

**DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR  
APPROPRIATION BILL. HEARINGS BEFORE  
THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN  
AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 12, 13, 14,  
15, AND 18, 1916, PP. 15-120**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649488889

Diplomatic and Consular Appropriation Bill. Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, December 12, 13, 14, 15, and 18, 1916, pp. 15-120 by Various

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

# **VARIOUS**

**DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR  
APPROPRIATION BILL. HEARINGS BEFORE  
THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN  
AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE OF  
REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 12, 13, 14,  
15, AND 18, 1916, PP. 15-120**



DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL

HEARINGS

*U. S. Congress, House.*

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

OF THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 12, 13, 14, 15, AND 18, 1916

FY1918

664  
588  
19

STATEMENTS OF

HON. WILBUR J. CARR AND OTHERS



WASHINGTON  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

6/19/16

## DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
Tuesday, December 12, 1916.

The committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. Henry D. Flood (chairman) presiding.

### STATEMENT OF WILBUR J. CARR, ESQ., DIRECTOR OF THE CONSULAR SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

#### SALARIES OF COUNSELORS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Carr, at page 4 the bill seems to propose a change from the bill of last year with reference to counselors at embassies and legations.

Mr. CARR. The department has recommended this year the establishment of a separate grade of counselors at \$4,000 a year instead of conferring the title of counselor on the existing first secretary of embassy, who received only \$3,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. That would give a counselor and a secretary just as they exist under the law of 1915?

Mr. CARR. Yes; but it is not proposed to increase the corps of secretaries.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee was asked to make that change authorizing the President to designate secretaries as counselors the department stated to the committee in that connection that there would be no increased cost attached to the change.

Mr. CARR. There was not, last year.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand now that the counselors are getting \$4,000 a year instead of \$3,000?

Mr. CARR. They are getting \$3,000. Now, it is recommended that a separate and distinct grade of counselor, at \$4,000 per annum, be created.

The CHAIRMAN. The department would be authorized to appoint, if it desired, 40 counselors and the same number of secretaries as are authorized and appointed under the law now?

Mr. CARR. No. They have converted a number of the secretaries into counselors at \$4,000, and then they have asked you for the difference in the cost.

The CHAIRMAN. While there may not be an increase asked for at this time, in the next bill they could ask for an increase, could they not?

Mr. CARR. Yes. The difference in this bill is \$14,000.

The CHAIRMAN. This change in the law would authorize the appointment of 40 counselors for the State Department, if the State Department saw fit to make the appointments. Is that correct?

Mr. CARR. Not 40 counselors, for there are only 9 proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The probability is that they would ask a great deal more money next year for that very purpose.

Mr. CARR. I doubt whether they would.

Mr. CLINE. How many extra ones do you propose to appoint?

Mr. CARR. Only one extra one.

Mr. ROGERS. Where does the \$14,000 increase come in?

Mr. CARR. That can best be explained by inserting a statement showing the existing counselors and secretaries and also the changes which are proposed.

Title.	Salary.	Present.	Proposed.
Counselors.....	\$4,000	.....	9
Secretaries, class 1 (designated as counselors).....	3,000	8	.....
Secretaries:			
Class 1.....	3,000	6	10
Class 2.....	2,625	16	16
Class 3.....	2,000	42	37
Class 4.....	1,500	12	12
Class 5.....	1,200	.....	.....
Total personnel.....		84	84

In other words, we have for the present converted some of the first secretaries of embassy into counselors by so designating them, and whom under the proposed arrangement we will pay the counselor's salary of \$4,000 per annum, if that be appropriated.

Mr. ROGERS. You might find both counselor and several secretaries at an embassy?

Mr. CARR. Certainly. That is the basis upon which all other foreign services are organized.

Mr. COOPER. What is the function of a counselor?

Mr. CARR. A counselor is the officer of the embassy ranking next after the ambassador. He is expected to study and keep himself fully informed in regard to all important questions coming before the embassy and be ready at any time to advise the ambassador as well as to confer with the foreign office. This is a very important and difficult task, especially at present, when there are so many intricate questions being dealt with by our embassies. It is not feasible for an ambassador himself to do all the work of this kind, neither is it possible for a first secretary of an embassy to do successfully this class of work in a large embassy in addition to the administrative work devolving upon him as the responsible head of the office force of the embassy.

