war are not relying upon past censuses, and they will therefore not receive any help from the census of manufactures and population made in 1920 and printed in 1923. The Congress can order a census of manufactures any time when it is needed. We do not have to wait for a 10-year period, and such a census will be made whenever it is needed, but to be of use it must be made with promptness and dispatch when our industries have again returned to normal conditions, and also, to be of value, it must be made in a time of peace.

As to a census of agriculture as provided by this bill to be made in 1920, how useless it will be for us to expend millions to obtain a dozen volumes of statistics in 1923, when the Department of Agriculture is engaged to-day in making a continual census of agriculture. Its reports are of great value to the Nation, because they are made monthly and are to-day relied upon, and not those made by the census of 10 years ago, and these reports from the Department of Agriculture will be relied upon for information in the days to come, and not any census made in 1920 and printed in 1923.

Before the Committee on the Census appeared the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Houston, who testified, among other things, as follows:

Secretary HOUSTON. We have over 150,000 volunteer reporters working for us. We have in each State reporting for us a very considerable number of the best farmers, the most alert farmers in each county; they are on the job throughout the year. Many of them have been working for the department for years, trained in the department's methods. The reports are made by the best farmers we have been able to select in every community in the Union. We get our information in that way.

We have recently appropriated to the Department of Agriculture millions of dollars to make a census of agriculture, and that department is now making monthly reports of agricultural products all over the Nation of all crops planted, of the kind of crops raised and produced, the kind of products of the animal industry of the country, and the plant industry and plant diseases, marketing, the distribution of farm crops, the purchasing of farm seeds, and so forth.

In addition to this, the Food Administration bureau, at great expense, is making a census all the time of food products and all that pertains to the farm and the food production of the country. Now, why should we, at great expense, expend other millions in duplicating the work now going on by the Agricultural Department and Food Administration and other bureaus and get no better and perhaps not so good results?

The same is true of a census of mines and mining provided by this bill. A few days ago this Congress provided, at great expense, a census and survey of all the mines and mineral resources of the country in connection with the Geological Survey; and why should we spend another million dollars in a duplication of that work and make another survey that will not be of value to us until 1923?

The same is also true of a survey of forests and forest products provided for by an amendment to this bill. By recent legislation, at great expense, we have provided for a number of special censuses and surveys of all the forests and forest products of the country. Now, why at this time, when we are at war, should we be called upon to make another census of forest products, when we should practice the strictest economy and not spend another million in duplicating the work of these surveys by a census that will not be available until 1923?

During the present war Congress will pay no attention to this bill if enacted. Those who have the conduct of the war will obtain no help or benefit from this bill, and in the days of peace to come Congress will not rely upon any census made in 1920; but after our manufactures and industries and agricultural and mining pursuits have all returned to a normal condition it will be time enough then to take a census of these manufactures and industries, which can then be made promptly and as an emergency, and down to date, and will not be made simply to give place and power to an army of slackers who want salaries and offices and profits from the Government of the United States.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSEY. Yes.

Mr. COX. How much will it cost to take the census of the population?

Mr. HERSEY. That depends upon how it is taken. If it is taken as the census of 1913 was taken, it would be very reasonable.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman any approximate figure as to what is a reasonable amount?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Ten million dollars.

Mr. HERSEY. It ought not to take that.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSEY. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Does the gentleman consider the census taken in 1900 a reasonable amount?

Mr. HERSEY. Oh, I never examined it.

Mr. HELM. Does the gentleman consider the cost of the census taken in 1900 a reasonable amount?

Mr. HERSEY. There were a great many frauds in the census of 1910, in the padding of the population at least.

Mr. HELM. Was the system good or bad in either instance?

Mr. HERSEY. It could be improved upon.

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

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERSEY. I know that while we are appropriating billions of dollars it seems a very small matter to attempt to save a few millions. I do not know how long the present war will continue, how many more billions will be demanded, how many more bonds will be issued, how many more liberty loans will be needed, how many more war-savings stamps must be sold, but I do know that there will come a time, and it will come soon, when the people will demand a stern accounting from those who agree to lavish and useless expenditure, under "pork-barrel" appropriations, of millions by increasing the expenses and salaries and by organizing and maintaining here in Washington a great army of political slackers who are but parasites upon the body of the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I still am not able to diagnose the case of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSBY]. His attitude with reference to this bill is incomprehensible to me. The question whether or not the census shall be extended to manufactures, mines, and mining came up in the minds of members of the committee and we sought an answer to that question from the very best available sources. Hence we called before the committee the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce, representatives of the Bureau of Mines, and the Director of the Geological Survey.

We also directed inquiries to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and other commercial bodies and manufacturing organizations, and all our information is to the effect that a census of manufactures, mines, and quarries is of the utmost importance. Many of them emphasize the fact that it will be of more importance following this war than at any other period in our history to take an inventory of our national assets. It is incomprehensible to me that any intelligent man with broad vision, recognizing this Government in its several activities as the greatest business concern in the world, thinks that it should not take an inventory of its assets. The gentleman asserts that this is an undertaking to make places for a lot of political slackers. I would inquire upon what basis he makes any such assertion as that? Every census that has been taken since I have been a voter was taken under a Republican administration and on terms substantially the same as in this law. Yet I never thought that in framing of census bills the responsible party in power had no higher conception of its duty to the people than to provide places for a lot of political adherents of a party in power. I would have contempt for the Republican Party if I thought that it could be prompted by any such mean, low motives. I do not assume that if this census is taken, beginning the 1st of July, 1919, and extending over to 1922, that it will afford a refuge for political slackers or men or women who may seek to avoid any of their obligations growing out of this war. On the contrary, I assume that this census will be taken in a way that will interfere as little as possible with the activities of the war that is going on, and if the war is over no such condition as the gentleman mentions would intervene.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. What was done under the appropriation made at the last session of Congress for a food survey with regard to taking an agricultural census during the past year, if anything?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The agricultural appropriation bill and the bill providing for a survey were for the fiscal year and necessarily must be quickly taken. It is taken through agents in the field on estimates and is not accurate but is for immediate use and in no way interferes with or overlaps or duplicates the work of the Census Bureau provided for in this bill.

Mr. GOOD. My recollection is that the amount appropriated for that survey was quite a considerable sum, running into a couple of million dollars or more.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. GOOD. It seems to me that that same organization ought to be qualified to do this work, so that there may be no duplication.

Mr. ALEXANDER. As I say, this is a census of agriculture. It will be the only accurate census we will get of mines and mining, because we will go to the original sources of information. The information is now taken quickly through agents and based on estimates, but all statisticians and political economists recognize the census as the only source of accurate information.

Mr. GOOD. I recall that when we had under discussion the repeal of the law, for which I think Mr. Burleson was responsible, to take an agricultural census every five years, there were some hearings, and it was admitted that an accurate agricultural census should not be taken. No farmer knows exactly how many bushels of corn he raises or how many bushels of wheat or rye or barley or how many tons of hay. The whole thing in that hearing, as I recollect it, was based on the best estimates the individual could make. So it is, after all, not accurate. It is a guess.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It may be in a sense inaccurate, but I am sure that an agent at a county seat can not sit down in his office and estimate how much wheat and corn and rye and other farm products have been raised in the county as well as the individual farmer can tell.

Mr. GOOD. Was that the way the food survey was made?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It was made through agents in different counties, who made a general survey.

Mr. GOOD. I thought they visited the individual farmer.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, no.

Mr. GOOD. Then they had too much money.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSBY], and I support it because if we are to pass a census bill at this time the work should be confined, in my opinion, exclusively to a census of the population. As a matter of fact, this bill should not be considered at this time. Legislation of this character should not be passed at this time.

It is impossible for us to tell nearly two years in advance of the census period what it may be wise to do when the time comes to take the census. If we are still engaged in war, it seems quite likely that it will be wise to confine the census activities to an enumeration of the population. On the other hand, it may develop that it is wise to have special examinations made at that time in order to secure and preserve a permanent record of the abnormal conditions existing in the industries at that time. It may be that it will be wise to go even further into some of these activities than is now proposed. On the other hand, it may not be wise to go into them at all. On the other hand, if in the meantime peace shall come and normal conditions are in the course of being established, it will probably be wise to conduct inquiries and investigations along lines with regard to which we are not now fully advised. It seems to me that a survey of the present situation and a consideration of present conditions all lead inevitably to the conclusion that it is utterly futile and foolish to legislate at this time in regard to matters on which we can not have full information nearly two years in advance of the advent. Some gentlemen have suggested that we should make a census provision at this time ample and wide, as is proposed, because conditions will be abnormal, and that we should have a record of that situation. Assuming that to be a sound argument, we can not at this time tell how far we shall want to go, in what direction we should extend our inquiries, just what class of inquiries we should make, so far in advance of the time and with so little knowledge as we now have as to the conditions that will exist. We never have, so far as I am informed, provided for a census so far in advance. But in times of profound peace, when matters are moving along in a normal and ordinary way, we may be able to tell, we might be able to determine even two years in advance, what it would be wise to include in the investigations and inquiries of a census. But under these circumstances no man is wise enough to forecast the future, no man is wise enough to know what should be embraced within the census inquiry, and therefore the Congress is simply wasting its time in legislating on the subject. I predict that whatever may be the form of this legislation as it passes this House it will be radically different when it becomes a law, and that if it becomes a law in the near future it will be radically amended before we reach the census period.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all concerned about the law being passed at this early time—to me that is a very minor consideration—nor am I very much concerned about the fear of some of my Republican friends over there that there is going to be a lot of jobs given out to somebody. That does not give me any trouble or worry whatever. Not that I care anything about the jobs, but you who are preaching that doctrine to-day do not believe what you are preaching, not one of you. I was a Member of this body 10 years ago, when the census was taken. A very warm Republican friend of mine was made district supervisor in my district. I thought we had an understanding, he and I, as to the division of these little enumerators. It finally wound up by the Democratic Party getting two enumerators in one township where there was not a Republican who could qualify for it. So that is the extent of Democratic patronage the third district of Indiana got when the census of 1910 was taken. This patronage does not concern me at all. You men are just as big political grabbers for jobs as any Democrat on the floor of the House.

Mr. GARNER. And probably a little bit more so.

Mr. COX. And probably a little bit more so. So I hope no man will rise any more on the floor of the House and discuss this from that viewpoint. But I am sincere in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine. I concede that it is necessary to have a constitutional census of population, but I am unprepared to concede the necessity of taking such a voluminous census at this time. If I could see where it would increase the production one extra bushel of wheat, rye, oats, corn, barley, hay, I would quickly vote for it. If I could see where it would produce an extra pound of pork or beef or mutton or any other food product, I would willingly and gladly vote for it.

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

Mr. COX. I will.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Do I understand the gentleman's position that he never was in favor of taking a census?

Mr. COX. Oh, no.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If it will not produce another pound of pork or another bushel of wheat—

Mr. COX. I admit in peace times it is necessary to take this census, but what the nations of the earth need to-day in this war is food. They want bread and meat; they want something to support and maintain their armies and civilian population at home, and instead of taking these people out of the line of production in producing these things they want to leave them at home. Now, in section 8 of this bill, I would like to have some gentleman at this time explain just how the taking of an agricultural census will increase production—to find out the occupants of the farm, tenure, acreage of farm, acreage of woodland, value of farm and improvements and the incumbrance thereon, value of farm implements, number of live stock on farms, ranges, and elsewhere, and the quantities of crops and other farm products for the year ending December 31 next preceding the enumeration? I repeat, how is that going to stimulate production if production is what we are after in the country, and we certainly are after it, because the burden of feeding not only our people but half the population of Europe is resting upon the shoulders of the farmers of the United States to-day, to-morrow, and until this war closes. Now, there is another thing I want briefly to mention. It is conceded, I think, by everybody who has touched this bill or knows anything about it that it would be a matter of economy to take a constitutional census of the population.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COX. Here is the condition in the city of Washington: We recently passed an appropriation of \$10,000,000 to provide homes and to build dormitories for the clerical force that is here and 20,000 more soon to arrive. When these figures are being compiled that will be taken by the enumerators out in the various parts of the country it will increase the clerical force here in Washington anywhere from 15,000 to 20,000 clerks. They have got to come here, and soon thereafter Congress will be called upon to make another appropriation, in all probability, of \$10,000,000 more, with which to provide homes and build dormitories for clerks, and so forth, coming here for that purpose.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. For a question.

Mr. HELM. Do I understand you to say it will be necessary to house 20,000 more clerks?

Mr. COX. Fifteen thousand to twenty thousand.

Mr. HELM. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. COX. How many clerks came here 10 years ago?

Mr. HELM. About 3,000.

Mr. COX. Now, then, we could take a constitutional census and comply with the organic law of the Nation in every respect, saving to this Government a few millions of dollars, a thing that is certainly very essential now in view of the condition of the Treasury, and, as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY] well said a while ago, when the Ways and Means Committee is racking its brains in connection with the Treasury to find some objects on which to raise by Federal tax \$8,000,000,000. Now, when these jobs are to be given out there will not be any draft required. Oh, no! They will come from every valley, hilltop, and mountain in the United States, but every one of them will come here with the request, "I want to do my bit to help in this war, but in order to do my bit and help win the war I ought to have a salary of about \$1,500 a year," and from that on up. This amendment, gentlemen, ought to prevail. [Applause.]

