Federal control act of March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petitions and resolutions by the California Redwood Association, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring Senate bill 5020, to revive and restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission powers taken away or suspended by Federal control act of March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions by the Federal Employees' Union, No. 76, Vallejo, Cal., favoring Government ownership of the railway systems of the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Resolutions of Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring legislation relating to the validation of informal war contracts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Trustees Fairmount Park Art Association, Philadelphia, favoring completion of Government housing projects; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolutions of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association of Philadelphia, favoring legislation relating to the validation of informal war contracts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 10, 1919.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, lead us we pray Thee, by Thy spirit through this day; that in thought, word, and deed we may make dominant all that is purest, noblest, best in our being; and thus reflect Thy glory round about us; after the similitude of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 79. An act for the sale of isolated tracts of the public domain in Minnesota; and

H. R. 9865. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to school district No. 28 of Missoula County, Mont.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution providing that one term of the United States district court for the eastern district of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Hugo, Okla.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producting commercial products, had requested a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. POINDEXTER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 28.

Resolved, by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Sunday, the 9th day of February, 1919, be set aside as the day upon which there shall be held a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives for appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late Theodore Roosevelt, former President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, and President of the Senate.

That a joint committee, to consist of five Senators and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be named, with full power to make all arrangements and publish a suitable program for the joint session of Congress herein authorized, and to issue the invitations hereinafter mentioned.

That invitations shall be extended to the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and such other invitations shall be issued as to the said committee shall seem best.

That all expenses incurred by the committee in the execution of the provisions of this resolution shall be paid, one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 1423. An act for the relief of Alexander F. McCollam;

H. R. 8444. An act for the relief of Ira G. Kilpatrick and Guy D. Dill; and

H. R. 12194. An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. WEEKS and Mr. HOLLIS members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Treasury Department.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution providing that one term of the United States district court for the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Hugo, Okla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIAL EXERCISES FOR THE LATE EX-PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution 28, which has just come over, which I ask that the Clerk report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 28.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Sunday, the 9th day of February, 1919, be set aside as the day upon which there shall be held a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives for appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late Theodore Roosevelt, former President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, and President of the Senate.

That a joint committee, to consist of five Senators and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be named, with full power to make all arrangements and publish a suitable program for the joint session of Congress herein authorized, and to issue the invitations hereinafter mentioned.

That invitations shall be extended to the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and such other invitations shall be issued as to the said committee shall seem best.

That all expenses incurred by the committee in the execution of the provisions of this resolution shall be paid, one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Chair announced the following committee: Mr. KITCHIN, Mr. CANTRILL, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. CALDWELL, Mr. MANN, Mr. TEMPLE, and Mr. SCHALL.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the Speaker to excuse me from membership upon the committee and, if I may be permitted, to suggest in my place the name of Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD, of New York.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD in place of Mr. MANN.

MEMORIAL EXERCISES FOR THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE TALBOTT.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 9, 1919, has heretofore been set aside for exercises in commemoration of the late Representative TALBOTT, of Maryland. By authority of two gentlemen from Maryland—Mr. LINTHICUM, who had the day set aside, and Mr. BENSON, who is the successor of Mr. TALBOTT—I ask unanimous consent that the order setting aside February 9 be changed to February 16, on which to hold the exercises upon the life, character, and public services of Mr. TALBOTT.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the memorial services for the late Representative TALBOTT be changed from the 9th of February to the 16th of February. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF SOLDIERS' ALLOTMENTS, ETC.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from the Secretary of War in reference to the payment of allotments, which I think ought to be read to the House. I ask unanimous

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

consent that the letter may be read, and also that my reply thereto may also be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 6, 1919.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANN: My attention has been called to the statements which have been recently made on the floor of the House concerning the delay in making payment to the enlisted men of the Army and of their allotments, and I feel that there is some misunderstanding in the matter which, in justice to the War Department, should be clarified.

With respect to the matter of allotments, I wish to state that the War Department has jurisdiction only in cases where the allotments do not carry family allowances, and that those which do carry family allowances come within the jurisdiction of, and are paid by, the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, Treasury Department.

Concerning the allotments which are payable by the War Department, I wish to state that these payments are being made promptly and that they are not in any way in arrears. There may be, and probably are, cases where there has been some delay due to inability to locate the allottee, but these are few in number, and even in these cases it is hardly likely that any hardship has resulted, as these allotments are not made for the benefit of families. Allotments which are made for the benefit of families and which carry family allowances are not paid by the War Department, but by the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance of the Treasury Department. The War Department is cooperating heartily with the Treasury Department in its efforts to solve the intricate business imposed by the sudden assumption of this great undertaking. I do not comment here upon the work of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau, because the committees of Congress have already looked into it and have been made acquainted with the almost endless detail which the inauguration of this new and helpful system of insurance and payment entailed, and I refer to the subject only in order that the line of division and responsibility may be made clear, and to assure you that the War Department is in hearty cooperation with the Treasury Department in its effort to solve the problem.

Concerning the pay of enlisted men, I believe that this matter can best be understood by dividing the men into two classes—those who remained in the United States and those who went overseas. With reference to the men who remained in the United States, I wish to state that during the past year the troops at the large camps and cantonments have been paid their monthly pay in full at an average of the fifth day of the month. In many instances payment at these camps, each containing from 40,000 to 60,000 men, has been completed on the last day of the month in which the pay accrued, and in a great many cases payment has been fully made on the first day of the succeeding month. In the early months of the war there was some delay in the payment of the individual cases of men who were transferred from their organizations, which was due to the system then in effect of transmitting their service records. This situation was met and overcome by the inauguration of an individual pay card which the soldier carried in his personal possession, and upon which he could be paid, even though his official service papers were not available at his new station. I mention this so as to show that the department did not fail in its duty to initiate new methods which were required to meet the new conditions of service.

With respect to the troops overseas, payment has not been made as promptly as has been the case of the men who remained in the United States, and it is known that a great many of the sick and wounded who are being returned from overseas, and of whom I shall speak later in this letter, are several months in arrears in their pay. It is to be borne in mind that from July to November of last year the overseas troops were actually in the fighting line, and I think that any delay in their payment can properly be attributed to the conditions of their service rather than to any lack of effort on the part of the authorities of the American Expeditionary Forces. It requires no stretch of imagination to realize the vast difference between paying troops which are in camps or cantonments and paying troops which are in actual action along a wide battle front and operating under conditions of intensive offensive campaign.

It is cases of sick and wounded men coming back to the United States from the field of operations in France which have given rise to the statement that there has been a serious and unwarranted delay in the payment of troops, and when consideration is given to the conditions under which these men were operating in France it is not strange that they should be returned to the United States in arrears in their pay or without proper records showing the condition of their accounts with respect to pay and other items which enter into the computation of their pay and allowances.

When these men reached the United States the department was confronted with the problem of making payment to men who had no records whatever showing the date to which they were last paid, or the condition of their accounts with respect to allotments, insurance, or any other items which enter into the computation of pay. To meet this situation the department made partial payments to these men upon their arrival at the ports of debarkation in the United States, and also partial payments upon their arrival at the various hospitals to which sent, anticipating that the necessary official records would be received shortly after the arrival of the men so as to enable settlement of their accounts in full. When it was ascertained that it would probably be impossible to obtain these records from France, instructions were issued on December 12, 1918, to take the personal affidavits of the men as to the date to which they were last paid and the status of their accounts with respect to their allotment and insurance and to pay them all the arrears of pay due as shown by these affidavits. There is no sanction of law for the action taken by the department, but the situation demanded that measures be adopted to effect payment in full to these sick and wounded men, and the only way to accomplish this was to take the affidavits of the men themselves and accept these affidavits as establishing the correct amounts due them.

