

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Proceedings and Debates of the 66th Congress
LD-4 (Rev. Nov. 78)

HOUSE

BILL H. R. 9783

DATE April, 10, 1920 PAGE(S) 5492, 3

ACTION Remarks

(c) Expenditure of abnormal or quasi war character arising out of temporary obligations, such as the maintenance of an adequate force in the eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea until peaceful conditions are established in those regions, estimated to cost about \$500,000, and

(d) The maintenance during the calendar year of a fleet of 131,000 men strength which, in the opinion of the Board of Admiralty, can be regarded as providing in present circumstances for the security of the Empire.

Owing to the great increase of salaries, pay, wages, and pensions, and in the prices of materials of every description since 1914, a direct comparison with the previous estimates is of little value. An analysis, however, of the gross expenditure of £26,490,181 estimated to be incurred in 1920-21 shows that it can be approximately divided into—

(a) Nonrecurrent war liabilities & terminal charges.....	£19,077,000
(b) Recurrent expenditure, due to war conditions; e. g., increases in prices and in rates of wages, pensions, etc., and separation allowances.....	40,023,000
(c) Normal expenditure on basis of prewar rates and prices.....	37,489,981

On this basis, the following comparison of the gross estimate for 1914-15 with the gross estimate for 1920-21 can be made.

1914-15.	
Gross estimate.....	£52,373,261
Deduct amount for new construction.....	18,373,000
	33,999,261
1920-21.	
Gross estimate.....	96,500,181
Deduct war liabilities, including new construction.....	£19,077,000
Deduct recurrent expenditures due to war conditions.....	40,023,200
	59,100,200
	37,489,981

The increase of approximately £2,200,000 over the provision required in 1914-15 is due mainly to the following causes:

- The grant of clothing allowances to men of the fleet.
- Provision of larger hospital ships.
- The extension of scientific research and of technical training.
- Reduction in the hours worked by the industrial staff.
- Increase in non-effective charges.

The above comparison takes no account of the greater extent to which stocks will be used without replacement during 1920-21, as compared with 1914-15. Against this, however, must be set the fact that a considerable expenditure will be incurred in 1920-21 in building up reserves of victualing and clothing stores, medical stores, oil fuel, and in the provision of new types of shell and ammunition consequent on experience gained in the early part of the war.

The number that we propose shall be voted in vote A for the maximum number of the personnel of the fleet to be borne on any day during the financial year is 136,000, as compared with 151,000 in 1914-15. The numbers at the date of the armistice were 467,316, and by November, 1919, had been reduced to 137,000. The actual number required for the reduced fleet which it is proposed to maintain during the year is 127,569; but the provision under vote B for the pay of the fleet has been based on the assumption that 131,000 officers and men will still be borne at the end of the year, as it can not be expected that all those who are surplus to our reduced requirements can be disposed of during 1920-21.

There is great difficulty in suddenly effecting large decreases or increases in naval personnel, and the reduction of over 25,000 officers and men in the 17-months from last November to April, 1921, will, if accomplished, as we hope, be a remarkable feat. It must be remembered that the crew of a ship is made up of numerous small groups of individuals of many trades—gunners ratings, torpedo ratings, engine-room ratings, signal ratings, electricians, armorers, mechanics of many kinds, and so on, each group possesses entirely distinct qualifications and having an entirely distinct duty, but each absolutely essential to the fighting efficiency of the ship. In every adjustment of naval personnel provision has to be made for each of these numerous branches of skilled men to be kept up to strength in every ship all over the world, any attempt to wash out naval personnel with a broad brush at once immobilizes far more units of the fleet than was ever intended.

The time is opportune for an explanation of some of the principal decisions which the board of admiralty have taken and of the motives by which they have been guided while framing these estimates which may, perhaps, be unexpected in spite of the considerable provision for war commitments which they embody as the first of the new series of peace estimates. I therefore append some notes on naval policy and a note on dockyard policy. It should be understood that these statements do not purport to be exhaustive even of the decisions already taken, still less of the matters which are engaging the attention of the board.

The statement which I issued on December 1 last to accompany the estimates for 1919-20 (Ld. 451) contained a summary of naval activities since the armistice. I have thought it unnecessary to present any detailed record of the work of the Navy and Admiralty during the short period which has since elapsed

ADMIRALTY, March 12, 1921.

WALTER H. LONG.