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

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the gentleman's time be extended.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reach an agreement for closing debate on this amendment. I ask that it close in 10 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. I would suggest half an hour, 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. HELM. The gentleman from Maine has already consumed 18 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana, supporting the amendment, has used 8 minutes, and only 5 minutes have been consumed in opposition to it.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. Make it 20 minutes on each side.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan and 10 by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan and 10 by himself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] is recognized.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, am I recognized?

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman does not control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Michigan are in control of the time.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a good deal in what the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] have said with regard to the matter of taking of the special censuses at this time. Personally, I represent an agricultural community. My people are interested in agricultural production, and anything that is going to help them to increase production at this time, when it is increased production that the country wants, I wish to be for if it can be had within anything that is reasonable. I have here the Agricultural Yearbook for 1917. That book contains what I suppose is rather reliable information as to the exact number of bushels of corn produced in the United States, subdivided, giving the number of bushels produced in every State. And the same information is found in that book with regard to wheat, barley, rye, hay, cotton, and everything of that kind.

It gives the number of cattle, the number of horses, the number of hogs, the number of mules and sheep in every State and in the United States. It gives all the information, Mr. Chairman, that it is proposed to secure by the expenditure of millions of dollars in this bill to take an agricultural census.

Now, I submit that, taking corn, for instance, in the State of Missouri, this report shows that they doubled the production of corn last year over 1916. Is it claimed this information is not reliable? The farmers of the United States have been speeding up without a special census. They have been speeding up under the stimulus that comes to every patriotic citizen of America to do all he can to help win the war.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I doubt if after spending several millions of dollars you will have more reliable information, so far as the production of the farms is concerned, than you already have under the organization, the splendid organization, of the Agricultural Department. It does seem to me that we ought not to double up on all these things at a time when the war is demanding that millions of our young men shall give up the vocations of peace and go into the line. While that is on, if we can stop some of this special investigation work, the work requiring large sums of money and a great many people in counting things that could well be deferred, we should do so.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, there will be only one speech on this side, and I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NICHOLS] to yield some of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment—

Mr. HELM. I announced to the gentleman from Michigan that there will be only one speech on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NICHOLS] desire to use his time?

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. I wanted to reserve it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to use it now, because the gentleman from Kentucky announces that there will be but one speech on that side.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. Then I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gravamen of the argument advanced by those who insist that we should take a census of agriculture, manufacture, mines, and quarries at this time is that it will be of value to statisticians and political economists. I have followed this debate from its very inception and no one has claimed up to the present moment that a census of agriculture will add one iota in bushels of crop yield when the census is taken three or four years before the statistics are available. As far as manufactures are concerned, it goes without saying that manufacturers do not depend upon statistics to determine their output. The only reason presented by the Bureau of the Census, which was read by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] in the letter from the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, did not contain any argument, but merely the opinion that it would be of value.

I would like to know some reason for the extravagant outlay of \$7,000,000 when no good will come to the manufacturing interests or the agricultural interests from the compilation of these statistics at the present time.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield for a brief question. My time is limited.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman state to this House what value has come to the manufacturing industries of this country by taking a census of the manufactures in the years past?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, those statistics have not been for manufacturers. They have been for statisticians and political economists, and most of the work of the Bureau of Census is of interest only to statisticians and political economists. Mr. Schwab and other great captains of industry do not depend upon statistics to determine whether or not they will go into a certain line of manufactures, nor do the farmers of the country depend upon statistics of agriculture for determining whether they will plant corn or wheat. They plant corn or wheat on the price of those commodities. They raise hogs when there is a prospect that the raising of hogs will be profitable.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. Do you believe in taking a census of manufactures?

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe in taking a census of manufactures when conditions are normal, but it is agreed that there is no reason at the present time to take a census of manufactures, because the conditions are utterly abnormal. Will your Dodges and your Fords and your other great manufacturing captains of industry in Detroit determine their position in the future upon these statistics collected in abnormal times? Of course not. They determine their policy upon conditions existing to-day, upon the demand for their products and the sale of their products. It is ridiculous. Is there a man employed in the Ford or the Dodge plant or any other great motor plant in Detroit dependent on statistics to determine whether they will extend or curtail their production? The gentleman can not cite one who resorts to census statistics to determine their production.

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. They do it now just as much as ever.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; a very clever answer, because they have never resorted to it, and I have never known a successful manufacturer to resort to statistics collected by the Bureau of the Census, four years old, when they are available four years after being taken, to determine whether they shall extend their business or not.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is quite right, so far as the farmers are concerned. These statistics are absolutely valueless. They do not come in until five years after they are taken. The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. They may be of value to philosophers or economists, but they are of no value to farmers.

Mr. STAFFORD. If there was some value to the Government to-day, well might we spend \$7,000,000 for that purpose. But there is proof here that we have as first-class information as is obtainable by the Food Administrator and by the Agricultural Department here in the statistics read by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. He shows that there is available to-day first-hand information, not dusty, obsolete information four years old, as to the amount of acres utilized in the production of the various commodities. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, no good reason has been advanced up to the present time for the expenditure of \$7,000,000. It is necessary under the Constitution to have a census of population, but no more, and the burden is upon the committee to show some reason why we should spend the \$7,000,000 in these abnormal times when the results will not be of any value even to statisticians. [Applause.]

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

Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for one minute.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it is rather remarkable that there should be an arraignment of the Census Bureau in the last 50 or 100 years, so far as it has any value at all. It is remarkable indeed that this Government should have continuously taken a census of agriculture, manufactures, mines, and quarries all these years and suddenly gentlemen here find out that it is absolutely worthless. That is a strange and significant thing under these circumstances.

Let me say that the book from which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] read is built upon one estimate after another made on the census of 1910.

Mr. GOOD. The production of 1917?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. The production of 1917 is made on the basis of estimates, so the man who appeared before the committee stated. Every department said that. There has been no complete census in 1917, no complete census, but on the cursory survey, based upon estimates largely, and not correct. Evidently, it could not be. When men talk this way, extravagantly, about its utter uselessness, it looks to me as if it were unfair treatment of the subject. [Applause.]

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

Mr. HELM. If the gentleman desires an extension of time, I will give it to him.

The CHAIRMAN. All other time has expired. The gentleman has six minutes remaining.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, it is a very singular situation that confronts the committee, and I am at a perfect loss to understand how it is that the great Republican Party has degenerated into a contest over a census bill for a political issue in the coming election. [Applause.]

If the Republican Party has gotten down to such a fine point that it expects to depend upon the passage or nonpassage of the census bill, including a census of agriculture, manufactures, mines, and quarries, then you are indeed in a desperate condition, gentlemen, a deplorable condition, if you are undertaking to make a campaign issue out of that fact. You have, indeed, arrived at "the irreducible minimum."

Now, let us see. The censuses of 1900 and 1910 were passed by Republican Congresses. They were good then. They certainly ought to be, in your estimation, a good precedent for the passage of a census bill for 1920. The worst feature of this bill is that it is copied after both of those bills that were passed by Republican Congresses and approved by Republican Presidents. If they contain any vice at all, from my viewpoint, it is that they are the offspring of Republican legislation, and why you at this time should undertake to repudiate your own product is something that I can not understand. [Applause.]

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

Mr. HELM. With pleasure.

Mr. HERSEY. Do you copy from the Republican census bill of 1910 in the way of the appointment of supervisors?

Mr. HELM. My good friend, we are now considering your amendment to section 1.

Mr. HERSEY. Why do not you answer my question?

Mr. HELM. I do not want to punish you. [Laughter.] I think so much of you that I do not want to treat you as your position deserves.

Mr. HERSEY. Do not worry about me, but answer the question.

-Mr. HELM. We are discussing—

Mr. HERSEY. Are not you going to answer the question?

Mr. HELM. If you will give me an opportunity to answer it, I will; but if you want to draw a blue print for my answer, why, I will say no. But I will answer your question in my own way, if you will give me an opportunity to do so. The gentleman has offered an amendment to strike out almost the first line of the first section on the first page. If he wants to jump clear over into the back part of the bill and to discuss the last section of it, I will tell you very frankly it has been stated perhaps 500 times that this bill differs from that bill in that respect. Has the gentleman been answered?

Mr. HERSEY. No. Will you yield further?

Mr. HELM. No; I do not think your attitude toward the committee merits it. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Maine is a very delightful gentleman, except when he gets his Maine type of politics stirred up in him. [Laughter.] Individually and personally he is as delightful a gentleman as I ever met or ever hope to meet; but when he gets up here on the floor he gets his quills up and begins to play a little politics over a bill that has no element of politics in it.

Mr. HERSEY. Will you yield for a question?

Mr. HELM. Certainly. I will take one more chance with you.

Mr. HERSEY. Do my questions embarrass you?

Mr. HELM. Get that out of your mind. Nothing that you could ask me about this bill would embarrass me in the least. [Laughter.] Now, let us get back to the bill and the amendment under consideration. I know that every fair-minded man in this Chamber must admit that a census of manufactures, of agriculture, and of mines and quarries is a necessary piece of legislation. Let me make this suggestion to you gentlemen over there who are undertaking to play a little game of politics.

After the close of this war necessarily there will have to be a tariff bill written, and I am disposed to believe that the tariff question following this war will not be a very decisive political issue. We will have to raise a tremendous amount of revenue to pay the interest on this war-bonded debt. Now, in order that a tariff bill may be written, I submit to every fair-minded, candid man here, can you write that bill without knowing what your resources are, what your stock in trade is, and what volume of business we have done?

Mr. HERSEY rose.

Mr. HELM. I do not yield any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HELM. I hope gentlemen will think over that feature of this situation. Now, I want to submit this other proposition to you: Is there a successful business man conducting a big business proposition in the United States who on the 1st day of January does not take an invoice of his stock? It does not put a pound of any commodity in his establishment. It does not add a single article of value to his stock in his store or in his warehouse. It does not take anything out of it. But how long would a business man continue in business without knowing what his stock consisted of? And that is this proposition exactly. We are undertaking in this bill to take an invoice in 1920 of the stock in trade of this country. Any business man who fails to do the same thing in his own private affairs will soon be out of business.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HELM. With pleasure.

Mr. FESS. I understand the Constitution requires that there be a census taken every 10 years, with reference to the apportionment for Congress.

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. FESS. And you are simply adding to that requirement that we shall also make an inventory of our wealth in addition to the population.

Mr. HELM. We are simply carrying in this bill what has been carried in it since 1820, and I undertake to say that if you did not include a census of agriculture and of manufactures in this bill, the very first thing that would be done at any succeeding session of Congress would be that some one would come on the floor here to introduce just such a measure as this one to take a census of manufactures. The idea of undertaking to do the volume of business that the United States is doing without taking an invoice of the business every 10 years, when an individual takes an invoice of his stock every year and sometimes biennially, is an absurd idea.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. HELM. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman is saying about adding to the census an inquiry as to these elements of wealth. The only thing I have in mind is that in our food-survey bill of last year we undertake to get our status as to agriculture, and that was said to be annual. Will we not be called upon to repeat that?

Mr. HELM. No. Let me give the gentleman the reason. All of the activities provided for heretofore with reference to agriculture expire June 30, 1919, and the decennial period begins July 1, 1919. So you see that all of the stocktaking and food survey and everything else that has heretofore been provided for expires before this bill even becomes effective, and there is no overlapping, no duplication. As a matter of fact, it is recognized by every department in this Government that the Bureau of the Census is the one bureau that they all depend upon for reliable, accurate information. Here is a letter from the chief of the Bureau of Markets, stating that without the census of agriculture their work is virtually worthless. Now let me give just a little instance. In the food survey they take a few representative families in a community and find out what they have, and multiply it by the number of people in the community.

Mr. FESS. That is a mere estimate.

Mr. HELM. That is a mere estimate. It is just a wild guess. It is the best they can do, and when you have an opportunity to do something that is worth while some gentlemen here are disposed to criticize and throw aside the only real valuable instrument of the Government that we have to get dependable and reliable information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired; all time has expired, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hersey) there were 33 ayes and 42 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That during the decennial-census period, and no longer, there may be employed in the Census Office, in addition to the force provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year immediately preceding the decennial census period, an assistant director, who shall be an experienced practical statistician; a chief statistician, who shall be a person of known and tried experience in statistical work; a disbursing clerk; an appointment clerk; a private secretary to the director; 4 stenographers; 8 expert chiefs of division; and 15 statistical experts. The assistant director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The chief statistician, the disbursing clerk, the appointment clerk, the chiefs of divisions, and the private secretary to the director shall be appointed without examination by the Secretary of Commerce upon the recommendation of the Director of the Census. The statistical experts and the stenographers shall be appointed in conformity with the civil-service act and rules.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether it is practicable to designate the 1st day of July next preceding the census by naming the year. In the language as reported by the committee it says "for the fiscal year immediately preceding the decennial-census period." That compels a mental calculation. Is it practicable to designate the 1st of July of the year intended?