The department has made a full and complete report to Congress of its action in issuing these instructions to have the men paid in full on their personal affidavits and has requested that legislation be enacted which will sanction the steps so taken.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1919.

Hon. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY BAKER: I am in receipt of your favor of the 6th instant, which I shall ask to have read in the House.

The inefficiency of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance would be a burlesque if it were not a tragedy.

Unless the many letters which come to me and other Members of Congress misstate the facts, you are in error in believing that the allotments payable by the War Department are being made promptly and are not in any way in arrears. Nor do I understand that the allotments made by the soldier are not made for the benefit of families. The allotment made by the soldier, as I understand, is made for the benefit, usually, of somebody more or less dependent upon him even in those cases where there is no family allowance by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

I beg to say, also, that I am receiving many complaints from soldiers that they are not receiving their pay and have not received it for many months, in many cases though in dire need of money. That there is unwarranted delay in the payment of sick and wounded men coming home is beyond question, unless the many soldiers who write are all lying about it, and I do not believe that. The Government is utterly failing in its responsibility to the soldiers and to their dependents in regard to pay and allowances. Excuses, of course, will be offered, but what is needed is attention to the business.

My mail is filled with complaints and I am informed the same is true of other Members of Congress.

These are not the only complaints being made against the War Department. While the Government is maintaining an expensive system of officers under the Department of Labor to secure employment for discharged soldiers, the soldiers in the service who have employment awaiting them, and where they are needed, find it in many cases difficult or impossible to secure discharges. It is, I think, just a pure lack of proper attention or proper consideration and humane concern.

Another matter to which I call your attention is the refusal of the War Department to obtain information concerning soldiers who are reported wounded and referring them to the American Red Cross. If a soldier under the War Department has been wounded abroad and is in a hospital of the United States abroad, surely the War Department ought to obtain information and give it to relatives here instead of advising relatives to communicate with the Red Cross. Such action on the part of the War Department seems to indicate an absolute insensibility to humane feeling.

Just as an illustration of the very many letters which are being received by me and others at the Capitol relating to the payment of soldiers in hospitals, I inclose you one letter from Sergt. John J. McAvoy, Company A, One hundred and twenty-seventh United States Infantry, Thirty-second Division, General Hospital 28, Fort Sheridan, Ill., though I confess I fear to send such letters to the War Department for fear it will result injuriously to the soldier. Of course, a part of his letter refers to the failure of the War Risk Insurance Bureau; but how can you reconcile your apparent complacent satisfaction with the pay department of the Army with the statements in this letter, if they be true?

Yours, very respectfully,

JAMES R. MANN.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—TUNNEL UNDER HUDSON RIVER.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reference of the bill H. R. 12588, introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN] to provide for the construction of a tunnel under the Hudson River between the States of New York and New Jersey, which has been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, be rereferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF BONDS BY SOLDIERS.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see from the reading of the reply of the letter from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to the letter of the Secretary of War that it is quite evident that the gentleman from Illinois has fully recovered his health. [Laughter.] Along that line there is one other suggestion that I desire to make. A new trouble has arisen, and I do not know that anyone else seems to have heard of it. I am getting quite a number of letters from soldiers who have paid for their liberty bonds but who can not get them. It appears that they have made an arrangement by which the money would be taken out of their pay and sent to the Federal Reserve Bank at New York City, the bonds to be then sent to the place designated by the soldier when paid for. They do not get the bond. The soldier writes to me, and then I write to the bank, and find that the matter has passed out of their hands, I do not know how, to the Department of Allotments or to some of their branches. They write back something about the bank, and they have no definite information about the matter. I write back rather briskly, and I get this answer, that they are now waiting for a report from the company commander as to whether or not the soldier has paid for the bonds or not. The bank that got that money and the department that got it knows whether the bond has been paid for. The paymaster's office knows whether it has been paid for, whether the soldier got the pay, or whether it was reserved from his pay. The idea of sending off to France to ask

some company commander who may have died in battle, or whose whole company may have died in battle, is absurd and ridiculous. If they have arranged it so that they have to depend upon the company commander to determine whether or not the soldier has paid for his bond, the whole thing has gone to pieces, because every record might be lost in 10 minutes on the battle field and never recovered. I hope somebody may take this in hand and get as much interest in it as I have, so that we may see to it that these soldiers who have paid for their bonds get them and without any delay. [Applause.]

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMALL. 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. 13462, the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor bill, with Mr. BOOHER in the chair temporarily, in the absence of the permanent Chairman, Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee.

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. 13462, the river and harbor bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13462) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, at this point I believe it is proper to introduce amendments, because the first paragraph in the bill has been read. Am I right?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. FREAR. I wish to offer an amendment at this time—in fact, four amendments—which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FREAR: At the end of page 1 insert the following after the word "named," in line 9:

"*Provided*, That no contract for work herein appropriated for shall be entered into unless the President or the Secretary of War shall first declare that immediate commercial or other public necessity exists for the prosecution of such work and for the use of such project at this time."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, we have made conditions on many projects that have been placed in this bill. Some of them relate to contributions by the locality, others to the performance of conditions. Frequently we have provided that a project shall not be advanced until the Secretary of War is satisfied as to certain conditions. I have gone a step further, and it seems to me at this time of all times it is very important that we should know there is a commercial necessity existing or something imperative that requires the insertion of 70 new projects in this bill and a large increase of appropriations placed in the bill after the engineers make the first recommendation to the committee. And in order that that may be passed upon with some degree of judgment by those who are not interested in the project themselves but who understand the condition of the Public Treasury at this time, I believe this amendment of all amendments should be passed. Now, what does it provide? That no new contract for work herein appropriated for shall be entered into unless the President or the Secretary of War shall first declare that immediate commercial or other public necessity exists for the prosecution of such work and for the use of such project. The Army engineers have not said these 70 projects should be advanced at this time. No one except the committee has placed them there, and I ask if the House is going to permit the committee to say that these 70 projects are important, that these additions which have been made to the various projects—sometimes $2,000,000 in amount—are important and of immediate necessity?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. No; not just this moment; I will later. We have the position confronting us, and with that position confronting us and with the fact that we are going to sell public bonds to raise money for the improvement and to levy a direct tax I submit, Mr. Chairman, of all times that the President of the United States and the Secretary of War ought to be permitted to pass upon the question, that it ought not to be taken out from their authority, and that this House, without any knowledge of the importance of these projects, should determine if they should be a tax upon the Treasury. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I was going to ask the gentleman if every project in this bill has not been heretofore recommended by the Secretary?

Mr. FREAR. That is not the point. The point is the immediate necessity after they have recommended. Yes; the Trinity River was recommended, the Missouri River was recommended, any number of worthless projects, and some of them have been abandoned. However, that is not the point. The point is the question of immediate necessity. You ought not to be afraid to leave it to the President of the United States or to the Secretary of War.

Mr. DUPRÉ. My first inquiry was to be followed by this one, if I may make it of the gentleman: Does the gentleman think it is the function of the Secretary of War or the President of the United States to appropriate money, or is it the duty of the Congress to do so in its wisdom if it sees fit?

Mr. FREAR. I believe that this House—that we, as the Committee of the Whole House here—are derelict in our duty if we pass this bill in its present form, without the condition put there that the Secretary of War, in certain conditions, may determine whether or not it is proper and timely to make the improvements.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. I do.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Does not the gentleman know that if we impose that condition that the President or the Secretary of War will send this matter to the engineers in order to get an expert report?