THE BUDGET.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes for the purpose of asking a question or two on this very subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, during the last presidential campaign both the Democratic and Republican Parties put a solemn plank in their national platforms promising the American people the prompt enactment of a budget system. It is true that during the war, throughout the SIXTY-NINTH CONGRESS, we were so busy that we could not follow it up, but soon

after the 19th of May, 1919, when Congress was convened in extra session and this Republican House was organized, we appointed a Select Committee on the Budget, and I have been and am very greatly gratified to be a member of that committee. Our committee went to work promptly under the very able leadership of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], and let me say that Congress and the country owe him a debt of gratitude and commendation for his energy and efficiency in securing as witnesses the most eminent experts on the subject in the United States, and in conducting the hearings we were favored by the advice and suggestions of some 40 of the most profound students of the subject in this country. Our hearings extended from September 21 to October 9, 1919, and made a printed volume of 758 pages and exhaustively covered the subject. As a result we prepared a bill (H. R. 9783) and introduced it, brought about its prompt and thorough consideration by the House, and on October 22, 1919, the House passed the bill on a roll call vote of 285 yeas to 3 nays. The bill went to the Senate on October 22, and apparently no action was taken on it until December 15, on which date the Senate committee to which it was referred held a short hearing on it. Then nothing was done for another month; when on January 14, 1920, another short hearing was held, all the hearings containing only 195 pages and being mostly documentary material and a restatement of their views by some half dozen witnesses who had appeared before the House committee and whose statements were fully printed, and from January 14 to this good hour nothing whatever has apparently been done with the bill.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand that the Senate committee has either reported the budget within the last day or two or anticipates doing it in a day or two, and I understand it is their intention to take it up within a week.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It has been reported.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; it has been reported, as the gentleman from Tennessee says.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I ask to proceed for one minute more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think the gentlemen are misinformed about the Senate committee having reported out the budget bill. I understand that committee contemplates reporting it out some time next week. But be that as it may, the question is, Why has this tremendously important measure been sleeping in a Senate pigeonhole for eight months? What is holding it up? Why has not the party in control of the Senate and House given this law to the country many months ago? What are they waiting for? I see by the newspapers nearly every day that Gov. Lowden, of Illinois, and Gen. Wood, and the Junior Senator from Illinois, who is the chairman of the Senate committee that has this bill in a pigeonhole, and various other prominent Republicans are making speeches somewhere, loudly extolling the marvelous virtues and imperative necessity of a budget system in this country at this time, all of them trying to make campaign thunder, promising the people a budget system if they are elected. Why do not you Republicans keep the faith and do it now? Now is the accepted time. We have, all of us, promised the people this law. We have all the information necessary. Why wait another year or two? Why regale the people with more promises? Why do not the steering committee of this House put that budget bill right straight onto an appropriation bill as a rider, right now, and on this fortifications bill, and bring in a rule making it in order, and put it through this House now, instead of letting it sleep in the Senate and promising the American people to enact a budget system some time in the future if they are elected next November?

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I only have a minute and can not, unless I can get more time. I am not criticizing this House, because we have performed our full duty in this matter. And I will not criticize the Senate, because that would be unparliamentary, but I will criticize the leaders of the party in power in both the Senate and House for their utter failure to enact this solemnly promised and vitally needed legislation, as they should have done many months ago. They have no right to hold this bill up to allow some prominent gentlemen to make campaign speeches about it and try to monopolize that subject as a campaign issue. Let us establish it now. With the exception of 3 votes, there was no opposition to this bill by any Democrat

or Republican in this House, and there ought not to be any opposition in the Senate or any politics about it. I want to see the Congress keep the faith and pass this bill and establish this budget system in this country at this session and before we adjourn for the summer. The country needs this system now a hundred times more than it ever has. With the high cost of living going higher, with taxes and prices going to the blue sky, with waste, duplications, and unnecessary governmental expenditures as shown in the hearings there is no earthly excuse for delaying this bill all these months while prominent candidates are trying to make campaign thunder out of clamoring for a budget system.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

MR. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

MR. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my friend and neighbor from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] on his enthusiasm for the budget system, an enthusiasm which is shared by all the Members of this House and, I think, by a very great majority of the Members of the Senate. It is a very large question, which requires careful consideration. The Senate will in a day or two report the budget bill. They propose to take it up very soon. The gentleman from Colorado knows that the budget system, no matter when the bill we passed months ago becomes a law, can not become operative and effective upon the transactions of the Government until the executive departments begin to prepare their estimates, which are to be presented in October, so that if the budget bill is a law—which I trust it will be within the next 30 days—any time soon it will have been provided within abundant time to make provision for the earliest use that could possibly be made of it. As everybody knows, it passed the House months ago.

MR. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman to say that within 30 days we will have a budget-system law on the statute books?

MR. MONDELL. I feel quite confident of that.