Mr. HELM. I see no objection to saying July 1, 1919.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that would be an improvement?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is in accordance with the language of existing law. The language is, "for the fiscal year immediately preceding the decennial-census period."

Mr. STAFFORD. I realize that it has to be indefinite or continuing language, because this bill is not seeking to take the Fourteenth Census only but succeeding censuses; but I suppose the date extended is July 1, 1919.

Mr. HELM. I do not think there is anything indefinite about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. It would be a little more definite if we named the year. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 16, after the word "division" strike out the semicolon, insert a period, and in lines 16 and 17 strike out the words "and 15 statistical experts."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hersey) there were 13 ayes and 23 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 3 as follows: Strike out, in lines 21 and 22, the words "without examination"; strike out, in line 23, the words "the statistical experts" and all of lines 24 and 25 and insert the following in lieu thereof: "That all appointments made or to be made pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be made in accordance with the provisions and requirements of the civil-service act of January 16, 1883: *Provided, however,* That no male citizen shall be appointed under the provisions of this act who at the time of his appointment is within the age limit rendering him liable to draft for the military service of the United States; *And provided further,* That whenever an appointee under this act becomes of the age which renders him liable to military service of the United States he shall by reason of that fact be forthwith released from service in connection with his appointment under this act."

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the purpose of this amendment is to put this bill and the appointees under it within the provisions of the civil-service act. There is no reason why they should not be within the civil-service requirements as to efficiency, and there is every good reason why they should be. The establishment of a standard for this service ought not to be treated as a political question in any sense of the word.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Does the gentleman or anybody believe that anyone would take a civil-service examination for a job lasting two or three weeks?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes; because the examination could be made to suit the character of the employment. This same question was up when the last census was taken. The bill was vetoed by President Roosevelt for that very reason. I have his whole veto message, which is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1966, of 1909, and I want to read a little of it, because it is refreshing to go back and see how the law has been developed and protected through the efforts of a Republican President. We have heard the statement made that that was a Republican census bill, and it has also been charged against

the Republicans that probably they were attempting to manipulate that act and the appointments on political grounds. Now, in section 7 of this bill you will find all the appointments removed from civil service, and in section 10 of that bill is to be found the antagonism to the whole principle of civil service in its most flagrant form. President Roosevelt's veto of the census act of 1900, in part, reads as follows:

Section 7 of the act provides in effect that appointments to the census shall be under the spoils system, for this is the real meaning of the provision that they shall be subject only to noncompetitive examination. The proviso is added that they shall be selected without regard to political party affiliations. But there is only one way to guarantee that they shall be selected without regard to politics and on merit, and that is by choosing them after competitive examination from the lists of eligibles provided by the Civil Service Commission. The present Director of the Census in his last report states the exact fact about these noncompetitive examinations when he says:

"A noncompetitive examination means that every one of the many thousands who will pass the examinations will have an equal right to appointment, and that personal and political pressure must in the end, as always before, become the determining factor with regard to the great body of these temporary employments. I can not too earnestly urge that the Director of the Census be relieved from this unfortunate situation."

To provide that the clerks and other employees shall be appointed after noncompetitive examination, and yet to provide that they shall be selected without regard to political party affiliations, means merely that the appointments shall be treated as the perquisites of the politicians of both political parties instead of as the perquisites of the politicians of one party. I do not believe in the doctrine that to the victor belong the spoils; but I think even less of the doctrine that the spoils shall be divided without a fight by the professional politicians on both sides; and this would be the result of permitting the bill in its present shape to become a law.

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

Mr. ROBBINS. Just for a question.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it not a fact that a Republican Congress later enacted this law and appointed these people without the civil service?

Mr. ROBBINS. No; they did not. I have the law here.

Mr. ASWELL. The fact is that they did.

Mr. ROBBINS. I shall not bandy words with the gentleman about that; the law will speak for itself. I continue the reading:

Both of the last two censuses, the Eleventh and the Tenth Censuses, were taken under a provision of law excluding competition; that is, necessitating appointments being made under the spoils system. Every man competent to speak with authority because of his knowledge of and familiarity with the work of those censuses has stated that the result was to produce extravagance and demoralization.

Mr. Robert T. Porter, who took the census of 1890, states:

The efficiency of the decennial census would be greatly improved and its cost materially lessened if it were provided that the employees should be selected in accordance with the terms of the civil-service law.

There, now, I have cited to you not only a former President of the United States but two Directors of the Census, stating that it ought to be taken under the civil-service law by employees selected pursuant to its terms. The gentlemen know that the civil-service law was the result of 40 or 50 years' struggle for the betterment of the civil service of our Government, and that the Republicans were in power when the civil-service law was enacted, and that it was enacted because it was believed that that party—or any party—in power would abuse the right of appointment to public office and use public office for political spoils. Mr. Chairman, the worst feature in this bill is not, perhaps, the selection of these minor appointees outside of the civil service. That is bad enough; that will "produce extravagant demoralization" of the service, in the language of Director Porter—and everyone will acknowledge that he was a distinguished gentleman, a scholar, and a patriot. It will produce inefficiency also. Let us turn to page 10 of the bill, to which this amendment will also apply. We find there that the majority party in this House have not only increased the number of supervisors, who are presumably to be the representatives of the Census Bureau, taking the census in each congressional district, from 330 to 400, but they have also made them appointees of the Secretary of Commerce, on the recommendation of the Director of the Census! Think of that! That takes all of these officials who will select all the enumerators, and who, in turn, will be in charge of the actual work of the taking of the census, and will be responsible for its accuracy and faithfulness as to all the facts, out from under the civil-service law. Under all prior census laws the supervisors were appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, but in this bill the Secretary of Commerce is to make these appointments. It would appear as if the majority party do not trust their own President! It may be argued that this will entail too much work upon the Civil Service Commission.

I took occasion to inquire into that. I hold no brief for the Civil Service Commission. I am speaking of it as a Member of Congress, regardless of whether the principle of making appointments under that law is to be applied here to a set of Democratic officials to take the census or a set of Republican officials. I believe in the system. I want to say to the gentlemen who

are going to oppose this amendment that I was in Congress when Mr. McKinley was President, when the civil-service law did not apply to the appointment of postmasters. I represented a congressional district where there was over 300 post offices to be filled by appointment of the President on the recommendation of the Member of Congress. That was the greatest burden and the greatest cause of dissatisfaction and criticism that I ever had to deal with in all my experience in public life, politically, professionally, or otherwise. Those who sought these appointments or their friends were after me morning, noon, and night about these post offices. The communities where they were located at times became interested and divided, so intense in some cases did these contests become. Happily that has all been eliminated and none of us are now troubled since the Civil Service Commission has been placed in charge of these appointments, and the results have been eminently satisfactory. Can the Civil Service Commission perform this work? I think I have shown conclusively by the testimony of a former President and of two former census directors that can not be denied or seriously questioned by those who are experienced in this matter that all these positions ought to be placed under the civil-service law. If the civil service can furnish the lists of eligibles from which to select these appointees, why should anyone object. I took occasion to call up the Civil Service Commission on the 22d of June and inquire as to the ability of the commission to furnish suitable lists of persons eligible for these places, and I received from the commission the following letter:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1918.

HON. EDWARD E. ROBBINS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ROBBINS: I inclose herewith copy of my letter of May 9, 1918, to Hon. HARVEY HELM, chairman of the Committee on the Census of the House of Representatives. The references in this letter are to the committee print of the bill, which was then under consideration.

I know of no good reason why appointments to the census force should not fairly and properly be made under the civil-service rules and regulations. The commission is amply able to do the work.

Very respectfully,

JOHN A. McILHENNY,
President.

Inclosure.

Let us turn to the work that this Civil Service Commission is doing. It has a large building here in the city of Washington, and many employees, all of which are essential to one of the great departments of our Government. They hold examinations all over the country, and lately we modified the rules so that they can examine in Washington anyone, provided the party applying for the examination can show that he or she is entitled to it, and can be charged to some congressional district in the United States, and have a legal domicile other than in the city of Washington. During the last year—and I now read from the annual report of 1917, page 7, of the Civil Service Commission—it examined and certified appointments as follows: In the field, 174,653 applicants, and in Washington, 35,765; and there was appointed to office from this list thus certified to governmental departments persons qualified to fill the positions that were asked to be filled, as follows: Outside of Washington, 78,528, and in Washington, 6,761. We have their word, as expressed in the above letter, that they can furnish eligible lists of persons duly qualified for all these places in the Census Bureau. I appeal, therefore, to the majority party in control here not to force this bill through and make these places all political spoils. "To the victor belong the spoils" is no longer a popular political slogan. Destroy the merit system, and you will find these appointments coming home to plague you politically in your congressional districts, because for every man that you appoint to office you will have five or six that are displeased.

Mr. COX. Oh, 50.

Mr. ROBBINS. And the men you put in will be snugly sitting on their salaries and the five or six whom you will dis appoint will lie awake nights on your political trail.

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

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more. The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBBINS. My friend from Kentucky [Mr. HELM], who is the chairman of this committee and in charge of this bill, is something of a humorist, I notice in his reply to the questions of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY]. I want to lift this discussion to the plane of real serious debate and out of the hustings of popular politics, because it does not make any difference to me, politically or otherwise, whether you make this the "spoils system" or not. We Republicans will obtain control of the Government in due time, no difference what is the

fate of this amendment, and, therefore, we expect no profit or advantage politically or otherwise by this bill. No department of our great and splendid Government enjoys to a larger extent the confidence and respect of all of our people than the Civil Service Commission.

President Roosevelt vetoed a pension bill enacted by a Republican Congress, because the places created thereby were not under its eligible list; President Cleveland stood firmly for its enforcement and announced that "public office was a public trust;" President Wilson has extended by Executive order the civil-service law to many offices not formerly covered by its provisions, and this House should not now curtail its operation by placing those who are to take the Fourteenth Census beyond the pale of its scrutinizing tests. But I do plead with you who are in the majority to preserve this civil-service law. The temporary advantage of striking it down will not benefit any political party and it will be a demoralization to the public service of our country that we as patriots ought not to tolerate or encourage. [Applause.]

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, all of the employees of the Census Bureau are now under civil service, and this bill provides that those employed in the bureau shall be under civil service, and it applies only to those in the field service, as suggested by the gentleman who has just spoken. Mr. Chairman, it is recognized that while the Constitution places the responsibility in time of war upon the President, this Congress has ungrudgingly and without stint given the President ample authority. The same principle applies to any business. Any man in charge of a great business industry, whether it be merchandise, manufacturing, or farming, the man who is responsible for the success of that institution must have authority. The director should have authority over the appointees. Put them under the control of the Senate, and they ignore the director at will, and the work fails. The claim has been made by the gentleman who has just spoken and by others that supervisors, who are to serve only a short period of time, should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASWELL. In just a moment. I call the attention of this committee to this fact, that the Director of the Census is charged with the responsibility of making this decennial census a success. He is held accountable for the results of this work, and if this Congress holds him responsible, why, does it not stand to reason that he should be given opportunity and authority? It has been charged that the Director of the Census and the Secretary of Commerce are well-known ordinary politicians, and therefore should not have the right to make these appointments. I call the attention of this committee to the fact that those two gentlemen, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Redfield, and the Director of the Census, Mr. Rogers, received their appointment by the President and were confirmed by the Senate, and to the gentleman's argument that the danger is that they will appoint politicians, I call attention to the fact that they themselves, the very gentlemen Members on this floor have been criticizing, received their appointments from the President and were confirmed by the Senate. [Applause.] So, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the claim that these temporary workers, some of them schoolboys, some of them women, some of them men, who have opportunity to work for only two or three weeks, it seems to me that it would be ridiculous to call upon them to go to the trouble and expense of taking the civil-service examination when this bill provides that the Director of the Census himself shall give examinations to such extent as will absolutely guarantee the fitness of each individual in taking the census. [Applause.]

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. ASWELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBBINS. I have before me the act of 1909, and the gentleman does not want to misquote it. The law reads this way on this point:

Supervisors shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

This bill reads that "the supervisors shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce upon the recommendation of the Director of the Census," on page 10. Does the gentleman mistrust his President and will not allow him to make these appointments? Is that the gentleman's position?

Mr. ASWELL. This section has nothing to do with supervisors.

Mr. ROBBINS. But it amounts to the same thing, because my amendment puts everything under the civil service.

Mr. ASWELL. That is where the gentleman's amendment is wrong.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is not right; that will not answer the question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASWELL. I will.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I would call the attention of the gentleman from Louisiana to the fact that under section 6—

That in addition to the force heretofore provided for and to that authorized by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year immediately preceding the decennial census period, there may be employed in the Census Office during the decennial census period, and no longer, as many clerks with salaries, etc., as may be found necessary for the proper and prompt performance of the duties herein required.

