

CONGRESSMAN SHALLENBERGER'S SPEECH

(Continued from Page 11)

feat and then rise again, as Mr. Bryan has repeatedly done. He has been defeated three times for the highest office in the world, the Presidency of the United States; and although thrice defeated for a prize more valued than any that ever crowned a king, his name will live in the history of his country and in the hearts of his countrymen when those who berate and slander him here are forgotten forever. (Applause.)

That is all I have to say about that. Now, I want to call the attention of the house to the bill which is pending here.

Mr. Fields. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman right here?

Mr. Shallenberger. Yes.

Mr. Fields. Right in connection with what the gentleman says about the defeat of Mr. Bryan, may I add a word that Mr. Bryan uttered on the morning of his first political defeat?

Mr. Shallenberger. Yes.

Mr. Fields. That those who fight for the right may be defeated, but they are never conquered. They may suffer reverses, but they never suffer failure. (Applause.)

Mr. Shallenberger. The first-line troops must not only be trained, but organized into fighting units, and this is the deliberate judgment of the highest authority we have in this country.

Having now the statement of the general staff as to what they say our military policy must be, I, as a member of that committee, felt it no more than right that for the information of this house and the country the general staff should give to us an estimate of what that policy was going to cost this government, so I submitted seven written questions to the chief of the general staff asking for definite information as to what this was going to cost. We know that the system we have now is going to cost a lot of money. We have appropriated more in the last 12 years than Germany spent before she became engaged in the war in Europe.

Mr. Kahn. The gentleman will admit, however, that that is due to the comparatively large salaries that we pay to the soldiers as compared with what Germany pays.

Mr. Howard. To the officers.

Mr. Shallenberger. The pay amounts to only about one-sixth of the cost of the army.

Mr. Chairman, this congress will

appropriate a billion of dollars more for national defense than did the congress that preceded it. I believe that we might just as well face the fact that in the future war expenditures will total something like a billion of dollars a year. The expenditures for the army and the navy will therefore absorb all the revenues derived by the government from taxation, and the nation will have to finance itself in the future by the issue of bonds, never to be paid, but the interest upon them will remain a constant charge upon the revenues of the government. This has been the inevitable result in every country which has adopted a policy of complete military and naval preparedness in time of peace. If we are to match ourselves against the strongest military nations of the world, we must pay the price. The great powers of Europe can claim at least as efficient and economical management as ourselves, and none of them has escaped a constant increase in their national debts.

The bill that we are considering is the only one of the great military and naval supply bills to be reported at this session carrying a less sum than was appropriated for the same purposes at the last session. But, nevertheless, it is in effect an increase over the previous bill as it was reported by the military committee at the first session of this congress. The bill reported by the military committee at the previous session carried almost one hundred millions of dollars less than the present bill when it was first brought into the house. As it finally became a law it carried two hundred and sixty-seven millions.

If the awful calamity of war should result from the present international crisis, all previous appropriations for national defense will but constitute a drop in the bucket of the flood of wealth that will be poured out of the national treasury. But we should not deceive ourselves into thinking that the army and navy will not in the future demand larger and larger appropriations for their support in time of peace. In my opinion the military and naval establishments will hereafter absorb all the revenues the people will consent to pay. The additional increments for the regular army and the national guard, as already provided for in the national-defense act of June 3, 1916, necessarily demand increased appropriations for arms, munitions, ma-

terial, and materiel, and these appropriations will continue to grow like Jonah's gourd. The appropriations by this congress for national defense on land alone will exceed by \$500,000,000 the amount appropriated for the same purposes in the Sixty-third congress.

When the regular army reaches the maximum strength provided for under the so-called Hay bill and the national guard is increased to 420,000 men, as is contemplated under that law, the cost of maintaining those units, added to the expense that will be required for our fortifications and coast defenses, will total a sum of \$500,000,000 a year. And yet any student of modern military development knows that if we are to maintain a system that will in any degree equal those of the great governments of Europe, which have gone into the war game, with the idea of developing the full fighting strength of the nation, our military policy will have to be entirely changed.

This is not a statement of my own opinion, but on page 773 of the hearings before the military affairs committee, upon this very bill, General Scott, our chief of staff of the army of the United States, speaking for the organization of which he is the head, stated that after long study of the situation in the lights of the experience gained from the war in Europe—and I quote his exact language—

"The conclusion of the war college division, which is concurred in by the remainder of the war department staff, is that our system should now be able to furnish 1,500,000 trained organized troops at the outbreak of war and 1,500,000 additional in 90 days."