Mr. FREAR. Conceded. Now, the engineers themselves have not asked for these 70 new projects, not one of them. That is the point I make—the engineers themselves have not submitted these. The Chief of Engineers, whatever may be his disposition, determines these questions. Then we have got the responsibility fixed that this is an immediate commercial necessity in his judgment, and we can hold him to that responsibility.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I will.

Mr. CALDWELL. Was the gentleman in the Hall when the President delivered his message at the opening of Congress?

Mr. FREAR. I have been in the Hall when the President delivered many messages.

Mr. CALDWELL. At the opening of the Congress?

Mr. FREAR. Yes. Go on and ask the question.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does not the gentleman remember the President said——

Mr. FREAR. I do not care to answer questions of that kind. I believe if the President of the United States or the Secretary of War, if they are willing to pass upon it, we have got something to go upon, but to-day we have not.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I will.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and has the testimony before him, of course, as to the relative merits of the projects suggested.

Mr. FREAR. There was no testimony. That is the point; there was no testimony before the committee outside the engineers' reports, and some of them were back five years and more ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FREAR. I ask for five minutes more. I may not take more than a moment.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask the gentleman one other question?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman proceeding for five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TREADWAY. Has not the gentleman sufficient confidence in his colleagues on the Rivers and Harbors Committee to allow them to pass on the merits of the various projects they recommend?

Mr. FREAR. I will say, in answer to that, that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] who questions me was one of those who led one of the recent fights on this very bill two years ago, and for the very reason he did not have confidence in a majority of his colleagues.

Mr. TREADWAY. If I may be allowed to interrupt the gentleman in his time, I will say that that was not the reason.

Mr. FREAR. Then let me say this, that the gentleman from Massachusetts at that time presented a statement, with which I was agreed, that there was a balance of over $30,000,000 in the hands of the Chief of Engineers, which was sufficient for all purposes. At this time $45,000,000 is in the hands of the Army engineers, and you are adding 70 new projects to this bill and you are increasing by several million dollars—yes, a good many million dollars—some of the old projects. Over $15,000,000, as nearly as can be estimated, in all, is the amount that has been added since the engineers first reported to the committee. They

reported upon a war basis. Is there anything that can be objectionable to gentlemen on the other side that the President or Secretary of War shall be permitted to pass upon this? If you have an immediate project you want put in without examination, yes. Why not be willing to leave it to the Executive? I certainly am, because I believe you fix responsibility and determine then the importance of the particular project.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania and Mr. DEMPSEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he is not a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and has not been for several years?

Mr. FREAR. I believe the gentleman is quite familiar with the fact that I have been. We have had a good many controversies on the floor and do not always agree on the subject in controversy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is true, but the gentleman has been or is a distinguished member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. FREAR. With the exception of the adjective, I accept the correction.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I placed the adjective, because it is well bestowed.

May I ask the gentleman further if he presented the amendment he now presents to the Committee of the Whole to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. FREAR. No; but I did this: I asked when the Committee on Rivers and Harbors met that the Chief of Engineers or his representatives should come before the committee, and that a stenographer should be there to take the proceedings, both of which requests were refused.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman if he was a faithful attendant on all the meetings of the committee held on this bill?

Mr. FREAR. I have been as faithful as the average member.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman did not attend all the meetings?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no. I was in attendance here on some very important meetings, where I had the encouragement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is now addressing us.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That may be true.

Mr. FREAR. And certainly I could not be in two places at the same time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There are some things that the gentleman from Wisconsin does that the "gentleman from Pennsylvania" approves.

Mr. FREAR. I appreciate it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. "The gentleman from Pennsylvania" was inquiring whether, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin has started his fight against the River and Harbors bill this morning on the basis of the amendment that he now proposes, which would tend to revolutionize the entire system, he had presented this in good faith to the membership of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which he is a member?

Mr. FREAR. If the gentleman wants a reply to that, I will say that for four years I presented almost this identical amendment at the beginning of the discussion on this floor. It is not a new amendment. Every member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors who has followed the discussion knows that it has been offered by other Members here on the floor, including the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], who spoke a moment ago. It is my recollection that he introduced it and asked that the President and Secretary of War be permitted to do what my amendment asks.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would it not have been the regular order for the gentleman to have presented his amendment to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, so that it might have been discussed by that committee before it came here?

Mr. FREAR. It seems that a member of the committee would have a right to raise that objection, but the gentleman who has spoken, and who has many important projects in this bill, has not the right to take to task any member of the committee, who has a right to do his duty here or elsewhere.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman that if I had a very important proposition to lay before the House and country, as the gentleman has, because his is a country-wide proposition, I would lay it before the committee of which I was a member and fight it out there; and if it was defeated there, then, giving notice to my colleagues on the committee, I would bring it into the House.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Do you think it would have made any difference in the results of the committee deliberations if the gentleman from Wisconsin had presented it to the committee?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It might not if all the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors agreed with the gentleman from Illinois who just asked the question and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], with whom he agrees; of course not.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It might make some difference if it was offered to the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If those two gentlemen were unalterably opposed to river and harbor improvements—and I would not say in favor of railroad domination of the country—then it might be we could never get the question I am raising before the House unless some gentleman outside of the committee ventured to do what I am doing now—call the attention of the larger body to the fact that when a member of the committee had a chance to present his amendment to his own committee he did not do it, but brings it suddenly on the full membership of the House when the members of his committee did not have full notice.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know whether I correctly understood the gentleman from Wisconsin or not, but I gathered the inference from his remarks that there were some of these new projects incorporated in this bill that did not have the specific recommendation or indorsement of the Board of Engineers. Is that true?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not a member of the committee. I can not answer that.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me say this to the gentleman from Alabama, however: That the time has come for new projects to go into this bill. The people of this country, this United States, have been waiting since the war began for improvements in their own country. They have been making vast appropriations and great sacrifices to help the people of other countries. They have been aiding canals elsewhere. Their money has gone to the construction of railroads in France while they have been suffering in the United States for lack of decent and sufficient transportation facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like to interrupt the gentleman with a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Understand, I am not in opposition to the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman is not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But it has been my impression heretofore that it was impossible to procure the insertion of any item in the river and harbor bill without the backing of the Board of Engineers. That has been the policy, as I understand.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand that has been so; otherwise there would be fair ground for the criticism of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to the gentleman from Alabama that there is not a project incorporated in this bill but has the indorsement of the Board of Engineers.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think for myself that there ought to be some which have not got the indorsement of the Board of Engineers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that statement were agreed to, it would be up to the gentleman from Wisconsin to challenge it. He is a member of the committee.

Mr. FREAR. I have specifically admitted it, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then the gentleman from Wisconsin stands in direct opposition to the Army engineers.

Mr. FREAR. They have abandoned some of the projects they urged years ago.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are any of those abandoned projects in this bill?

Mr. FREAR. One is modified. It has not been abandoned. But that is immaterial. I speak of that simply as regards their own judgment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I speak of the gentleman from Wisconsin as in general opposition to the bill and in general opposition to the War Department, and he does it in a broad, general way apart from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which he is a member, where, if he had attended regularly the meetings of that committee, he might present his opposition.

Mr. FREAR. I presume I have attended the meetings of the committee as regularly as the average Member, and as regularly as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has attended the meetings of the committee to which he belongs. But I have not discussed or criticized the War Department any more severely than has the gentleman who has just spoken, and that within the last two or three days, and I believe that is his province and his duty.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have done that in regard to the failure of the War Department to pay soldiers' allotments and allowances and to make discharges, and I will continue to do so as long as it appears that our public officials are not making prompt settlement with our soldiers and their dependents.