Section 7 provides—

That the additional clerks and other employees provided for by section 6 shall be subject to such special test examinations as the Director of the Census may prescribe, the said examinations to be conducted by the United States Civil Service Commission, to be open to all applicants without regard to political party affiliations, and to be held in such places in each State as may be designated by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is simply examinations by the commissioner himself.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Civil-service examinations.

Mr. ROBBINS. The commissioner has the right and he prepares the questions.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Has the gentleman read all of the Civil Service Commissioner's letter?

Mr. ROBBINS. No; I did not read the first paragraph because it referred to another letter, but I can read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HELM. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania relates to two different subjects, one the Civil Service Commission and the other the appointment of persons liable to military service.

Mr. ROBBINS. Oh, the gentleman probably did not understand it if he did not read it and simply heard it. It simply says that no man can be appointed to a position liable to the draft.

Mr. HELM. I think everybody wants to agree to that, but I do not think everybody wants to agree to the civil-service feature of it, and therefore I ask for a division of the question presented by the amendment.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, in order that I may be perfectly well understood, and that the gentleman may not misunderstand the amendment, I will say that it only provides for putting the positions under civil service and provides that no man can go in there that is liable to military service.

Mr. HELM. There are two very distinct propositions involved in that.

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

Mr. ROBBINS. You can not divide the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it can be divided.

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have the amendment again reported?

Mr. ROBBINS. May we have it read again so that we will all understand it?

Mr. ALEXANDER. My understanding is that there is no objection to the last proposition. Does the gentleman want to oppose it? We are willing to concede the second proposition, but we are not in favor of the first proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the first part of the amendment.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, the first part of the amendment, as I understand it, relates to the civil-service feature. I ask for a separate vote on that. I want to be heard for five minutes, or less time.

The staff officials of the Director of the Census are the assistant director, the chief statistician, the disbursing clerk, the appointment clerk, the chiefs of divisions, and private secretary to the director. Now, let us look at that just a moment. Would any man in Congress want his private secretary appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ROBBINS. I except the director's private secretary.

Mr. HELM. You except the private secretary?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. HELM. And not the assistant secretary's secretary?

Mr. ROBBINS. No; not the assistant secretary's.

Mr. HELM. That looks like an absurd proposition on its face. The assistant director has charge of the office force and perhaps 80,000 to 100,000 appointees, and has to possess administrative ability to handle men and to direct the business; and to require such assistant director to be put under the civil-service rules is an unthinkable proposition to me. You might just as

well say that the director should be appointed under civil-service rules and regulations. Men who handle this type of business are men who have initiative and administrative capacity, and to undertake to say that a man who gets a high standing on a civil-service examination shall be put at the head of a bureau is a most unbusinesslike proposition. It would be almost as reasonable to appoint the higher officers of the Army and Navy by competitive civil-service examination. And, as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], you would have to confine yourself to the age limit under the civil-service rules and regulations.

Now, as to these statisticians. These men, who are to direct and to digest and who are to coordinate all of the data that is brought to that office, have been in that office for a period of years, and have had training along a particular line of duty. You can not go into the States and pick up at random a man who is qualified to act as chief statistician whose sole and only qualification is his ability to successfully take a civil-service examination. The work in the bureau is divided into three or four separate divisions.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield in that particular?

Mr. HELM. In just a moment. In the Division of Population there are 2,000 clerks; in the Division of Agriculture there are 1,000 clerks; and in the Division of Manufacturing, Mines, and Quarries, 1,000 clerks. That is the office force and not the field force. Now, do you want to just pick a man at random and put him in charge of 2,000 men who are assembling data and getting it in an intelligible form? It would be an unbusinesslike procedure. It is not good common sense. And I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS], on reflection and further consideration, will see that these statisticians are men of different capacity and different training, and that we do not want to cripple the service by requiring the impossible.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume from the gentleman's statement that the chief statistician is a statistical expert?

Mr. HELM. The chief statistician is a—

Mr. STAFFORD. Should be a statistical expert?

Mr. HELM. As a matter of fact, he ought to be the very highest type of statistician.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, you provide in your bill—

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

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, you require the statistical expert authorized by this section to be subject to civil-service examination. Why not require the chief to be subject to the same requirement? Why allow him to be a creature of spoils?

Mr. HELM. The chief statistician?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Well, the gentleman from Wisconsin can certainly draw a line of distinction between a man who is directing such a large organization as the statistical branches in the Bureau of Census and his subordinates?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can draw this distinction, if the gentleman will permit, that the chief statistician should be under the same rigorous examination as to qualifications, and more so, than the subordinate statistical experts which the gentleman's own committee require to be under civil-service rules.

Mr. HELM. Now, as a matter of fact, the chiefs of the divisions of population, agriculture, manufacture, mines, and quarries are men who are and have been in the bureau and do have a civil-service status, so far as that is concerned. But—

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the very purpose, if the gentleman will permit—

Mr. HELM. But if anything should happen and any one of these men should die, to require the director to hold a civil-service examination to select a man to be placed in charge of a force such as this seems to me to be—

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the very point I am trying to bring out, if the gentleman will permit, in all seriousness. Under the existing law, on the statutory roll there are carried nine chiefs of divisions that are subject to civil-service rules. Now you bring in a bill where you provide that the statistical experts of the census only shall be subject to civil-service rules, but you do not provide that these eight expert chiefs of divisions shall be under civil-service rules. Yet he was not placed on the statutory roll. They are required to be on the census roll.

Mr. HELM. Let us not meet that until it is presented, Mr. Chairman. I ask for a vote.

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

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

Mr. ROBBINS. An amendment is pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to this fact: The last proviso in his amendment is as follows:

Provided further, That whenever an appointee under this act becomes of the age which renders him liable to the military service of the United States, he shall, by reason of that fact, forthwith be released from service in connection with said appointment.

I hardly think the gentleman realizes the effect of that. In other words, if the military age remains as it is and a man under 21 years of age is appointed to any position, although it may be that of a mere enumerator, whose services would not be required for more than three weeks, yet if in the middle of that work he becomes of the age of 21, he is immediately liable to military service, and he must quit his position and some one else must be appointed to take his place, although he might not be called to service for months.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. I thought of that, and I made that flexible, so as to cover the possible draft age from 18 to 45, according to the amendment now pending in the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. If a man happens to arrive at military age, he might not be called for service for six months, and yet on the very day he reaches military age he would have to be released from employment.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is the only way I can see to safeguard against getting a lot of slackers.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUMNERS. The point is that this question is not now before the House. The gentleman is discussing one part of the amendment and another part is pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. It strikes me that this amendment should not be agreed to in that form.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not believe in agreeing to it except by a division of the question. I think the amendment should be divided and the two parts separated. If the party recommended is called into the service of the United States, then—

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think that is needed. These positions are not exempted from the military service. There is no place that a man holds that exempts him unless his chief states that his services are indispensable. But if it is necessary to amend the act so as to make it sure that they are not exempted, no objection could be made to that. I do not care to see any of these positions filled by men of military age, but if a man who is of military age and who has been examined and rejected and could not get into the Army is transferred to some job in here, he would have to be immediately removed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no objection to the principle of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to the principle; but it will work out, as I believe, unwisely.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it not a fact that the Army regulations control that? The whole amendment, in that case, would be useless. Under it you could not employ anybody in the bureau anywhere unless he was under 18 or over 45.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose we should take a man within military age, over 25 years old, as an enumerator. He would not require more than three weeks to perform his duty in the district assigned to him. He might not be called into service for three months. It strikes me that it is an undue precaution to require that men shall be disconnected from the service when they have reached military age, although not called into service. I think it would be sufficient to provide that appointment under this act shall not entitle any man to deferred classification or exemption from military service.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the principle involved in the amendment which proposes that men to be employed shall be outside of military age, and I hope that something of the kind will be approved by the committee. I am not concerned as to the words or as to the amendment being adopted in the exact words suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS]; but as to the objection made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I think his objection is not good. I think the administration of this act should be in the direction of refusing to employ men within the age which subjects men to military service, and then the objection of the gentleman from Kentucky would not obtain. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Kentucky says also that employment in this line of work does not exempt a man from military service. That is true; but this employment gives opportunity for the head of the department or the official to whom this employee is subject to ask for his deferred classification on account of his employment.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I know of a department in this Government employing thousands of men in positions that do not exempt them from military service. I know also that the head of that department has asked for deferred classification for thousands of those men on account of their employment. It is up to the head of the department. The employment itself does not exempt a man, but the head of a department has authority to ask the draft boards to place men in deferred classes, and no draft board disregards the request of the head of a department.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the gentleman's suggestion be corrected by providing, instead of eliminating anybody who might arrive at military age, an amendment that would make it impossible for the Director of the Census or anybody under him to ask for a deferred classification for a man of military age?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I want it air-tight. I am not concerned, as I said, about the words, but I think it is up to this Congress now—it should have been done before—to provide that these places we are creating should not be filled by men within draft age. The Congress is coming to that state of feeling. It should have experienced that feeling earlier. It ought to give expression to it now.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think that provision in substance has been adopted in several bills that have been passed already.

Mr. ROBBINS. I have some of the bills here.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; but the gentleman from Kentucky suggests another form, a form that I do not approve.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not concerned as to the form, but I can foresee a ridiculous situation that might arise with people arriving at military age, when their duties would not require more than a month's service, and yet they would immediately be disconnected from their duties, although they would not be called into service for months.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It would be easy to frame the amendment in such words that that difficulty could not arise.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be wise to eliminate from the appointment of these men those who are liable to military service, but if anybody is appointed who is not liable to military service I do not think a worthy object could be effected by separating that person immediately from his position before he is called to the military service.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. I will state to the gentleman that I have just left the Senate, where an amendment is being considered to put within the draft age every man between the ages of 18 and 45. If that law were passed it would make it difficult to secure the necessary number of enumerators.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I doubt if that amendment will be adopted by Congress, particularly at this time.

Mr. HELM. If anybody will present a well-considered amendment along the line of the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan, I do not think there will be a particle of doubt about the adoption of it. The only question is in getting the amendment in proper shape.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Pardon me for a moment. When the Agricultural bill was under consideration I offered an amendment—

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Would an amendment to the second portion of the amendment offered be in order at this stage of the proceedings?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. It is divisible. The gentleman from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I want to make a parliamentary inquiry. The chairman has decided that this amendment is divisible, but after the committee has acted on the first portion of the amendment, will the second portion be open to debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Then I do not care to proceed further at this time. I have nothing to say as to the first part.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, can we have the first part reported as the Chair has divided it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

First part of the amendment offered by Mr. ROBBINS, of Pennsylvania: Strike out, in line 23, the words "The statistical experts and the stenographers shall be appointed in conformity with civil-service act and rules" and insert the following in lieu thereof: "That all appointments made or to be made pursuant to the provisions of this act, except the private secretary to the Director, shall be made in accordance with the provisions and requirements of the civil-service act of January 16, 1883, and the rules and regulations made thereunder."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBBINS) there were—ayes 22, noes 35.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

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

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move to strike out the words "become of the age which renders him liable" and insert in lieu thereof the words "whenever called into."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BANKHEAD to the second part of the amendment offered by Mr. ROBBINS: Strike out the words "become of the age which renders him liable," and insert in lieu thereof the words "whenever called into."

Mr. STAFFORD. So that it will read—

Mr. ROBBINS. Let the Clerk read the whole amendment as proposed to be amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

So that it will read:

"Provided, however, That no male citizen shall be appointed under the provisions of this act who at the time of his appointment is within the age limit rendering him liable to draft for the military service of the United States: And provided further, That whenever appointed under this act, whenever called into the military service of the United States"

Mr. HEFLIN. The first part ought all to be stricken out.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my amendment for the purpose of redrafting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws the amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to oppose the amendment, if I may be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BORLAND. I am in full sympathy with what I believe to be the purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, and I hope he will get his amendment into such form that we can all agree upon it. His purpose is to prohibit men using these census positions as safety-first jobs during the war. We are all in hearty sympathy with that purpose, I think. It seems to me that men will be appointed to positions under this census who are of military age, but there is no reason why their appointment, whether they have actively sought it or not, should exempt them from the military service that is common to all American citizens of their age.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the first part of the second clause of the amendment no man of military age can be appointed.

Mr. BORLAND. And that is exactly the difficulty with it. The language is so drastic in its nature that no man of military age could be appointed. Under the present wording of it, no man between 21 and 31 could be appointed to the service; and if the military age were enlarged from 18 to 45, then it would be extremely difficult to get a working force under this census bureau of men not within military age. But the purpose can all be accomplished by permitting freedom of appointment in accordance with the civil-service regulations, but refusing any exemption on the ground of necessary employment to men who are in that line of service. It does seem to me that either by oversight of Congress or by slipping up on the soft side of executive officers a large number of men who ought to be subject

to military service, like any other good citizens of the United States, have been exempted from military service. It is not at all creditable that that sort of thing has gone on to any extent.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. HERSEY. Would not that objection be obviated by appointing women to the places?