Mr. COOPER. If the law was not amended, they could appoint a first secretary, or secretary, and then make him a counselor, could they not?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Without any change in salary?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Just a change in title?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. And his functions would be the same?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. If this amendment was adopted you could still, in certain legations, or embassies, have a first secretary with the same functions which the secretary or counselor has to-day, and yet, in addition to that, would you have a \$4,000 counselor in the same legation? Now, then, having the first secretary, with certain functions, and letting him retain the title of secretary, what would be the function of the \$4,000 counselor in that legation?

Mr. CARR. That function would be changed. The first secretary's functions, in so far as they involve advisory work, would go to the counselor.

Mr. COOPER. Would you have a man at \$3,000 and another at \$4,000 doing the same thing?

Mr. CARR. No; because the secretary would confine himself to managing and directing the administrative and general work of the embassy, while the counselor would devote himself to the important diplomatic questions and acting as an adviser of the ambassador.

Mr. COOPER. The bill you suggest, as amended, would simply change the title?

Mr. CARR. The title, and increase the salary \$1,000.

Mr. COOPER. Then, when you changed the title to counselor, their functions were altered, were they not?

Mr. CARR. That is true. They were altered in the manner just explained by separating the advisory from the administrative functions and leaving the latter to highest grade secretary.

Mr. COOPER. What are his functions? Wherein do they differ from those of the first secretary?

Mr. CARR. When there is no counselor the first secretary is obliged to perform functions of an advisory as well as of an administrative character. In a busy embassy this can not successfully be done because one interferes with the other. But when you have a counselor he can give his time to the larger questions before the embassy, be a real assistant to the ambassador, and leave the management of the current work of the embassy to the first secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The first secretary, then, would perform duties minor or subordinate to the counselor.

Mr. COOPER. The law does not provide any different duties.

Mr. CARR. The law does not provide any specific duties for any of these men. Under former conditions we had, in London, for instance, the ambassador, a first secretary, a second secretary, and a third secretary. Now we have an ambassador, a first secretary with the title of counselor under this law, and seven secretaries of embassy, one of whom acts as first secretary and has charge of the administration of the entire embassy staff. Each one of the secretaries is kept very busy, and they could use a few more if they had them. The counselor has more than he can properly do, relieved as he is of all administrative responsibilities. The condition is the same in Berlin and elsewhere where we have designated first secretaries as counselors.

Mr. COOPER. How many men were designated last year under this act?

Mr. CARR. Eight in all, one at each of the following embassies: Vienna, Paris, London, Berlin, Rome, Petrograd, Constantinople, and Madrid.



Mr. MILLER. What are functions of counselor in a foreign legation?

Mr. CARR. Substantially as I have explained.

Mr. COOPER. Just as you have explained for the American legation?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. The term "counselor" stands for something distinguished in foreign legations, in foreign countries, does it not? Just what is that distinction?

Mr. CARR. The man who is counselor, it is always understood, everywhere in the Diplomatic Service, is a man ranking next to the ambassador and a man who acts in the ambassador's absence. He is a higher functionary than the first secretary. Inasmuch as other Governments appoint counselors as the officers of their embassies ranking next to the ambassador the United States is constantly at a disadvantage without officers of the same grade.

Mr. ROGERS. The secretaries appointed under last year's law with the title of counselor would number about 13 or 14, would they not?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten, isn't it?

Mr. ROGERS. There are 13 of them, I think, or about 13.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CARR. There are eight.

Mr. ROGERS. This increase of \$14,000 would give you enough money to have a counselor at each embassy, would it?

Mr. CARR. No. We have 13 embassies, and it is proposed to have only 9 counselors at \$4,000 a year.

Mr. ROGERS. At \$4,000 a year?

Mr. CARR. At \$4,000 a year; yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER. Under the law of last year—the last bill—how many first secretaries, or secretaries, did you convert into counselors?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirteen.

Mr. CARR. There are 13 embassies, and there is a counselor at only 8 of them.

Mr. COOPER. We have 13 counselors at our respective embassies. Now, then, you propose what? They are getting \$3,000 a year, now, are they not?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. You propose under this bill, if enacted into law, to make four of them \$4,000 counselors?

Mr. CARR. No.

Mr. COOPER. You would establish a grade of counselor, would you not?

Mr. CARR. We propose to have 9 counselors at \$4,000 a year, 10 secretaries at \$3,000, 16 at \$2,625, 37 at \$2,000, and 12 at \$1,500. There is no increase proposed in the total number of offices.

The CHAIRMAN. And that will take only \$14,000 additional?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. CARR. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. You change them all to counselor at \$4,000 a year?

Mr. CARR. Yes; all now having the designation of counselor and one additional secretary not now designated as counselor.