But that has nothing to do with this. I am in favor of construction and reconstruction within the United States. I was just pointing out that we have made liberal appropriations and allowances, and have undergone vast sacrifices and imposed heavy taxation upon our people for reconstruction in other climes than our own; and during all this time, when we have been sapping the business life blood of our Nation and the physical life blood of our men and women for the benefit of other peoples, our new river works have remained idle, have stood still. We have failed to make appropriations for ourselves. We have fallen behind in the matter of our commercial relations with foreign nations. We have not brought ourselves up to date in the vital matter of transportation, and we have permited ourselves to go almost exclusively into the hands of those controlling existing transportation methods without giving ourselves the benefit of a competitive means of transportation.

Now, this bill proposes to reconstruct—to construct and reconstruct—the waterways of the United States in order that this infernal railroad inadequacy and congestion may be relieved. [Applause.] And the gentleman from Wisconsin, who opposes this bill in toto, and who seems opposed to the principle of waterway improvements, who rejects the recommendations of the United States Army Engineers who are endeavoring to give us a competitive transportation system in this country, stands to hamstring the business people of the United States, to compel them to pay the highest possible freight rates, to compel them, when there is plenty in certain parts of the land, to pay the highest prices in other sections where they can not get food supplies, and to hold back and throttle forever the opportunity that the people generally demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, pending the gentleman's remarks, may I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] advocates the abdicating by Congress of its function of legislating as to all new projects included in this bill. The proposition is not a new one. It was presented last year by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], who urged it because we were in the midst of war, with war facing us with all of its difficulties. But this House, none the less, decided to hold the legislative part intact and firm in its own hands; and to-day the gentleman from Wisconsin again urges that we place the function which belongs to us in the hands of the President, that we abdicate and give to him the right to legislate, regardless of the fact that we have considered deliberately and in the regular way the subjects as to which he says we should hand over to the Executive our rights and our functions.

And does he in any way justify the abdicating by Congress of its rightful function? Does he point to any unworthy project in the bill? Does he give a bill of specifications, and does he turn to the items and say, "Here is an unworthy project"?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Just a moment, and then I will. Does he say, "There are 70 new projects, and among those new projects I specify that such and such projects are unworthy of being improved"? Oh, no. He makes a general indictment. He does not turn to any one item and show that that project should not be improved. He says, generally, we should turn our back upon progress. We should not in this great and growing country of ours, with all its need of increased transportation, have any new projects, however worthy, unless after we have passed the bill with deliberation and consideration the President says we are right by specifically writing his approval of each new project. That is the proposition in its nakedness, and that is all there is to it. Now I yield to the gentleman and ask him to specify which one of these 70 projects he criticizes, which of them is wrong, which of them this Congress should not approve? Or, I ask him the broad and general question, Is he opposed to all improvements unless, after Congress has passed the bill, the President invests himself with our functions and relegislates in our behalf? Is that his proposition?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman asks me a question, and he makes a long and extended argument in regard to it. I will say this in response, that when this country is facing a deficit of $18,000,000,000 in the Treasury I do not feel that it is dangerous to submit to the President or to the Secretary of War the question of the commercial necessity of these 70 new projects, and I ask the gentleman to say which of these 70 new projects he considers is of vital necessity at this time that he thinks the President or the Secretary of War would not approve of?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say in answer to the gentleman two things. He asks me to specify a project, and I will give him one as an illustration. I will point the gentleman across the country to Beverly Harbor, and I will tell him that if Beverly Harbor had been improved as we propose to improve it, New England last winter, that great and prosperous part of the country, which contributed as much as any other part of this Nation to the waging of the war, would have been warmed; that its people would not have suffered for lack of coal, because we would have been able to furnish a way to distribute by water the coal to those people who needed it.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Now, I will specify that as one of the instances. And then, on the general proposition, I will say to the gentleman that the Secretary of War has already approved of each one of these projects, approved of it specifically after thorough examination, and that approval was before this committee, and was one of the things that influenced us; not all, because we do not believe that we ought to be bound solely and wholly by the judgment of the Secretary of War. We believe we are sent here ourselves to legislate, and that we ought to give the country the benefit of our own thought and consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FREAR: At the end of page 1 insert the following:

"*Provided*, That prior to any expenditure of public moneys under this bill the Secretary of War shall be satisfied that there now exists, or shall secure satisfactory assurances that local interests will provide sufficient areas of water frontage and suitable public water terminals adequate for the traffic which shall be open to the public on equal terms and as conditioned in the upper Cumberland project contained in this bill."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this subject has been discussed not only in the committee but on the floor by the chairman of the committee. We are all familiar with the fact that the Government heretofore has gone on in the case of the Ohio River and has expended something like $59,000,000 without a single water terminal. We are asked here to improve many different waterways without public terminals; and if we are going to be consistent we will make the same condition that we have made in the case of the upper Cumberland and other waterways without favor, and say, "If this project is to be improved, you must provide satisfactory terminals before the Government will put its money into this project."

Now, the Chair is well aware of this fact, and so is the committee, that after an amendment is offered different members of the committee or Members of the House have the privilege, particularly if they are interested in projects in this bill, of assailing the Member who offers the amendment, and that there is no chance to answer them. For instance, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who just spoke, has more money se-

cured for Philadelphia in this bill, and for its immediate neighborhood, than any gentleman—nearly one-quarter of the bill. I do not question his interest, but I do say that when he says I am opposed to the principle of waterway improvement he must know that that statement is untrue. I have approved constantly of the improvement of deserving waterways. Why, as the gentleman himself said a day or two ago on this floor, we are taking the blood from the people of this country. We certainly are. We are facing a deficit of $18,000,000,000. Six and a half million dollars are appropriated in this bill for the Delaware River and the waterways immediately surrounding Philadelphia when only $900,000 were recommended by the engineers to the committee in the first place, and $5,500,000 have been added for the Delaware River, for the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, and for the Schuylkill. When this is proposed, I ask that the Secretary of War may tell the country of the immediate necessity for that expenditure, because when we are taking the money out of the blood of the people, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well says, it seems to me it is time for us to know the importance of these expenditures.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wish the gentleman's statement were true about the Delaware River and about the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I wish it were true that we were getting so much as the gentleman indicates. I am glad to take the gentleman on his own proposition as to whether the Delaware River is worthy of improvement or not.

Mr. FREAR. That is not the question. The question is that the gentleman has just charged me with not being willing to improve waterways, and the gentleman has secured $6,500,000 for projects around Philadelphia.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I challenge that.

Mr. FREAR. Let me enumerate them: Two and a half million dollars for the Delaware River, $1,000,000 for the Schuylkill, right there at Philadelphia, and $3,000,000 for the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, which the gentleman time after time and year after year, and I am afraid successfully, has been urging as a project which the United States Government should take over.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal is in the States of Delaware and Maryland.

Mr. FREAR. And Pennsylvania and Philadelphia hold practically all the stocks and bonds that are invested in that canal, and the gentleman has been a most ardent exponent and advocate of that canal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman admits that.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman, whose eloquence could secure almost anything. But let me say this——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We need these improvements for national reasons.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, there is no project in the bill but what is put in as a national proposition. Now, in regard to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], I made a statement which was not repeated correctly. I said, Is there a proposition which the gentleman knows of that the President and Secretary of War would not approve? He says Beverly Harbor—would not the Secretary of War approve it? That is the only question, and I had no fear or question about it. The House votes down the proposition. We required proper terminals on some of these propositions, and why not on all of them?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a third amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of page 1 insert the following:

"*Provided*, That no contract for work hereinafter appropriated shall be entered into until the city, county, or State, or any other agency, shall have deposited with the Secretary of War, in some bank to be designated by him, an equal amount for the sum herein appropriated, which sum shall be expended by the Secretary of War in the prosecution of said work."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is a question of contribution. It has been urged in this House and in the Senate on various occasions. There is no reason why, as suggested in the amendment, Nawiliwili Harbor, Hawaii; the Sandusky port, on Lake Erie; and many other different projects which I can enumerate are required to contribute to the improvement, while nine out of ten of the other projects do not contribute a dollar. Why is this partiality shown? Let us, if we are going to give them these sums, do as they do in European countries, say to the localities that they must give a certain amount to show their earnestness in regard to the improvements. Do not make the Government contribute at all. And if we are going to contribute it all, let us say we will do so impartially. What right have we to say to Nawiliwili Harbor that they shall contribute $100,000 and make good terminals before a dollar will be expended by the Secretary of War? What right have we to do that except that they have not a Delegate with a vote to cast? He can only speak on the floor. I know the islands give a great deal more to the revenue of the Government than they have got back. If we are going to be fair, just, and honest in this thing with these various communities let us treat them all alike. Let us have good faith on the part of the community in that they are willing to make some contribution, that they believe in the improvement.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Does the gentleman's amendment apply to new improvements?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; and necessarily so.