The first line of troops must not only be trained but organized as well—that is, actually organized into fighting units. This is the deliberate judgment of the highest military authority which we have in this country.

Having the statement from the general staff as to what they believe the safety of the nation required for a proper military defense, it seemed to me that the committee on military affairs and congress as well ought to be informed as to what the cost of such a military establishment would be to the nation, should we conclude to put this plan into actual being. I therefore asked the chief of staff to furnish us a statement as to the probable cost of their plan. So far this statement has not been furnished the military affairs committee, but I have made some estimates of my own, only partial, of course, but based upon actual tables and data furnished as to the cost of the different units of our present army for arms, munitions, material, and materiel, and so forth. I am sure these figures will be found very conservative and much under the mark as to what our actual military expenses will aggregate in time of peace, if the plan proposed by General Scott is carried out. The questions submitted to the chief of staff, in my endeavor to ascertain the cost of putting the proposed plan for a military establishment into practice, were as follows:

"Mr. Shallenberger. I should like to have, first, the cost of artillery of all calibers and ammunition, both for annual use and a suitable reserve of ammunition for all calibers for an army of that size.

"Second. The cost of rifles and ammunition for yearly use and the necessary reserve of rifles and am-

munition for rifles for 3,000,000 men.

"Third. Quartermaster's supplies, including uniforms and complete field equipage for an army of 3,000,000 men and cost of subsistence, transportation, and expense of annual field maneuvers, and all other necessary expenses of the quartermaster's department to maintain an army of 1,500,000 in being.

"Fourth. Cost of necessary aeroplanes, including reserve materiel and equipment for field service of a sufficient number of aeroplanes for an army of 3,000,000 men.

"Fifth. Cost of equipment and maintenance of an engineering corps sufficient for an army of 1,500,000 men, as demonstrated necessary by the experience of European nations in the present war.

"Sixth. Cost of pay of officers and enlisted men for an army of 1,500,000 troops maintained in field condition and ready for service, together with a reserve of 1,500,000 men sufficiently trained to be ready for battle service in 90 days.

"Gen. Scott. Yes, sir.

"Mr. Shallenberger. I should like to have those costs; that is all."

The cost of equipment for an army of 3,000,000 men, which I have estimated for, is based upon the above table. (Table top of next page.)

The estimates which I have here submitted are in line with the questions asked of the general staff. In the first place the system proposed by General Scott contemplates the retention of our present military establishment, so far as the regular army is concerned, after it shall have been increased to its maximum strength under the national-defense act. The maintenance of this force entail a cost of at least \$350,000,000 a year. This is fully and plainly set forth by General Scott on page 791 of the hearings of the military committee upon this bill. His positive statement is that the regular establishment of the national defense act will be needed as an expeditionary force and to garrison and maintain our domestic and foreign fortifications.

On page 349 of the Infantry Journal of December last is given a table in detail of the cost of arms and equipment for a field army, the cost of each arm of the service, and the engineer corps as well. It is as exact as any that I could obtain. On the same page is given a table of percentages of the officers of the different field and staff corps of the army.

Taking these percentages as a basis, we find that our army should consist roundly of 48 per cent infantry, 20 per cent cavalry, 28 per cent field and coast artillery, and about 4 per cent engineers, and so forth. With these tables accepted as a basis, I find the cost of equipment alone for an army of 3,000,000 men would be \$2,576,000,000. If these figures seem excessive, please remember that every army expert who has appeared before the military committee has agreed that all field equipment, including arms and munitions, must be on hand when war starts, or the war may be over before they can be obtained. Just as Col. Tilson has stated, an army without necessary fighting material is no army at all.

The amount stated is only the cost of equipment for actual needs before war begins. There must also be a reserve of all those things essential for the maintenance of an army in the field, or the effectiveness of that army will be gone in a few days of fighting. The Treat



There's a good way
to keep growing boys and girls
healthy and happy and that is
to give them

Grape-Nuts
for breakfast.

This wonderfully nourishing
food has a sweet, nutty flavor that
makes it popular with children.

One of the few sweet foods
that does not harm digestion, but
builds them strong and bright.

At grocers everywhere.