Mr. CLINE. When you appoint a first secretary as counselor then there is a vacancy in the first secretary's office, is there not? Is that

true? Then you move a second, third, or fourth secretary up to take the place of first secretary?

Mr. CARR. That would be the ordinary course; yes, sir.

Mr. CLINE. So that under this statute here it would give you authority to complete the appointment of counselors in every one of those embassies next year with a new man, if you wanted to do it.

Mr. CARR. I do not quite understand what you mean by "new man."

Mr. CLINE. A man not acting as first, second, or third secretary.

Mr. CARR. Oh, no.

Mr. COOPER. There would be only one new job.

Mr. CARR. Yes. All we could do would be to promote somebody else from the office of first secretary at \$3,000 to counselor at \$4,000 a year.

Mr. CLINE. Where do you get four extra men?

Mr. CARR. If I said four I was mistaken. There would be but one additional counselor.

Mr. CLINE. You appoint them as secretary and then carry them on up—promote them?

Mr. CARR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You would put these counselors into the classified service in this way, would you not, Mr. Carr?

Mr. CARR. Yes; the posts would be filled by men already in the classified service.

SALARIES OF DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS WHILE RECEIVING INSTRUCTIONS AND MAKING TRANSITS.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, there is, on page 5, Mr. Carr, line 15, some words in italics, "and the permanent appropriation for this object is hereby repealed." Some of the gentlemen do not understand the purpose of the insertion of those words there. I wish you would explain it, Mr. Carr.

Mr. CARR. Prior to last year you made an appropriation there without amount—an indefinite appropriation—for salaries of diplomatic and consular officers while receiving instructions or in making transfers. Under ordinary circumstances the amounts expended every year were, I think, in the neighborhood of \$50,000 to \$75,000. You wanted to make a specific appropriation of some particular amount; so you fixed it at \$65,000. We are operating under that now. The added language there is simply, as I understand it, to repeal the practice of making a permanent appropriation—a permanent indefinite appropriation—which goes in, as a matter of course, through the Secretary of the Treasury and does not come before this committee. This language in italics is to accomplish more effectively just what the committee decided last year and what the Congress did do.

Mr. COOPER. Would it not be better to make a specific reference to the words to be repealed? The language there would not be clear in its present status. Reference ought to be made to the specific language of the law to be repealed.

Mr. CARR. Yes; that could be done. I will look that up for you.

Mr. COOPER. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. Why not put the definite amount in this title? There is not very much in that statute—section 2—which makes any permanent appropriation. The committee has been going on the theory, and the department has, too, that it has authorized the department to take whatever is necessary from the Treasury of the United States to meet these expenses. Just leave that line in italics there; it will be all right.

Mr. SABATH. There might be a general appropriation and then a special appropriation. It is to safeguard against a double appropriation.

Mr. CARR. I will look into that.

Mr. MILLER. You can not repeal an appropriation. Could you not reach it by putting in the usual words repealing all acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith. Would that not cover it?

Mr. CARR. That would cover it, absolutely.

Mr. MILLER. "Permanent appropriation for this object is hereby repealed" is very indefinite and does not mean anything.

Mr. CARR. Actually the department is going to be guided by the \$65,000 appropriated. The "permanent appropriation" means nothing to the department now. Unless the money is appropriated it can not be spent by the department.

Mr. MILLER. Of course.

Mr. CARR. I will suggest a change of language for that, if you wish me to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

#### CLERKS AT EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS.

Now, Mr. Huddleston, you raised the question about clerks. You think there ought to be some more detailed statement as to what clerks they were and as to what places they would be assigned to?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Not where they would be assigned, but it seemed to me that the grade of clerk and their pay should be established, or provided for, in the act itself.

The CHAIRMAN. In the act?

Mr. CARR. In the act?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. CARR. I hope you won't undertake that, because it will make the service almost unworkable. In legislating for the departments here in Washington you know exactly what to provide for, because the conditions are stable. In legislating for these foreign positions, such is not the case; conditions are different in different places. The conditions are different in every country. It often happens that we have to transfer a man from one place to another, from one country to another, not because we want to, not because the man himself wants to be transferred, but because of conditions over which neither he nor the department has control. If you undertook to specify—which you did a number of years ago—that clerks of different grades shall be here, and clerks of other grades shall be there, and so on, the service would be so tied up that it would be utterly impossible to administer it under present conditions.

Mr. MILLER. You mean to say that we could not appropriate for so many clerks at \$2,400, so many clerks at \$1,800, and so on, and then