Mr. ROBBINS. If you take Pennsylvania, no county could contribute anything to rivers and harbors under the constitution.

Mr. FREAR. The answer obviously to that is that I believe in changing the present system and adopting one so that communities may contribute. You could change the constitution of Pennsylvania. Why should Pennsylvania get $6,500,000 in this bill while Nawiliwili Harbor only gets a few thousand dollars and is obliged to contribute $100,000?

Mr. ROBBINS. That is no answer.

Mr. FREAR. It is an answer.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is because $21,000,000 per annum comes in through Philadelphia and nothing comes in through Nawiliwili.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, yes; Hawaii contributes more to the country than she gets out of it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am speaking of Government revenue that comes in through the improvements.

Mr. FREAR. I am speaking of revenue that comes from Hawaii, and I know they give far more to the Government than they ever receive.

Mr. ROBBINS. Take the harbor of Erie, Pa.; we know that it is necessary to improve it by reason of the damage to the breakwater by a storm.

Mr. FREAR. Just as at Nawiliwili Harbor, which has a breakwater, and we say to them, "You must give $100,000 before the Government will contribute a dollar. You people have not any vote on the floor, although you pay more taxes than you receive back, but we make that as a prior condition." Why should we do that?

Mr. ROBBINS. Because Nawiliwili Harbor is a Territory.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; but they pay more money to the Government than they get back.

Mr. ROBBINS. You can not apply your rule to any State in the Nation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Why not make your rule work the other way and abolish all contributions? You would reach the same result logically.

Mr. FREAR. Let me say that many projects in this bill would never appear here if the people were obliged to make contributions. They will get all they can from the Government Treasury because they have no responsibility on their side. All they have to do is to come and beg first of the Army engineers and then put the thing through the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment here which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of page 1, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That work on any new project herein adopted shall not be commenced until the Secretary of War is satisfied that railroad connections have been made or will be made within reasonable time to make the project accessible to the communities whose commerce is properly tributary to such waterway, as provided in conditions for improvement of Nawiliwili Harbor in this bill."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, that relates to the same general proposition, excepting here in that case they require them to establish railways to bring all of the traffic down to the harbor of Nawiliwili. That is, the committee has done that in addition to their paying $100,000 into the Treasury before a dollar will be expended upon the part of the Government. I did not mean to say that there was no Delegate from the Hawaiian Islands. There is, but he has not a voice in the determination of this bill; as we all know, he can not vote. We can tax Hawaii as we choose. We can give them whatever we choose

and make whatever conditions we choose. They have no one here who can tell on the floor what should be done who can vote. That is the point I make. Here is a condition, and I do not know that it is not a proper condition. I rather think it is, but it should be generally imposed, if so, on all projects.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin knows that the Delegate from Hawaii has a right to speak on the floor.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, yes; but he has not the right to vote.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know the gentleman wants to do justice to the Delegate from Hawaii, with whom he is on very good terms.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, surely. We are all on good terms with him, a very estimable man, and I do not think that project should be singled out and such conditions made there unless the condition is made on projects generally. The chairman of the committee on the floor talked for half an hour almost on that one subject of terminals, and let me say that he talked well, and I think no one can fairly raise any objection to that proposition, that the Government should not make expenditures unless there are terminals built by localities, and he was addressing himself largely to the Ohio River. If the Ohio River ought to have it—and we have spent $59,000,000 there with very little result—and if the Missouri River ought to have it—and we have spent $24,000,000 there with very little result—why not make it general with all? That would seem to me the only fair condition, and that is the reason that I have offered the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tenants Harbor, Me.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 12, Sixty-second Congress, third session, $12,500.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The other day at the conclusion of his remarks the chairman of the committee made a statement which in substance was that men who objected to this river and harbor bill were not intellectually honest. That would include a large part of the House membership, if true. I desire to present just a few brief remarks in this connection, which I think may be of interest at the outset of this bill. I oppose this 1919 river and harbor bill, not from any personal or local injury, fancied or real, but because the bill is vicious and wasteful in character. I am not acting alone as a Representative from Wisconsin in this opposition, but for taxpayers throughout the country, who are equally concerned in its defeat.

Members of the committee in past years have poked fun at all western waterway traffic. Let me say my own State represents more actual waterway traffic than that of any other member of the committee, with one exception. Wisconsin stands second in waterway commerce of all the States in the country. Last year four of its harbors, taken from a dozen of its ports, handled over 70,000,000 tons of waterway traffic, hauled on the average over 800 miles. The total appropriations for these four harbors reached $11,670,000 in the last 50 years. The greatest river in the world, without a boat line upon it, also flows past my district, a hopeless, deserted stream.

In general debate on this bill I was severely criticized by Chairman SMALL of the committee, who hails from North Carolina. I ask the House to judge between us as to our comparative interests and intellectual honesty. On pages 8, 9, and 10 of this bill over $1,500,000 is carried for North Carolina rivers, canals, and rivulets that were placed in the bill after the engineers' reports were first sent to the committee, according to the committee memorandum book. This is more than ten times all amounts in this bill appropriated for Wisconsin's waterways, and yet all the actual North Carolina waterway traffic does not reach one-hundredth part of that of Wisconsin. The chairman of the River and Harbor Committee comes from North Carolina. One river in North Carolina—the Cape Fear—with its tributaries, has already received from the Government Treasury for so-called improvements $7,730,168, or more than has been given the second harbor in the world at Superior-Duluth; yet this river's commerce last year was less than 1 per cent of that of this Wisconsin harbor.

The bill before us carries $554,000 more for that one North Carolina stream, or over five times as much is in the bill for that river, as for all the Wisconsin projects put together. Again, $1,000,000 more is carried in the bill for two insignificant North Carolina waterways that do not handle in real commerce 5 per cent of the waterway traffic of the little harbor of Ashland, in my own State. North Carolina, the home of the chairman of the committee, also gets six new projects in the bill, more than any other State in the Nation; and with this astounding record of having four feet in the hog trough, the chairman of the committee from that State seeks to distract attention from his many appropriations by criticizing me personally.

Returning to other waste contained in the bill, Wisconsin has one harbor, Superior-Duluth, that has received from the Government in the past about the same amounts as the Cumberland River, and yet that Wisconsin harbor handled over five hundred times the actual commerce of the Cumberland River last year and shipped it ten times as far. In this bill the Cumberland River will receive $340,000, in addition to $7,108,767, which will begin another hopeless $4,500,000 canalization project on that river. Yet I am criticized by the chairman for protesting against this indefensible waste of public money. Again, one of Wisconsin's five largest harbors last year handled three thousand times as much traffic as the hopeless Missouri River, which project was first rejected by Col. Townsend. The Missouri River, in addition to over $24,000,000 thus far received from the Government, gets $400,000 more in this bill for a so-called commerce of less than 15,000 tons last year. Compared with this, about $100,000 is given in this bill for all the Wisconsin harbors, that handled over 70,000,000 tons last year.