Mr. BORLAND. I have no doubt that a large number of women will be appointed. It is unquestionably true that women are in many respects as well or better adapted to office work than men. But there will be a great many of these positions, such as enumerators, and places of that kind, which can not very well be filled by women. I take it that there will be a large number of men, notwithstanding the very general employment of women in this service.

Mr. WHEELER. If I understand the first part of this amendment correctly, a man 25 years of age who had only one leg could not be appointed to this service, because he is within the military age.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. If it simply excludes men of military age the gentleman from Illinois is correct. A man of military age must be refused appointment, even though not qualified for military service.

And that brings before us another thought that must be prominent in our minds from now on for the immediate future. It is that most of these Government employments ought to be open to men who have performed military service and who bear the scars of battle. Men who have been crippled in the service—one-legged soldiers, one-armed soldiers—can do a great deal of this kind of work. As far as I am concerned, when any place in the Federal service is open that a man crippled in this war can fill, he will be the first man who will have my voice for the place. I think general legislation will probably be passed which will enable the civil service to be open to self-respecting and patriotic Americans who have been crippled in the military service, who come back here bearing the scars of this great war for democracy. Those men ought to be put in. We can amend this so that men liable to military service and who are called upon for military service shall promptly go into the military service, as other American citizens go. Then there can be no evil concealed in this law. I think that is the full purpose and scope of the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama. I think his purpose is a very proper one, and I hope he has got his amendment in such shape that we can all agree upon it with that idea in our minds.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the second part of the Robbins amendment.

Mr. ROBBINS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBBINS. I have modified the amendment, after consultation with the gentleman in charge of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for second part of the amendment offered by Mr. ROBBINS: "Provided, That no man appointed or employed or who shall hereafter be appointed or employed under this act shall on account of such employment be certified by any official or authority for deferred classification under act No. 12, Sixty-fifth Congress, entitled 'An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States,' approved May 18, 1917, or under any act amendatory thereof that has been or shall hereafter be enacted."

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the substitute for the Robbins amendment unless the amendment permits the soldiers who have been in the service and been discharged for disability, or who have been rejected on account of physical disability. I do not think we ought to put up a bar against soldiers who have been in the service and have been disabled or been honorably discharged, or put up a bar to those of military age who have been rejected by examining boards.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. My amendment will meet the situation the gentleman has in mind. It will not prevent the employment of disabled soldiers, it simply provides that no one shall be employed under this act who, on account of his employment, has been certified by deferred classification under the act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman interpret his amendment so that it would not bar anybody that should not be given a deferred classification?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Anyone could be appointed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Anybody that came back from the service could be appointed?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. He could.

Mr. HELM. I withdraw the point of order.

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

The question was taken and the substitute was agreed to.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 25, after the word "rules," insert the following: "Provided further, That wherever practicable women shall be employed in the positions herein provided for."

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, as has been suggested on the floor, these are positions in which women can perform the services very easily. Women can do the work of enumerators. It has been found that women who have been employed as tenement-house inspectors were able to do the work as efficiently as men. The detailed work necessary in these positions would be faithfully performed by women. This amendment, if adopted, would also prevent men who are needed in war work from being employed in this bureau.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that women have full right to do this work the same as men now have under the bill, without any such amendment as has been offered by the lady from Montana.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to my friend from Louisiana who has just said that women would undoubtedly be given an opportunity for employment that the fact is, however, that there are some men who prefer to employ men in work of this character, and therefore unless we provide for the appointment of women when practicable they are not likely to get the positions. Undoubtedly in some cases men will be recommended and appointed for political purposes, because of their political influence. In this time of war and stress when man power is so greatly needed on the fighting line or in the heavy, active, essential work of the war, the women of the country should be given an opportunity, so far as it is possible to do so, to do the work which they can do just as well as men. In the taking of the census women will be found as efficient and capable as men, and therefore I favor the amendment of the lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN], which provides that they shall be employed so far as is practicable.

Mr. ASWELL. They have the opportunity now, have they not?

Mr. MONDELL. They have the opportunity, but without some such suggestion as this, some expression of legislative opinion they are not likely to get the jobs.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Unless there is some advice to the appointing officers indicating the view of Congress in this matter, women are not likely to be appointed in considerable number. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASWELL. This census is to be taken in 1920, and by that time undoubtedly a large number of crippled soldiers will be here. Would the gentleman eliminate them from this work?

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all. This amendment would not eliminate crippled soldiers. So far as it is practicable to employ crippled soldiers by all manner of means they should be employed.

Mr. ASWELL. This amendment does not say anything about crippled soldiers.

Mr. MONDELL. This amendment does not relate to that particular matter. This amendment refers to the employment of women. I should be glad to have it amended to include honorably discharged soldiers.

Mr. ASWELL. Would the gentleman suggest that this Congress go on record specifying any class of citizens in work of this kind?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, yes; proper specification.

Mr. ASWELL. When all classes are admitted into this work?

Mr. MONDELL. We frequently grant preference to soldiers, and in time of war it is our duty to appoint for clerical work people who are not available for military service or heavy productive work.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I want to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill if the amendment of the lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN] would be satisfactory if we added to it "and crippled soldiers," so that it would read, "that so far as practicable, women and crippled soldiers shall be employed"?

Mr. HEFLIN. Does not the gentleman think that the amendment would be better if it said "may be employed"?

Mr. GOOD. If that would be satisfactory to the gentleman, I should be glad to so amend it.

Mr. ASWELL. If the gentleman is asking me the question, I should say that it would be entirely out of the proprieties or the

proper thing in any sense to specify any class of citizens when everyone should have a chance to do the work.

Mr. HEFLIN. It seems to me that the amendment would be better if it read "may be appointed" instead of "shall be appointed."

Mr. MONDELL. This is simply a preference. The appointing power is not compelled to appoint women exclusively. Women are to be given the preference wherever it is practicable so to do.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is it not barely possible that the women may wield some political influence about the time these offices open up?

Mr. MONDELL. I think they may, and it may prove just as wise politically to appoint women to these positions as to appoint men. This legislative suggestion will be along that line, but, apart from all political considerations, this is the time to utilize the services of the women of the country in all lines of endeavor to which they are adapted.

Mr. ALEXANDER. They have that influence in Montana now.

Mr. MONDELL. And in Wyoming.

Mr. ALEXANDER. In Wyoming.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment offered by the lady from Montana by adding the words "and disabled soldiers" after the word "women."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Good to the amendment offered by Miss RANKIN: After the word "women" insert the words "and disabled soldiers," so that the amendment as amended would read: "Provided further, That wherever practicable women and disabled soldiers shall be employed in the positions herein provided for."

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move as a substitute for the amendment of the lady from Montana and the amendment to the amendment that it read "disabled soldiers and sailors."

Mr. GOOD. I would be very glad to accept that amendment.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. My substitute goes to the amendment of the lady from Montana, and also the amendment offered to the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa, and I would strike out the amendment offered and substitute the one that I have suggested.

Mr. GOOD. I will ask the gentleman if he would not modify his amendment by including those honorably discharged.

Mr. HELM. I understand that the amendment is by way of substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That wherever practicable disabled soldiers and sailors shall be employed in the positions herein provided for.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman who offered the last amendment intend to strike out the word "women"?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to offer this as a substitute to strike out "women" and make it apply to disabled soldiers and sailors.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi as a substitute for the amendment offered by the lady from Montana: Page 2, line 25, after the word "ruled," insert the following: "Provided further, That wherever practicable disabled soldiers and sailors shall be employed in the positions herein provided for."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the lady from Montana [Miss RANKIN] has great merit. It has such merit, it seems to me, that it can not be sneered off the floor of this House in any such manner as is attempted here now. If the gentleman will send to the folding room and secure a copy of the war labor laws of Great Britain, printed under a resolution offered by Senator HOLLIS, he will find that in Great Britain the labor unions have welcomed the employment of female labor in practically all of the great munition plants and in all of the industries. Wherever women can be employed in Great Britain and in France during the war, they are employed to take the place of men. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, if adopted, will serve notice on the Director of the Census, even where practical, he must not employ women.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Because the effect of his amendment is to reject the amendment offered by the lady from Montana to utilize a

great body of women wherever practical, and that is all her amendment would accomplish.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Ought not the gentleman's amendment to have soldiers and sailors?

Mr. GOOD. I was going to add that. If this amendment is adopted, I shall ask to modify my amendment so it will read "honorably discharged soldiers and sailors." The man who is honorably discharged, who has performed his military service over there, if he can be employed to do this work, and is competent to do it and is not fully capable of doing some other and harder work, he ought to have the opportunity to be so employed. And it seems to me while this war is on we ought to utilize wherever we can the women power of America for doing this very class of work, especially clerical work, and thereby relieve the men to fight the battles of the Republic. They are all needed, and we should come to this position at once.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it not a fact this bill provides that now? There is nothing in the bill to prohibit it, and is it not the fact that women are being utilized throughout the entire country here? There is nothing in the bill to prevent that. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. I think the Congress ought to emphasize the fact that women should be employed to a greater extent than they are now, so that men not within draft age can go and take the plow and help speed up production, can take to the factory, where he can do work that women can not do so well, and I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi will be defeated.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I notice the gentleman would make a preference given to women and disabled soldiers and sailors?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Now, where would the preference come? Would women come before the disabled soldiers and sailors, or disabled soldiers and sailors before women? In other words, who will have—

Mr. GOOD. That will be left entirely to the Director of the Census.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The women will be appointed first, and then if there are any places left, give them to the soldiers and sailors?

Mr. GOOD. Not necessarily so. I take it that the Director of the Census will be a man with red blood in his veins, and if he had a job that could be performed better by a woman than by a disabled soldier or sailor, he will appoint the woman, and if the work could be done better by a disabled soldier or sailor, he will appoint him.

Mr. ASWELL. The Director of the Census makes the statement already that he intends to do that. Now, what is the use of this legislation?

Mr. GOOD. He intends to take a census, then what is the use of passing this census law?

Mr. ASWELL. You will have to have some authority to take the census—

Mr. GOOD. I think the Congress ought to direct in matters of this kind, and especially when it comes to directing as to the speeding-up program.

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

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is not the substitute in order first?

The CHAIRMAN. The rule is to perfect an amendment before voting on a substitute, and the Chair is right.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment so it will read "honorably discharged soldiers and sailors."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent—

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I agree to that amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "women" insert "disabled and honorably discharged soldiers and sailors."

Mr. GOOD. I ask to strike out "disabled" because they would be honorably discharged.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert "honorably discharged soldiers and sailors."

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, may we have that reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa should stand, an honorably discharged soldier or sailor would be in the same class as a disabled soldier or sailor honorably discharged?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think it comes within his prerogative to construe what the amendment might be, and therefore declines.

Mr. HEFLIN. But he might not be disabled while he might be included in this—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not feel called upon to construe—

Mr. HEFLIN (continuing). And be put on the same footing with the disabled.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry along the same line.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. If the amendment should be adopted then there would be no preference in the employment of women; that is, if the substitute be adopted?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Only for disabled soldiers and sailors.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not construe the law as to that.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my substitute by adding "disabled soldiers and sailors honorably discharged."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated and which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi offers to modify his amendment as follows: After the word "sailors" insert the words "honorably discharged."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi by way of substitute to the amendment offered by the lady from Montana.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GOOD. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 38, noes 35.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Miss RANKIN and Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi took their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 33, noes 45.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the lady from Montana as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 49, noes, none.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: Line 23, page 2, before the word "statistical," insert "chiefs of division."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 2, line 23, before the word "statistical," insert the words "chiefs of division."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on the statutory roll there are employed at the present time nine expert chiefs of division. Those expert chiefs of division are under the classified service. I can understand wherein the Democratic side would wish to have the appointment clerk, the assistant director, and the chief statistician, perhaps, without civil-service requirements; but still the gentleman, if he provides for statistical experts under the civil-service rule as is provided in this last sentence, should be willing to include chiefs of division. There are eight chiefs of division provided for in this bill. There can be no distinc-

tion between the respective character of the work. If statistical experts should be under classified service, certainly these chiefs of division should likewise be. And I hope the gentleman will see the consistency of supporting this amendment in view of the report of the committee favoring statistical experts being included under civil-service rules.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, you would then have in line 20 that chiefs of divisions and a private secretary should be appointed without examination by the Secretary, and in line 23 you would have chiefs of divisions, statistical experts, and stenographers to be appointed in conformity with the civil-service acts and rules.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not get the gentleman's first statement, if he will permit.

Mr. HELM. He would have chiefs of divisions in line 20 to be appointed by the director.

Mr. STAFFORD. I intend to strike those out if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. HELM. There is a broad distinction, and I hope the committee will listen to me, between the chief of a division in the Census Bureau and a statistical expert. The chief of a division such as manufactures or of agriculture takes a man of exceptional qualification and exceptional administrative ability. When one stops to think, he will see that there are about 3,000,000 manufactories in the United States, and a man to handle that volume of business is a man out of the ordinary. And take the man who handles the division of agriculture, there are 7,000,000 farmers, and if you were to examine one of these schedules, the preparation of it, and the proper handling of this schedule and the business incident to it, you would see that the chief of that division is a man who must be almost on the same plane with the director himself. He is the man who does the work, as a matter of fact. And to restrict the operations of the bureau may possibly hamper the work in some way. Now, if you want the work to proceed in a businesslike, thorough-going manner, it seems to me the best thing to do is to let the bill remain as it is. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] will be defeated.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Question, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seem to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 29, noes 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BARKLEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 12441) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MARTIN, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. GALLINGER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOURTEENTH AND SUBSEQUENT DECENNIAL CENSUSES.