MR. GARNER. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the parliamentary situation, as suggested by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR]. If he is not perfectly confident of that, there is no reason why it should be put on an appropriation bill. It has had thorough consideration by the House and thorough consideration by the Senate committee and the Senate, and it ought to go to conference now.

MR. MONDELL. Nobody is more insistent about this thing than I am, and I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I have no sort of doubt but that before this Congress finishes its labors, which I hope will be the 1st of June, there will be a budget bill on the statute books.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

MEDICAL AND SURGICAL HISTORY OF THE WAR.

MR. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes, in which to have read a very short article on the subject of the medical and surgical history of the late war. This article is from the Journal of the American Medical Association.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to have read, in two minutes, an article on the medical and surgical history of the late war. Is there objection?

MR. KNUTSON. Does this deal with lancing also?

MR. LAZARO. No, sir.

MR. KNUTSON. It is just pure surgery?

MR. LAZARO. I think the information is worth something to the Members of the House.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE MEDICAL AND SURGICAL HISTORY OF THE WAR.

The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary of War, is asking for an appropriation, in the sundry civil bill, for the publication of the medical and surgical history of the World War. In its projected form, this medical history will be more than an account of the rapid expansion and administrative achievements of the Medical Department; it will be a collective study of the many problems of hygiene, medicine, and surgery which were involved in the efficient medical care of the Nation's armies—in fact, a system of medicine and surgery based on the experience and observations of the physicians who guarded the health of our soldiers. The knowledge which was gained by hospitals and in the battle field, and the vast amount of medical research carried on during the war, can be made of immediate value to the medical profession and the public only by prompt publication of the medical history. To reach no question of the merit of such a work, as a scientific treatise, the only real value of permanent nature, is that it is a source of information regarding their utility as a source of information in future conflicts. The first volume of an unofficial history of the Canadian

Army medical corps appeared last year; steady progress has been made on the official British medical history, and the history of German participation in the war will be issued in nine volumes late in 1920; much of the material for the American history is already collected, and publication waits on the action of Congress. Not only can be got from procrastination and delay; the appropriation requested by the Surgeon General should be allowed promptly. The medical and surgical history of the War of the Rebellion was delayed through 20 years. It is to be hoped that a similar fate does not await the publication of the medical history of the World War. If Congress does not, within a short time, make the appropriation necessary for the printing of this available material, the failure will be tantamount to an order for its destruction. In a few years this material would be of archaic but not of scientific interest.

ARTHUR WENDLE ENGLERT.

MR. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 795, for relief of Arthur Wendle Englert, a House bill passed by the Senate with an amendment, and that the House disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference thereon.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up H. R. 795, and moves to disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MR. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

THE SPEAKER. The Chair does not think it is subject to objection.

MR. WALSH. The gentleman is asking for a conference.

THE SPEAKER. He moves for a conference.

MR. WALSH. It is not in order to move for a conference. I should like to ask the gentleman if the Senate amendment increases the amount of this claim?

MR. EDMONDS. It increases it \$250.

MR. WALSH. Over the House bill?

MR. EDMONDS. Over the House bill.

MR. WALSH. Or over the amount of the claim?

MR. EDMONDS. Over the House bill.

MR. GARD. What was the amount in the House bill?

MR. EDMONDS. The amount in the House bill was \$500. We reduced the amount asked for by the claimant from \$748 to \$500. The Senate put back the amount originally asked for by the claimant. The bill as it passed the House this year was reduced to \$500, but the claimant last year asked for \$748.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS].

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. EDMONDS, Mr. LITTLE, and Mr. STEAGALL.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

MR. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record briefly.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

MR. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, upon what subject?

MR. ASHBROOK. Very largely giving the reasons why I voted as the gentleman did last evening on the peace resolution.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Was it not made in order yesterday for five legislative days for any one to extend remarks in the Record on the peace resolution?

THE SPEAKER. It was.

MR. ASHBROOK. I may touch briefly on some other things.

USE OF T. N. T. FOR PEACE-TIME PURPOSES.

MR. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Printing.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a privileged resolution from the Committee on Printing, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the report of John Swenchart, of the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin, giving scientific and experimental data for the practical use of T. N. T., a war-salvaged explosive for peace-time purposes, be printed as a House document, and that 5,000 copies be printed for the use of the House document room.

MR. KIESS. I move the adoption of the resolution.

MR. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, how much will this printing cost?

MR. KIESS. This printing will cost the large sum of \$15.10.

MR. CLARK of Missouri. How many copies are you going to print?

MR. KIESS. A usual number, 1,315, and 5,000 additional to go to the document room.

MR. STEINERSON. Should the committee have any objection to making it three times that number? I can use almost all of that edition for my own district. There is a large amount cut over land which they desire to clear, and this will be a very