Yet I am criticized for exposing such colossal waste contained in this bill. I could extend comparisons to many other old and new wasteful projects in the bill, but I am content to place these facts, taken from the 1918 engineers' records, before the country, and to say that with $45,000,000 balance on hand at this time for waterway expenditures and $18,000,000,000 indebtedness confronting the Nation, it is worse than foolhardy to finance such miserable reckless waste through liberty-bond sales and burdensome direct taxes. That is the issue, and no effort of the chairman of the committee or anyone else can sidetrack that issue.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I suppose a brief comment is in order. In reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], I desire to say that after the gentleman made almost an hour's speech upon this bill, when the committee was considering it under general debate, I used this language with reference to the gentleman and his speech:

He says this "wicked" bill is going to pass the House, carrying with it the indictment that the membership of this House will support a bill not in the public interest, involving a waste of the public money. It is an unfair, unjust, unjustifiable criticism of the committee and of the House. I make this expression immediately after the gentleman has concluded. I do not make it unkindly; but the gentleman has not made a criticism of this river and harbor bill creditable to a man seeking only the truth and desirous of doing only justice and fairness. I do not impute the slightest moral turpitude to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I have studied the gentleman from Wisconsin, trying to ascertain something about his mental methods. The only way I can account for them—because I do not impute the slightest lack of moral conception to his make-up—is that for some reason or other on river and harbor legislation the gentleman has great difficulty in being intellectually honest. In all truth and fairness I commend that criticism to the gentleman, with the hope that in good time he will reform.

I made that statement extemporaneously, but deliberately. I have had no occasion to palliate it or withdraw it. I do not think anything has occurred this morning which justifies any withdrawal of the statement.

The gentleman says a good deal about North Carolina and North Carolina projects. The gentleman intends, I presume, to say that as chairman of the committee I took advantage of my position to favor unworthy projects in North Carolina. If there is a single member of the committee other than the gentleman from Wisconsin who believes it, I not only invite but I urge him to say so. If there is a single Member of this House who has the slightest idea that the gentleman's imputation is correct, I invite and urge him to say so. This is a great body. This House makes up its mind about Members. It is not what the gentleman from Wisconsin says, it is not what I may say about myself. It is the verdict of the House that counts, and the verdict of this House, based on my experience of 20 years, is honest and just to every Member of the House. I am willing to leave my reputation for fairness and integrity and for such intelligence as I may possess to the membership of the House. The gentleman from Wisconsin, whether he likes it or not, must do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Boston Harbor, Mass.: For maintenance, $40,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The chairman of the committee has stated that this is in no sense a personal controversy, and I do not believe that either of us will engage in that, because he is not built along those lines, nor am I. He says as chairman of the committee that it is charged that he took advantage of his position, and that is the criticism. Is there such a criticism? I have simply

stated the facts. There are many things which I did not wish to state until the gentleman impugned my intellectual honesty, but I now say that his State, by a peculiar accident, let us say, gets more projects than any other State in the Union; that it gets $1,500,000, that do not carry one one-hundredth part of the commerce of my own State.

It was added after the engineers had reported, and the chairman from North Carolina, passing upon the 70 projects, recommended them to the committee. Is not that so? Now, with that situation, can he challenge me with intellectual dishonesty when a proposition like that confronts the House? Think of it! Take this proposition just passed. I do not oppose it. I do not intend to move to strike it out. The proposition in regard to Tenants Harbor—why, it is for the benefit of one boat, one single boat. Read the engineer's report on page 7:

The chief reason for the demand for increased depth in Tenants Harbor is the need for a channel that can be used at all stages of the tide by the sea boat which connects Tenants Harbor with Rockland and Portland, Me., and affords the customary means of transportation. This vessel draws about 13 feet. The business of the steamboat above referred to which is operated by the Eastern Steamship Corporation, amounted during the calendar year 1911 to 1,339 tons of freight and 1,000 to 1,200 passengers.

I am not going to move to strike it out, but at this time in the history of the country, with the condition of the Treasury as we know it, you ask that the item here ought not to be allowed. I am going to ask after a while what projects should be allowed that are of imperative necessity. Are you going to permit six projects of North Carolina to go into the bill, the Newbegun, Scuppernong, and other creeks down there? I am afraid they are to go in. But I do not propose to permit the chairman or anyone else on this floor to question my intellectual honesty in order to cover up such matters. I leave it to the House to determine who selected these new projects carrying a million and a half dollars for North Carolina when he presented the 70 projects which were adopted in this bill to the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Gloucester, Beverly, Salem, Lynn, Plymouth, and Provincetown Harbors, Mystic, Malden, Weymouth Fore, and Weymouth Back Rivers, and Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Mass.: Completing improvement of Weymouth Fore River, $183,000; completing improvement of Beverly Harbor in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 220, Sixty-third Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document as modified in the report printed in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 8, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $61,500; in all, $244,500.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 11, strike out "completing" and substitute in lieu thereof "for."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this simply corrects a clerical error. The appropriation does not complete it, and therefore the word "for" should be substituted.

M. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. I will.

Mr. TREADWAY. As I recollect the item, this amount of $61,500 is one-half of the total appropriation required to complete Beverly Harbor?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. It is $123,000, if I remember rightly the engineers' estimate.

Mr. SMALL. I think the gentleman's recollection is correct.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pollock Rip Shoals, harbor of refuge at Nantucket, New Bedford and Fairhaven Harbors, Fall River Harbor, and Taunton River, Mass.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance of Pollock Rip Channel, $200,000.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question if the gentleman from North Carolina will yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMALL. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I would like to inquire with reference to the intent of carrying out this project at Pollock Rip Shoals, Harbor of Refuge at Nantucket, New Bedford, and so forth, continuing improvement, and for maintenance of Pollock Rip Channel, $200,000. When does this sum of $200,000 become available and how is the money to be expended?

Mr. SMALL. I will say the appropriation becomes immediately available upon the approval of the act, and this is a continuation of the improvement which has heretofore been carried on at Pollock Rip Shoals, and I may say to the gentleman that with which he is entirely familiar, that the result of this matter has been most favorable and the channel has remained stable.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I am very glad to hear the chairman make this statement, because there was considerable opposition at the time the improvement was begun there for fear the same would not become permanent. But what I wanted to ascertain was, as the probability is there will be little, if any, expenditure in the Fall River Harbor, because the tide is very strong in that harbor, and therefore the harbor will naturally be provided for in the cleansing, and I was only inquiring what the expenditure would probably be in the other places, if estimated by the engineers. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. SMALL. There was so much confusion, I could not hear the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I asked as to the probable expenditure in the Harbor of Refuge, Nantucket, New Bedford, and Fair Haven Harbors, Fall River Harbor, and Taunton River, Mass. I presume the expenditure will be very small in the places mentioned.

Mr. SMALL. Yes; there is no estimate of appropriation for any of the places mentioned. The $200,000 is intended exclusively for the continuing of the improvement at Pollock Rip Shoals.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn.: For maintenance, $15,000; for improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 132, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, $75,000; in all, $90,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I approve of this item included in the bill, which is a new project, in accordance with the report submitted by the Engineers in reference to the lower Connecticut River. There are two sections of the Connecticut River, so called, as far as improvements are concerned, the lower section being that from Hartford down and the upper section running from Hartford to Holyoke, Mass., which is in my district. For some time an effort has been made to improve navigation in the so-called upper Connecticut River. A new survey was authorized in the Sixty-second Congress and a report was incorporated in House Document No. 417, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session. The Chief of Engineers, Gen. Kingman, in that report made distinct recommendations relative to the improvement of the upper Connecticut River. His recommendation in brief was:

That the Government should appropriate $1,870,000, with $65,000 for annual maintenance, and that there should be constructed a lock and dam at Enfield under private interest, and that the total expense of $3,950,000 should be met by the Government if this lock and dam was not commenced within a reasonable time by the private interest referred to.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That was the recommendation, I understand, of the district engineer, but it was not approved by the division engineer, the Board of Engineers, the chief, that part of it?