The committee resumes its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. That during the decennial census period the annual compensation of the officials of the Census Office shall be as follows: The Director of the Census, \$7,500; the assistant director, \$4,500; three chief statisticians and the chief clerk, \$3,000 each; three other chief statisticians, \$3,000, and the geographer, \$2,750; the disbursing clerk, \$3,000; the appointment clerk, \$2,750; the chiefs of division, \$2,250 each; the private secretary to the director, \$2,250; the statistical experts, \$2,000 each; and the stenographers provided for in section 3 of this act, \$1,800 each.

Mr. ASWELL and Mr. GOOD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 23, after the word "clerk" strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,500"; and in line 23 strike out "three" and insert "two."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] desire to be heard?

Mr. ASWELL. If anyone wishes it, I shall offer just a word of explanation. You will notice that three statisticians, the first three referred to, are the present chiefs of divisions. They will have charge of the three great divisions during the census period; that is to say, they will have 2,000 employees each under them and be responsible for the handling of reports from 85,000 enumerators. They are the three gentlemen who have been in the service for many years. The other three statisticians, you will note, will be employed for the census period only. The bill provided for three of these. The committee discussed it very thoroughly and decided to cut out one of the three and make the number two, and give those three men who have charge of all the divisions \$3,500, and thereby in actual dollars and cents there will be a saving of \$1,500 a year. These second statisticians are really under the supervision of the first three, and the responsibility of the success of the whole census rests upon the first three gentlemen.

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

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. What do these three trained experts receive now, and what did they receive under the former census?

Mr. ASWELL. Three thousand dollars in the last decennial census.

Mr. GOOD. And you are proposing now to increase their pay \$500?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes; and cut out one of the others and reduce the sum total.

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

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. You are increasing their pay from \$3,000 to \$3,500?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is that for just the period of the census?

Mr. ASWELL. For the three years only.

Mr. WALSH. It is not permanent?

Mr. ASWELL. It is not.

Mr. WALSH. And as to the two statisticians you are providing for, instead of three, what are they going to have charge of? How many employees will they have under them?

Mr. ASWELL. They, in a way, will be under the direction of these three.

Mr. WALSH. They will really be assistants to them?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he stated that these three experts during the time we were at work in collecting the data for the last census were receiving \$3,000. Are they receiving \$3,000 now?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes; during the census period.

Mr. GOOD. They received just the same?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. There is nothing in this bill that provides that after the work of taking this census is over their salaries will be reduced.

Mr. ASWELL. This census applies to only three years.

Mr. GOOD. So far as these experts are concerned we have always appropriated for them, in the years following the census, the same salaries that they formerly received.

Mr. ASWELL. No. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GOOD. My inquiry was whether, when they were at work before, collecting the data for the last census, they received \$3,000, and the gentleman said they received that salary.

Mr. ASWELL. Yes; during the census period.

Mr. GOOD. So that they did not receive any more salary during the time they were collecting the data than they do at present?

Mr. ASWELL. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. That is true, is it not?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The chief statisticians at present get \$3,000 a year, and under the Thirteenth Census they got \$3,000 a year. This bill proposes to increase their pay \$500 during the census period, but not as permanent law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit an interruption in that particular?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not understand that it is the purpose of the Census Committee to increase the salaries of the five chief statisticians who are now on the statutory roll from \$3,000 each to \$3,500, but it is the purpose of the committee to single out for preferment three chief statisticians who shall receive \$3,500, thereby having five highly-expert chief statisticians receiving \$3,000 on the statutory roll and another temporary force of three receiving \$3,500.

Mr. ALEXANDER. No. The provisions of this bill and the salaries named in this bill apply only to the fourteenth decennial period.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, if the gentleman will permit, this bill does not seek to change the salaries of those on the statutory roll unless specific provision is made for them on the statutory roll. I find in the bill before me that the director shall receive \$6,000, and five chief statisticians at \$3,000 each. The bill provides for the appointment of three chief statisticians, and you propose to give them a salary of \$3,500, \$500 more than the Census Committee reported in the bill presented to the House for consideration.

Now, I present to the gentleman this practical situation: Here you have five chief statisticians on the statutory roll, expert men, receiving \$3,000, and besides that you give three chief statisticians at \$3,500 each, which will necessarily cause dissatisfaction, so far as the five permanent chief statisticians are concerned, if you are going to pay three, who are brought into the service and who will not equal those on the permanent roll in efficiency, \$500 more during the three-year period for taking the census.

Mr. ASWELL. The three statisticians mentioned, who are to be increased to \$3,500, are the three who are now in the office and are now the chief statisticians.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is mistaken. There are five now in the office.

Mr. ASWELL. I am speaking of the three at the head of the office.

Mr. ALEXANDER. They will have charge of the census—one of agriculture, one of manufactures, and the other of mines and quarries—and in view of the fact that they were to be in charge of this important work they felt that their salaries ought to be increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma). The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Louisiana be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. These gentlemen came before the committee and insisted that in view of the fact that they would be in charge of the work of these several divisions they ought to have the \$500 additional pay, and instead of authorizing three other statistical experts we concluded, if that were true, that we would cut out one of them and add the \$500 to their pay, which would result in a net saving so far as that was concerned of \$500 and at the same time yield to their request, which we regarded as reasonable, to increase their pay during the census period \$500 per year. That is all there is to it.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I see this section provides for three chief statisticians and three other chief statisticians. That apparently makes six chief statisticians down there.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana cuts the three to two, as I understand.

Mr. WALSH. That is, instead of three others there are to be only two others?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And the three chief statisticians were each to get \$3,500?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. We cut out one of the others.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The amendment cuts out one of the other three.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment. I know how enthusiastic Members of Congress become when sitting around a table, as the committee reporting out this bill sat around the table and heard the statement of the cost of these expert statisticians. I have been amazed, at hearings that I have attended for several years, to find the comparatively small salaries received by expert men in the employment of the Government. I have been surprised to learn of the small salaries that able lawyers in the employment of the Government receive. Since I have heard these statements for several years and have come in contact with many of these men, I have felt that we sometimes slop over, so to speak, when we talk about the underpaid clerks here in the departments at Washington. I know that the hearings before the committee on the legislative, executive, and judicial bill have disclosed the fact that men at the head of bureaus, experts, statisticians, and lawyers, hundreds of them, who are employed in all the different branches

of the Government, are receiving very low salaries. I think many of them are underpaid, and that their salaries ought to be increased. I should be glad to engage in the work with the proper committee to revise the statutory salaries. But when the Subcommittee on Appropriations considered the legislative, executive, and judicial bill they found that in every department of the Government, including the Census Department, estimates were made for increases in the salaries of this very class of men. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] stood out and contested every one of these claims.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. The increases to which the gentleman refers did not apply to this case.

Mr. GOOD. They are the same character of men, even to the director himself. They are the same class of men in all the departments of the Government. I was about to say that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] had a job on his hands that lasted for 60 days, in declining all of these increases, and he did it on the theory that during this war there should be a substantial increase for those in the Government service who received salaries up to \$2,000, but that we would not grant any increase to officials whose salaries were over \$2,000. Now, in this amendment that the gentleman has offered, you are increasing the salary of the chief clerk \$1,000. He now receives \$2,500 a year, and you propose to increase his salary \$1,000. He received only \$2,500 during the last census.

Mr. ASWELL. I call attention to the fact that this bill is merely an authorization.

Mr. GOOD. So was the last census bill.

Mr. ASWELL. It refers it to the Committee on Appropriations to decide. It is not an order at all, but an authorization.

Mr. GOOD. In the hearings, on page 9, you have set out the last authorization bill, and that, as I understand it, carries \$2,500 for the chief clerk.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate in his statement.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I do.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The chief clerk during the taking of the Thirteenth Census received \$3,000. If the gentleman will turn to page 74 he will see the table there—

Mr. GOOD. I call the gentleman's attention to page 12 of the hearings, where I got my information. Section 5 reads as follows:

That during the decennial census period the annual compensation of the officials for the Census Office shall be as follows: Director of the Census, \$7,000; Assistant Director, \$5,000; three chief statisticians, at \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,500.

It was estimated that he should receive \$4,000. I am reading from the law. I can not tell about the gentleman's table, nor am I informed as to the amount subsequently appropriated. We are only concerned now with authorizations.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think the explanation of it is this: That in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill the chief clerk's salary was increased during the decennial census period to \$3,000. That was the explanation given to us, as I recall it.

Mr. GOOD. That may be true. The gentleman may be right.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. But the law that we enacted, the authorization, was for \$2,500.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. And this is an increase of \$1,000 over the authorization in the last law, according to this report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. I make these observations for this reason. In about three months we will have a new legislative bill to report. What does Congress want that committee to do in regard to salaries of this class of employees? Shall we increase the salaries of these very worthy men who now receive \$3,000 to \$3,500? Shall we reverse the policy of this Congress, where we declined to give these increases? We should be just and fair in our dealings with Government employees.

It was not long ago that I read somewhere in a platform of a political party about the salaries of these people that deplete the Treasury of the United States. I want to say to you now, without a tinge of politics, without any thought but interest of the Treasury and justice to the employees, that our decision should rest on a sound business proposition. We ought not

now to increase the salaries of any of these men \$500 a year, taking in view what the people are doing to put money into the Treasury of the United States. But if we increase the pay of one we should at the same time consider the claims of all employees of the same class.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, to move to strike out the last word. If this amendment were not so vital to the salaries of all the highly paid officials of this Government I would not attempt to supplement the argument advanced by my colleague on the subcommittee of the legislative, judicial, and appropriation bill. As stated by him, our subcommittee was beset from the beginning of the hearings lasting two months with demands for increased salaries to these higher-paid officials, based upon the fact that their work had been increased by our entering the war. Our subcommittee, supported by the full committee and approved by this House, adopted the policy that we would not in this time of stress and strain, when we needed money so badly to carry on this great war, increase the salaries of these highly paid officials. In every instance we continued the salaries despite the urgent appeals of the heads of departments, despite the appeal of the Secretary of State in person, despite the appeal of the Attorney General in person, and allowed the salaries of the higher-paid officials to stand as they were.

Now, what does the committee do as far as the chief clerk of the bureau, who is only receiving \$2,500, is concerned? They propose to give him an increase of \$1,000, or \$3,500, on the plea that his work will be increased during the census period, and yet the chief clerk of the department, charged with greater responsibilities, tenfold over than this clerk, an able man, receives only \$3,000. You are under the guise of exigency because he has a little different work, giving the chief clerk of the bureau \$500 more, an increase of \$1,000, and demoting, in fact, the chief clerk that has grave responsibilities in the department, allowing his salary to remain at \$3,000.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. I am sure the gentleman does not want to insist on an error. We are not increasing the salary of this clerk \$1,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. The chief clerk receives \$2,500. I have it here in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. ASWELL. The gentleman is correct in that, but I am not discussing what he is getting now, I am discussing the census period of 1910.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not made any statement as to the census period of 1910; my whole argument has been in harmony with the suggestion proposed to give this chief clerk a salary of \$3,500. The chief clerk of the department, Mr. Johannes, a most capable and efficient man, is receiving only \$3,000, and you are leaving his salary at \$3,000. I submit to this House whether you should single out this clerk and show him the favoritism when at this time Congress by a set policy has said that the higher salaries should not be increased during this period of war.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take it that everybody is in favor of saving money. That has been the cry, and yet when it gets down to the point of saving it we find that many who talk about it seem to be unwilling to do it. Gentlemen of the committee, if you are in favor of saving money, you are in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. The three clerks whose compensation it is intended to increase by this amendment are men who will be intrusted with the discharge of duties of a nature and responsibility which, I think, you will agree merits the increase of salary proposed in the amendment. One of these gentlemen will have 2,000 men working under him, another approximately 2,000, and the other at least 1,000.

The proposition is that in place of giving three statisticians \$3,000 each, we cut out one of them, which will make two instead of three. In that way you will save \$3,000 by disposing of the salary of one man. You can then add \$500 to the salaries of each of the three chief statisticians, increasing their salaries to \$3,500, and by that operation you save \$1,500. If you are in favor of saving money, and at the same time favor paying efficient men what their services are worth, you have the chance to do so.

If you vote against the amendment, you vote to squander, as it were, \$1,500 more, and if you vote in favor of the amendment, you vote to save \$1,500, and at the same time provide adequate compensation for men who are in responsible positions.

Mr. GOOD. Then if we really want to save money we can demand a division of the amendment and vote down the first part and vote in the second part of the amendment.

Mr. LARSEN. I do not think you could do that, but perhaps you can.