Mr. TREADWAY. This is a report, if this quotation is correct, of Gen. Kingman, Chief of Engineers, to the Secretary of War, paragraph 3.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. The gentleman does not mean to say the Chief of Engineers approved of that recommendation?

Mr. TREADWAY. The Chief of Engineers, Gen. Kingman, approved the statement I make, quoting from him, which appears in House Document No. 417, Sixty-fourth Congress. I think the chairman of the committee has the report before him or on his desk, and will vouch for the correctness of my statement.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman has read correctly from the report. Would the gentleman from Iowa care to have the report referred to to read?

Mr. TREADWAY. Now, Mr. Chairman, my particular interest in the adoption of this report comes from the definition of what may or may not be regarded as a reasonable time. I misunderstood that phraseology when I first read the report, but was corrected by Gen. Taylor in a conversation with him in reference to the subject matter. The "reasonable time" would date from the time of the adoption of the project by the Federal Government. So I submit that, in view of the dire need of the improvement of the upper Connecticut River, we should adopt the project and have that time underway to which he refers as reasonable, up to the time the Government should expend the total sum of $3,500,000.

Now, the upper Connecticut River project has been before Congress for many, many years, long before I was a Member of this body. In the Sixty-second Congress the project at that time, as favored by the Board of Engineers, became a part of the river and harbor bill in the Senate. When the bill went to conference the Senate amendment, including this project, was not agreed to. So it never has become a law. The whole matter hinges on the possible cooperation between private interests, anxious to secure the development of water power, and the Government's desire to secure navigation. The interest of Congress, of course, is solely that of navigation. The interest of the people involved is both, one as necessary as the other. The adoption of that project as a navigation project means 12 feet of water from Hartford to Holyoke, passing through a most fertile section of the country, a very thickly populated section, offering and having great industrial possibilities. There probably is no section outside of thickly metropolitan settled districts more industrially occupied and engaged than the particular reach within the Connecticut area. In addition, there is the greatest need of hydroelectric power.

The document to which I referred called attention to the saving of one item of coal alone in transportation for the population as then reported upon. There would be an annual saving on the basis of coal consumption at the time this report was made by Col. Abbot of from $200,000 to $300,000 annually. The various kinds of freight available, both outgoing and incoming, is almost unlimited. The mills of that immediate vicinity need the raw material. They need to get their finished product to the market. And it seems to me that we ought, as the representative body of the people——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TREADWAY. We ought to begin the period, wherein the Government may or may not cooperate, to secure this 12 feet of navigable water in this reach of 34 miles from Hartford to Holyoke. There is no question of the merit of the project. The only question involved is this relationship between the development for navigation and the development for power purposes. I realize that that subject has been a mooted question before Congress. This body has passed one bill, the Senate has passed another, and there it has been hung up almost indefinitely, certainly during the life of the last two Congresses, and what the prospect may be of amendments to the so-called Adamson general dam act, in a way that will permit of this dual relationship, nobody knows. Therefore when there is so much involved in the commercial welfare of a section as is based solely on the navigation feature, as provided by this report, it seems to me that we could do no more than to include this as one of the projects well worthy of adoption by Congress.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. It has not been the fault of the private individuals, either, that this improvement has not taken place, I would suggest to the gentleman, but the fault was with Congress or with the Government in not permitting them to go on with this improvement.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I am glad he refreshed my mind on that point. At the time it seemed probable that this project would be adopted in the Sixty-second Congress a large private corporation stood ready to undertake the private development to which the gentleman from Connecticut refers, and while, of course, we have no positive assurance that that cooperation could be secured to-day, nevertheless it is fair to assume that it could be secured, because the possibility of the development of 30,000 or 40,000 horsepower annually makes a satisfactory and desirable business proposition. It is only fair to anyone who is asked to put their personal money into such a project that the Government show its good faith by first adopting the project. That is why I am bringing the matter before the House to-day; not for its immediate action, because I am willing to bow at the present time in deference to the judgment of the committee that it should not be included in this present bill.

I appeared before the committee, stated the case as best I could, and am willing now to accept the judgment of the committee that the relationship between the two features, namely, navigation and power, should take further form before this project is adopted. But I do not think we should be asked to wait indefinitely for general legislation. I personally do not think that should apply to this particular project. I realize that the action of the committee was in their best judgment. They did not, as I understand it, pass an adverse judgment on the project, but asked for its further delay. Our people hope that that period of further delay is soon to expire. We have been very patient, have waited long and as patiently as we could, but if within a short period the judgment of the committee should be reversed it certainly would be very beneficial to the sections which I in part have the honor of representing.

I think I have made all the statement in connection with the matter that I care to, other than to ask, Mr. Chairman, that I may be allowed to extend my remarks and incorporate a memorandum that I left with the committee at the time of the committee hearing.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 14, 1918.*

Hon. JOHN H. SMALL,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMALL: In compliance with your suggestion made when I appeared before your committee on December the 11th advocating the adoption of the Connecticut River improvement project, I am pleased to submit the accompanying statement to the committee supplementing the testimony I then presented.

Sincerely, yours,

ALLEN T. TREADWAY.

Statement furnished the Rivers and Harbors Committee by Representative ALLEN T. TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, in support of the adoption of the Connecticut River project between Hartford, Conn., and Holyoke, Mass., in accordance with Document No. 417, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session.

1. The subject of Connecticut River navigation has been so continuously before Congress that only the briefest review need be made of its history. In the Sixty-first Congress, second session, Document No. 818, the Secretary of War transmitted a favorable report from the Chief of Engineers upon the project in cooperation with private enterprise which would secure a development of power. Following this report, in the Sixty-second Congress extended hearings were held before your committee upon a bill introduced by Representative GILLETT carrying out the details of the proposed cooperation between the Government and private interests. This bill was attached to the rivers and harbors appropriation bill in the Senate, but was not agreed to in conference. A new survey was then ordered, which resulted in the report contained in Document No. 417, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, already referred to. It will thus be seen that the Connecticut River project has been the typical case of interrelation between governmental appropriation for navigation and private construction for power purposes.

2. The division officer at the time of the survey in 1909 was then Maj. Harry Taylor, now Gen. Taylor, of the Board of Engineers, to whom I gladly refer you for any details.

3. Document No. 417, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, transmitted by the Secretary of War on December 15, 1915, distinctly recommends the improvement of this stretch of the Connecticut River at a total first cost to the Government of $1,870,000 and $65,000 annually for maintenance and operation, basing the estimate on the construction of the Enfield Lock and Dam by private interests. The district officer recommends that if private interests should not "in a reasonable time construct this lock and dam that the United States should undertake the entire work and lease the power created. On this basis the cost to the United States will be increased to $3,950,000." Adoption of either method by Congress would be acceptable to all interested. I do not need to make further quotations from the report, which is available to your committee and which in all details is favorable to the adoption of the project.

4. At the time the report was submitted the population directly affected was over 200,000. The saving in coal transportation alone would have been from $200,000 to $300,000 per annum. It was computed that 30,000 horsepower could be developed.