Mr. GOOD. That is the way we could save money, and I hope we will do it. I demand a division of the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I understand this is a committee amendment, and I desire to compliment the committee and the distinguished members upon the unique policy and theory they have advanced here for saving money. They recommend that we have three chief statisticians and a chief clerk, and then three other chief statisticians. If there was no need for the three other chief statisticians, why did the committee recommend it, and if there is need of but two chief statisticians, why not eliminate one of the three recommended, and if you do eliminate one of them, why should we tack on a part of the salary of that one to the three others, who are already getting a salary which is commensurate with the duties they will be called upon to perform? Gentlemen talk about one of these three chief statisticians having one or two thousand men under his charge. Various other employees of the Government have that number under them.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. They not only have 2,000 men in the office force, but those three gentlemen are responsible for the work of 80,000 men in the field, in collecting and arranging facts as the facts are brought in.

Mr. WALSH. The responsibility will be principally of a directory nature, it will not increase their work one-tenth, and if it does, they have been appointed to these positions and they know what their duties are. They have been given sufficient funds to equip their office so that they can perform this work in an efficient manner, and it should not be a condition attached to their positions that when we happen to take the census they should have their compensations increased during the census period. I submit this is no way of saving money—to bring in a bill and call for three officials when only two are needed, and then lop off one of them and divide up part of his salary among three others whom they say they do need. I trust the amendment will be defeated and that when we come to consider the other chief statisticians we will reduce them to two. The member of the committee who has offered this amendment has admitted here that they need but two other chief statisticians. That being the case, I submit the committee ought to ask that that number be reduced, and we ought not to establish the precedent here, as it is sought to be established for other bills, of increasing these higher-paid officials of the Government. The exigency of this work is nothing compared with the importance of the work done by other officials of the Government in various other departments more intimately associated with the crisis in which this country now finds itself. We have not sought to increase the compensation of chief clerks or the statisticians or the experts in other lines of activity in the Government in any such amount as this.

Mr. ASWELL. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the Bureau of the Census the highest-paid man is receiving a salary only of \$3,000, except the director.

Mr. WALSH. But you are increasing the salary in this measure.

Mr. ASWELL. Certainly; those three gentlemen will have added responsibilities.

Mr. WALSH. Now, if these gentlemen in the Bureau of the Census have only duties arduous enough to keep them employed \$3,000 worth of their valuable time during periods between the census, I submit that we might reduce the force instead of keeping them on the pay roll.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Does the gentleman know that the Bureau of the Census has already lost most of its best men because of the higher salaries paid in other departments?

Mr. WALSH. Well, I understand we have a law which prevents them from being transferred to other departments.

Mr. ASWELL. But the fact is that the Bureau of the Census has lost probably all its best men, who either went into the lump-sum appropriation or else went out of the service altogether.

Mr. WALSH. That may be, Mr. Chairman, but the salaries we provide in this bill will bring an army of experts out of the wilds and woods that will more than fill the Census Bureau up three or four times, because they are going to have all sorts of experts, statisticians, theorists, economists, and a salary of \$3,500 or \$3,000 will look very alluring to those gentlemen who have been obliged to work at much less than that in the past.

Mr. ASWELL. I call attention to the fact that some of these men coming out of the woods come from Boston.

Mr. WALSH. Then it is high enough salaries for them, too, whether they come from Boston as experts or whether they come from New Orleans.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa demands a division of the amendment. The question will be taken on the first part of the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 23, after the word "clerk," strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,500."

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. ASWELL.) there were—ayes 10, noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the second part of the amendment.

Mr. KEARNS. Let us have that read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second part of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

And, in line 23, strike out the word "three" and insert "two."

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move, line 21, to strike out "\$7,500" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$7,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 21, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$7,000."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is the salary of \$7,500, proposed in line 21, the salary which he is now receiving?

Mr. GOOD. He is now receiving \$6,000.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This proposes an increase of \$1,500?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; it proposes an increase of \$1,500 over the present salary, and if I am correctly informed an increase of \$500 over the salary that the last Director of the Census received.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Director of the Thirteenth Census got \$7,000 and the Director of the Twelfth Census got \$7,500.

Mr. GOOD. If the amendment which I have offered is adopted, the Director of the Census during the time required to take the census will receive the same salary that the last Director of the Census received during the time he was taking the census.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is right.

Mr. GOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit this is not the time to increase the salary of the Director of the Census so that he will receive \$1,500 a year more than United States judges of district courts receive. Some of the very best men in the United States give their time and legal ability acquired after years of experience and training for \$6,000 a year. Now it is proposed to pay the Director of the Census an increase of \$500 a year over the amount paid when the last census was taken.

If we are to do this with regard to the Director of the Census, who is an able and a very agreeable man, why should we not increase the salaries of all officials of the Government and pay them increased salaries during this period of the war? We have just decided that these experts, these statisticians, must work at the same salaries that they received when the last census was taken. Let us not adopt a different policy so far as the Director of the Census is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That in addition to the force hereinbefore provided for and to that authorized by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year immediately preceding the decennial census period, there may be employed in the Census Office during the decennial census period, and no longer, as many clerks with salaries at the rates of \$1,920, \$1,800, \$1,680, \$1,560, \$1,440, \$1,380, \$1,320, \$1,260, \$1,200, \$1,140, \$1,080, \$1,020, \$960, and \$900; 1 engineer at \$1,200 and 2 photostat operators at \$1,200 each; as many skilled laborers, with salaries at the rate of not less than \$720 nor more than \$1,000 per annum; and as many messengers, assistant messengers, messenger boys, watchmen, unskilled laborers, and charwomen as may be found necessary for the proper and prompt performance of the duties herein required; these additional clerks and employees to be appointed by the Director of the Census: *Provided*, That the total number of such

additional clerks with salaries at the rate of \$1,440 or more per annum shall at no time exceed 150: *Provided further*, That employees engaged in the compilation or tabulation of statistics by the use of mechanical devices may be compensated on a piece-price basis to be fixed by the director.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee offers the following amendment: Page 4, line 9, after the word "clerks," strike out all down to and including the word "each" in line 13 and insert the words "of classes 4, 3, 2, and 1; and on line 21 strike out, after the word "clerks," down to and including the word "annum" in line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the words "of classes 2, 3, and 4."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to say only a word in reference to this amendment. If this amendment is adopted it will restore the provision which was carried in the law of 1909, and I hope the gentleman in charge of the bill will accept it. This section as drawn proposes for a portion of the Census Bureau employees a radical change in the system of classification which has prevailed in the various departments and bureaus here in Washington for the last 20 years, possibly. Under present classification, clerks are divided into classes of 1, 2, 3, and 4, paying salaries of \$1,200, \$1,400, \$1,600, and \$1,800, respectively. This provision as written in this bill would change that classification, not as to the entire bureau, but simply as to those clerks who are employed during the decennial period of three years. In other words, we would have in the Census Bureau one class of clerks under the old classification and another set of clerks with the salary set forth in this provision, and it would necessarily create confusion in the drafting of the appropriation bill which will provide for the payment of these clerks.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. This provision gave me much trouble, because I have never familiarized myself with the classification of clerks and their pay. But on page 13 of the hearings this committee appointed by the director makes this observation:

Under the scheme of classification provided by section 6 as amended, the clerical salaries, starting with \$900, advance in increments of \$60 up to \$1,440 and thereafter by increments of \$120 up to \$1,920. This increase in the number of salary classes for clerks is considered desirable because it will make possible a more equitable adjustment of the salary to the varying degrees of merit and efficiency in the work of the clerks and will also permit more frequent promotions, thus tending to improve the morale and efficiency of the force. A small increase in salary carries with it a recognition of merit, the moral effect of which upon the clerk is hardly less than that of a considerably larger increase. The salary classification here advocated has already been adopted in some branches of the Government service and is substantially the same as that recommended several years ago by the committee on departmental methods commonly known as the Keep committee.

The gentleman is more familiar with that than I am.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say that the gentleman who made that statement is entirely in error, because there is not a department of this Government that has adopted this system of classification. The Director of the Census for the last two or three years has come before the subcommittee on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill and made a proposition of this kind. I have said before on the floor of this House that I hope the time will come when Congress will take up the question of reclassifying the clerks and do it upon a scientific basis, and make it apply to all the departments and all the bureaus of the Government; and I hope that will be done as soon as this war is over. But I am opposed to undertaking to do that by piecemeal and making it apply to a portion of one bureau.

The gentleman who made the statement just read by the gentleman from Missouri is entirely in error, because, so far as I know, there is not a department in this Government which has not operated and is not operating under the old classification, which has existed for 20 years. And the only object I have in proposing this amendment is simply to prevent confusion in the drafting of the appropriation bills. And that, I think, was the controlling reason of the subcommittee which has reported the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bills here in declining the recommendation of the Director of the Census.

Now, this bill does not apply to the regular employees. The gentleman refers to the fact that this would afford a more ready means and a more equitable means of promotion. As a matter of fact, it would bring about confusion and discrimination in the bureau, for at the same desk possibly there would be clerks who would be serving under the present classification of 1, 2, 3, and 4, and to which I have referred. It ought to apply to all the clerks or none. Therefore I think, gentle-

men, that in the interest of order and to the end that the Congress may know what it is doing when your appropriation bill comes in here next December this amendment ought to be adopted. If it is adopted, it will restore the provision which was carried in the bill of 1909.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to be in any way at cross-purposes with the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, and I think that my position is thoroughly understood by those who are associated with me on that committee. I endeavored to impress my views on the committee in drafting the bill. I think I am not transgressing any rule of propriety by saying that I was opposed to all increases in salaries in the drafting of this bill.

I believe that what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has said is correct, in that this departure from the usual method of classification and compensation to clerical employees will create confusion. We undertook to bring out that feature of the situation at the hearing, and we were assured, as I recall it—and I think my recollection is clear—that it would not disconcert the appropriations as stated by the gentleman from Tennessee, but on the contrary that several of the departments or bureaus, or subdivisions of some of the departments, had adopted this method. For my part, I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will carry. I have on several occasions addressed the House in opposition to proposed increases of salaries during the war in other bills, and have voted against all such proposals; for the same reasons I shall oppose the proposed increases in this bill. No Member of the House could justify a vote increasing his own salary during the continuance of the war; for the same reason I do not believe he is justified in voting to increase the salary of any civilian employee of the Government, except in the rarest instances.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the lady from Montana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss RANKIN: Page 5, line 2, after the word "director," insert:

"Provided, That, whenever possible, women and honorably discharged soldiers and sailors shall be employed in the positions herein provided for."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. STAFFORD. When the amendment offered by the lady from Montana was adopted to the prior section it was stated that it was after the word "rules," in line 25, on page 2. I believe it should have been offered to follow the amendment just adopted, offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]. The gentleman from Michigan offered an amendment not to exempt any of these persons from military duty, and then the lady from Montana offered her amendment. The way it was offered the amendment read to follow the word "rules," on line 25.

Mr. HELM. Anything to oblige the lady from Montana.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the lady from Montana should follow the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan that was adopted, instead of following the word "rules," in line 25, page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has already been inserted in that way. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That the additional clerks and other employees provided for by section 6 shall be subject to such special test examinations as the Director of the Census may prescribe, the said examinations to be conducted by the United States Civil Service Commission, to be open to all applicants without regard to political party affiliations, and to be held at such places in each State as may be designated by the Civil Service Commission. Certifications shall be made by the Civil Service Commission upon request of the Director of the Census from the eligible registers so established, in conformity with the law of apportionment as now provided for the classified service, in the order of rating: *Provided*, That the requirement as to conformity with the law of apportionment shall not apply to messenger boys, unskilled laborers, and charwomen: *Provided further*, That hereafter all examinations of applicants for positions in the Census Office from any State or Territory, shall be had in the State or Territory in which such applicant resides, and no person shall be eligible for such examination or appointment unless he or she shall have been actually domiciled in such State or Territory for at least one year previous to such examination: *Provided further*, That the Civil Service Commission may hold examinations for positions in such service of applicants temporarily absent from the place of their legal residence or domicile in the District of Columbia and elsewhere

in the United States where examinations are usually held upon proof satisfactory to the commission that such applicant is a bona fide resident of the State or Territory in which such applicant claims to have a legal residence or domicile: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be so construed as to abridge the existing law or apportionment or change the requirements of existing law as to legal residence or domicile of such applicants: *And provided further*, That no person afflicted with tuberculosis shall be appointed and that each applicant for appointment shall accompany his or her application with a certificate of health from some reputable physician: *And provided further*, That in no instance shall more than one person be appointed from the same family: *And provided further*, That when the exigencies of the service require, the director may appoint for temporary employment not exceeding six months' duration from the aforesaid list of eligibles those who, by reason of residence or other conditions, are immediately available, and may also appoint for not exceeding six months' duration persons having had previous experience in operating mechanical appliances in census work whose efficiency records in operating such appliances are satisfactory to him, and may accept such records in lieu of the civil-service examination: *And provided further*, That employees in other branches of the departmental classified service who have had previous experience in census work may be transferred without examination to the Census Office to serve during the whole or a part of the decennial census period, and at the end of such service the employees so transferred shall be eligible to appointment to positions in any department held by them at date of transfer to the Census Office without examination: *And provided further*, That during the decennial census period, and no longer, the Director of the Census may fill vacancies in the permanent force of the Census Office by the promotion or transfer of clerks or other employees employed on the temporary force authorized by section 6 of this act: *And provided further*, That at the expiration of the decennial census period the term of service of all employees so transferred and of all other temporary officers and employees appointed under the provisions of this act shall terminate, and such officers and employees shall not be eligible to appointment or transfer into the classified service of the Government by virtue of their examination or appointment under this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first proviso at the top of page 7.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 7, line 1, strike out the proviso beginning on line 1 and ending on line 9, which reads as follows:

"And provided further, That employees in other branches of the departmental classified service who have had previous experience in census work may be transferred without examination to the Census Office to serve during the whole or a part of the decennial census period, and at the end of such service the employees so transferred shall be eligible to appointment to positions in any department held by them at date of transfer to the Census Office without examination."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in moving to strike out that proviso is to put a stop to the very objectionable practice that has been indulged in by these new bureaus that have been established in competing with the various established departments in trying to secure their best employees at higher wages or salaries. The one major complaint that we have found in considering the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill has been that these new bureaus—the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, the Bureau of Food Administration, and the Bureau of Fuel Administration—have gone into the old departmental service and have offered to the clerks additional salaries, so that they would leave their former employment, causing disorganization in the permanent force of the old departmental service.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it not a fact that recent legislation has corrected that, and that whole matter is stopped? They can not be transferred at an increase of salary at all now.

Mr. STAFFORD. That practice was called to the attention of the President, because it became critical to the welfare of the public service.

Mr. ASWELL. It has been stopped.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has been stopped; but here you are permitting that very character of employment.

Mr. ASWELL. Not at increased salaries. The existing law prohibits increased salaries.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, under the Executive order, to correct that situation, the prohibition was made not only against the transfer at increased salaries but there was an absolute prohibition denying the right of any new bureau or department to secure the services of a clerk in the other departments without the full approval of the head of the bureau or department where the clerk was employed.

Mr. ASWELL. It does not have anything to do with that order.

Mr. STAFFORD. This authorizes the Census Office to go into any department of the Government and offer the employees higher salaries.

Mr. ASWELL. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is there anything that prevents it? Where is there anything in this bill that prevents the head of

the Census Office going into other departments and claiming the transfer of other clerks at higher salaries?

Mr. ASWELL. It is impossible under existing Executive order.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not possible under existing Executive order. The existing Executive order forbids the transfer of any clerk from one department to another new bureau or establishment. Now, here, by legislation—

Mr. ASWELL. It is forbidden by existing law now.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not hear the gentleman when I am talking myself.

Mr. ASWELL. I say it is forbidden by existing law now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, by this provision you are authorizing that very thing which the President found it was necessary to stop by Executive order.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. HELM. Much of the criticism that the gentleman refers to is absolutely correct. That is to say, some of the war bureaus have practiced some very gross improprieties in taking clerks from other departments by offering them higher salaries. No bureau in the Government has suffered more from that practice than the Census Bureau. Twenty or thirty of the best men in the Census Bureau have been drafted by these war bureaus in order really to show them how to perform the work that they were appointed to do. Now, so far as the gentleman's criticism was directed against that, he is correct; but this provision is to permit those who have heretofore been connected with the Census Bureau and are not otherwise employed—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no—otherwise employed.

Mr. HELM. Any man who knows the temperament of the departmental clerk as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin knows that a man who is in another department is not going into the Census Department at less compensation.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; at more compensation.

Mr. HELM. How is he going to get it? You have restored classes 4, 3, 2, and 1.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; there is nothing that prevents the Director of the Bureau of the Census—

Mr. HELM. These are clerical positions, and these men will come from class 1 in the Treasury Department into class 1 in the Census Bureau; they will come out of class 2 in any other department into class 2 in the Census Bureau; they will come out of class 3 in some other department and go into class 3 in the Census Bureau. There is nothing here to justify the criticism of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing in the bill that provides that these clerks who are now employed in one department shall be transferred to the other in the same class. If there were any such provision, there would not be the incentive for a person in one department to seek a transfer to the Census Bureau, where he has had prior experience in that line. The very purpose is that he may get back into the Census Bureau at an increased compensation, disorganizing the departmental service, of which I have complained, and the gentleman says my complaint is a just one. That is the one thing which I wish to warn against. We do not want to let the Census Bureau compete with other departments which have certain employees formerly employed in the Census Bureau.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Would the trouble that the gentleman from Wisconsin points out be remedied by an amendment like this—that no employee so transferred shall receive a higher salary than he is now receiving?

Mr. ASWELL. They can not, for a year afterwards, now.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Did the gentleman from Missouri rise to answer my question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has the floor. I understand the abuse sought to be stopped by Executive order was by transfer to other parts of the service where provision was made by lump-sum appropriation to pay the clerks. Could that abuse exist under this proviso? If they come into the employ of the Bureau of the Census, they would not come in under the lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes. I do not pretend to know the bill better than the gentlemen who have reported it, but all of these employees for the period of the census will be provided for by lump-sum appropriations, and, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, they will have to be in class 1, class 2, class 3, or class 4, and there will be nothing to prevent a clerk in the Navy Department, receiving \$1,400, from going to the Bureau of Census and receiving \$1,600 after his transfer to the Bureau of Census. The vice that appealed to the Executive and caused him to put a bar to that practice is being lowered by the proviso.

Mr. ALEXANDER. This was in a section of the bill of 1910.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the conditions then were not so pressing as they are to-day. One department should not be allowed to take the clerks of another department by offering them an increase of pay of \$200, \$400, and sometimes as high as \$600, to be paid out of a lump-sum appropriation, as has been indulged in by some of these new bureaus. This proviso would lift that bar and enable that practice, so far as the Census Bureau is concerned, to be continued.

Mr. GILLETT. Would not that also be disrespectful to the President, for is it not repealing his Executive order as applied to the bureau?

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no question about that, but I would not charge the Democratic Party with being disrespectful to the President.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is in the existing law and we did not disturb it. Would not the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Michigan cure that?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; it would not. It would not prevent them at any time increasing the salary to a higher grade.

Mr. ASWELL. The existing law provides that clerks can not be transferred and the salary increased within 12 months thereafter.

Mr. STAFFORD. But this law supersedes that, and you ought not to be allowed to disorganize one department by another.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a violent disagreement as to the interpretation of this section. I think if it is going to be correctly interpreted we should have a larger attendance, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. HELM. Will not the gentleman withhold it until we dispose of the amendment to this section?

Mr. WALSH. I will withhold the point temporarily, to see if we can not get the situation smoothed out.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 9, after the word "nation," add the following words: "but no employee so transferred shall within one year after such transfer receive a higher salary than he is receiving at the time of the transfer."

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

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

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing two pages of a statement of the Federal reserve bank of the fifth district relative to cotton loans.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee presented a conference report on the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for printing under the rule.

AEROPLANES.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in reference to the production of aeroplanes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will it consist of the gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. CRAMTON. In part, but it will include also a statement which I think will be of general interest to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. By a Government official or by an outsider?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say that there is no official objection to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 26, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FIELDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 401) requesting the Board of Managers of National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to report to the House of Representatives conditions at the soldiers' home in Virginia and reasons for separation of Joseph S. Smith from the governorship, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 691), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 392) requesting information as to the number of men in the service of the Food Administrator and Fuel Administrator who are within the draft age, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 692), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12557) for the relief of Sylvester Hannan, alias Henry Edwards, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 690), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FIELDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1766) to authorize the President to appoint Col. L. Mervin Maus to the grade of brigadier general in the United States Army and place him on the retired list, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 693), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12558) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 29, 1906, entitled "An act to establish a bureau of immigration and naturalization and to provide a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 12559) to punish the injuring and destruction of property essential to the national defense as acts of treason, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 402) requesting the Secretary of War to furnish certain information regarding the taking of pictures of the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 12560) granting a pension to Carl F. Gatterdam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 12561) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Tehan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 12562) to correct the military record of John G. Day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12563) to correct the military record of Thomas C. Tulley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 12564) granting a pension to Anna Hohndorf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 12565) granting an increase of pension to Magdalena Klein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Washington State Federation of Women's Clubs, urging war prohibition, the submission of the suffrage amendment, and the repeal of the postal-zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), letter from Obeur-Dixon Brokerage Co., Kansas City, Mo., against the Jones amendment; also the statement of Henry M. Leland, president Lincoln Motor Car Co., and 11 other leading business men, of Detroit, Mich., urging the adoption of the Jones amendment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), resolution of the executive board of the New York State Woman Suffrage Party, urging that military rank be conferred upon our nursing corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petitions of the West Michigan Conference of Seventh Day Adventists and of the Women's Clubs of Christopher, Ill., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of citizens of Pitman, Camden, and Sewell, N. J., urging nation-wide prohibition during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petitions of members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Clinton Junction; Congregational Church, Elkhorn; Baptist Church, Mukwonago; Seventh Day Baptist Church, Milton; Presbyterian Church, Janesville; Janesville Baptist Association; Walworth County Baptist Association; Good Samaritan Lodge, No. 135, Free, Ancient, and Accepted Masons, Clinton Junction; Women's Christian Temperance Union, Springfield; Daughters of the American Revolution Chapter, Elkhorn; Rebekah Lodge No. 59, Orfordville; Wauega Lodge No. 76, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Orfordville; Federation of Women, Janesville; trustees Beloit College, Beloit; all in the State of Wisconsin, urging Congress to immediately enact legislation to provide for war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of citizens of the twenty-second district of Ohio, protesting against the zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolutions of Bethany Methodist Episcopal Church, of Vancouver, Wash., favoring prohibition of the manufacture of alcoholic liquors during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Petitions of 35 citizens of Araret and of Thompson, Pa., for the repeal of the postal-zone rate postal bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Telegraphic petition of First Methodist Church, of Pasadena, Cal., for war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Petitions of S. J. Veitch, Mable W. Parker, Mrs. W. L. Distin, Ella B. Distin, Fred J. Tooker, Francis S. Podmore, Mrs. E. Cassavaugh, S. G. Hefelbower, Aminta E. Hitchins, Anna E. H. Hefelbower, Mrs. Helen Spaulding, Mrs. Ina Vandenburg, Mrs. Amelia E. White, Willis P. White, Mrs. M. Keene, Mrs. B. Tenison, Mrs. J. A. Baker, Mrs. W. J. Baker, Mrs. William Layhee, Miss Viola Layhee, Miss Roy Dickinson, all of Saranac Lake, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of "The Prospectors," of Saranac Lake, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Brier Hill, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the First Presbyterian Church of Heuvelton, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions for war prohibition from various residents of the thirty-third district, New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, June 26, 1918.

(Legislative day of Monday, June 24, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Harding	Martin	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Hardwick	Nelson	Smoot
Borah	Henderson	New	Sterling
Brandeege	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Calder	Holls	Nugent	Swanson
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Thomas
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Thompson
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Tillman
Dillingham	Kellogg	Polindexter	Trammell
Fall	Kenyon	Pomerene	Underwood
France	King	Ransdell	Vardaman
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Reed	Wadsworth
Gallinger	Knox	Sheppard	Walsh
Gerry	Lenroot	Sherman	Warren
Gore	Lewis	Shields	Watson
Gronna	McCumber	Simmons	Weeks
Guion	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Hale	McNary	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. SHEPPARD. The senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is detained by illness, and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] is absent on official business.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] are detained on official business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague, Mr. FLETCHER, on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

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

OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF RAILROADS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Acting Director General of Railroads in response to a resolution (S. Res. 258) of the Senate of the 6th instant, which will be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The communication is as follows:

DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILROADS,
Washington, June 21, 1918.

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

SIR: In compliance with the resolution of the Senate of June 6, 1918, I beg to reply as follows:

(1) No action has been taken in regard to taking over as part of the Railroad Administration any of the stockyards of the country.

As to the stockyards railways, the present view of the Railroad Administration is that in general it will be in the public interest for the Government not to exercise control of such railways, since they are either wholly or largely plant facilities for the stockyards service. The allowances made to such stockyards railways will, however, be carefully scrutinized to see that they are not excessive. It is believed that an adequate and nondiscriminatory service can be secured without Federal control of these railways.

In a few cases the stockyards railways may be so extensive and may serve so many industries, other than the stockyards and packing houses, as to make such railways an integral part of the general terminal facilities of the United States Railroad Administration and necessitate their retention in Federal control. The Chicago Junction Railway, which has 220 miles of track and serves many other industries, is of this class.

These questions at present are receiving careful study, and a specific answer as to the permanent status of these stockyards railways in respect of Federal control can not be made until the study shall be completed.

(2) It is believed that the Director General of Railroads has not authority under existing laws to take over stockyards. The authority under which the roads were taken over by the President is derived from the act approved August 29, 1916, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," and the power is limited to systems of transportation or parts