5. The need both of the transportation facilities through navigation and the hydroelectric power that could be developed never was greater than at the present time. The section to be served is growing in population and the industrial possibilities would be limited only by the power that could be developed and sold. A channel 12 feet in depth from Hartford to Holyoke would accommodate barges using the Erie Canal and the neighboring waterways from New York, relieving in a very large measure the congested freight shipments so well recognized at the present time.

6. At the last session of the present Congress a general bill passed the House substantially in the form presented by the special committee and would have permitted such a development as the one under consideration. The Senate has previously passed a particular bill for the Connecticut River, so it is submitted for your consideration that the two branches have virtually gone on record in favor of the Connecticut River, but that no positive law has yet been adopted. As a result, the citizens continue to pay unnecessarily high freight rates, traffic is congested, industrial development is delayed, and the water power is not only unavailable for commercial needs, but is absolutely wasted. The Connecticut River is a typical case of the combination of navigation and creation of power. I therefore submit that an initial appropriation should be included in your present bill.

7. Should the committee favorably consider the adoption of the project, it could readily incorporate such conditions as would place the project in harmony with the intent of Congress in the effort to pass the so-called Sims bill. I respectfully submit that the initial appropriation should be made by Congress before it could be expected that private interest should construct the lock and dam. The friends of Connecticut River navigation have waited patiently, but conditions are now so acute that patience in this case does not seem longer to be a virtue. We earnestly ask for inclusion of the project in the present rivers and harbors bill.

8. Attention should be called to the fact that improvement of the Connecticut River above Hartford to Holyoke, a distance of 34 miles, would not only make that stretch available to a large amount of commerce but would increase the use of the river below Hartford to the Sound by that amount of tonnage. The benefit can also be regarded as relieving the freight conditions from the points of loading of the tonnage for the upper Connecticut which would be New York, Perth Amboy, Norfolk, or other ports. The improvement, therefore, would not be affected solely on the stretch from Hartford to Holyoke.

9. I beg to again call attention of the committee to the specific phraseology of Gen. Kingman in his report, to be found on page 3, Document No. 417. He recommends a channel 12 feet deep at mean low water, 100 feet wide, between Hartford and Holyoke, at an estimated cost of $1,870,000 and $65,000 annually thereafter for maintenance. He designates four conditions which must be complied with, having to do with the lock and dam and terminal facilities. Under condition A reference is made to construction of the lock and dam at Enfield in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War "under the general provision of law applicable to such cases." I submit that the project should be adopted in the present rivers and harbors bill with the initial appropriation, that a reasonable time be given to any interested parties to lay before the Secretary of War such proposition as may be in accordance with statutes, and that he, the Secretary of War, can then pass upon the plans in accordance with statutes and that he, the Secretary of War, can then pass upon the plans in accordance with this condition "under the general provision of law applicable to such cases."

I would ask that the documents already referred to and my testimony before the committee on December 11 be incorporated with this statement as part of your records.

Respectfully submitted.

ALLEN T. TREADWAY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 14, 1918.*

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to supplement with a brief statement what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has just said, not for the purpose of clarifying his explanation of this project or of adding anything thereto, but to draw the attention of the House to an inference respecting this project.

This project involves both navigation and the development of water power. It is one of the most attractive propositions of its kind in the United States. As the gentleman says, it traverses a section teeming with industrial plants, with a large population, using very large quantities of coal and other raw products, and producing a large volume of finished products. All of these require transportation, and there can be no doubt that if this part of the river between Hartford and Holyoke were improved, commerce would follow.

As I said, the development of water power is involved here, and I think I may without impropriety state that the committee were not unfavorable to this project, but after some hesitation believed it ought to be postponed until we had some general water-power legislation, such as has been under consideration for so many years in Congress, legislation which would attract capital and protect the public.

This is simply another instance—and that is the main purpose for which I rose to speak—showing the necessity of some general legislation, in order that navigable improvements of this kind involving water power may not be longer delayed, against the public interest.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood the gentleman to say that he considered that this particular project—or rather the committee did—I wish to inquire whether the committee thought it should delay the adoption of this project until general legislation is enacted?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is that the attitude of the committee, in view of the recommendation of the engineer, Gen. Kingman, that this particular project should be adopted, and that such laws as now apply should be complied with by private interests?

Mr. SMALL. I probably should not have discussed in any way the action of the committee, but I thought it fair to say that there was no vital objection to the improvement itself, and that the only reason for delay was the absence of any general legislation.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] has stated. I have made so many speeches on this question that I am not going to take up the time of the House with one now. I began to work for this project when not a Member who is now present was a Member of the House. I hope the project will be adopted when every Member who is now present will still be a Member of the House. I feel, as the gentleman has said, that the one imperative and only necessity for the adoption of this project and its completion, which will add both to the industrial resources of the district and to navigation, is the general water-power legislation to which the gentleman referred, and I sincerely trust that the gentleman and others associated with him on the committee will hasten the passage of that legislation.

Mr. TILSON. In view of the very fair statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], I rise simply to call the attention of the committee to the extreme modesty of the people most vitally affected by this particular legislation.

As stated by the gentleman from North Carolina, this locality already has the commerce; there is no doubt about that; and yet, because there is a water-power proposition tied up with it, we are delaying the furnishing of navigation facilities.

In other parts of the country where there is only speculative commerce, where there is only hope that it will follow the improvement in navigation, we have expended large sums for locks and dams and for otherwise improving rivers and building canals. Here we have the business already. There is no doubt about the commerce that will use the improvement.

I wish to call attention to and emphasize the fact that the people in the Connecticut Valley have been unusually modest in their demands. Private individuals representing the water power at this point for 10 years, to my personal knowledge, have been asking for legislation, either special or general, that would permit them to go on with the water-power development. They have not been permitted by Congress to do so, and now the project that would make this great stream navigable, where the commerce is, is still held up for lack of legislation, lack on our part, on the Government's part, of legislation under which this improvement can be begun as a water-power project. I think I am justified in rising to call attention to the modesty of the demands of our good New England population.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman notes that the lower Connecticut is to be improved in this bill. The project we are now speaking about is for the upper Connecticut. If that should be adopted, would not the lower Connecticut, for which there is an appropriation, be benefited by just that much commerce?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. The lower stretch of river that we have already improved would be used very much more if all the commerce of Holyoke, Chicopee, Springfield, and the other Connecticut River towns of that industrial region should have facilities for water transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Duck Island, Branford, New Haven, Milford, Bridgeport, Southport, Norwalk, Five Mile River, Stamford, and Greenwich Harbors, Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, breakwaters at New Haven, and Housatonic River, Conn.: For maintenance, $23,000; for improvement of Bridgeport Harbor in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 898, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $111,300; for improvement of Norwalk Harbor in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1143, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $88,000: *Provided*, That no part of the latter amount shall be expended until the Secretary of War shall have received satisfactory assurances that local interests will construct such public wharfage facilities as, in his opinion, are required in the interest of commerce; completing improvement of Stamford Harbor in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1130, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $183,000: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands required for the purpose of this improvement: *Provided further*, That no part of the latter amount shall be expended until the Secretary of War shall have received satisfactory assurances that local interests will construct a suitable public wharf; completing improvement of Greenwich Harbor in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 289, Sixty-third Congress, first session, $35,000; in all, $440,300.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate, after the few recent remarks just made in passing, to question anything in New England, but for fear I may be challenged later on with sectionalism when I oppose one or two other projects and explain them in other parts of the country, I desire to refer incidentally to two or three projects contained in this one paragraph.

Let me read in regard to Bridgeport from the 1918 report of the Army engineers. This is not the project that is reported on by the engineers for this improvement. This improvement is not for the harbor. It is for Johnsons Creek and to reach up to a boat yard away up at the edge and not on the main harbor. Here is what the report of 1918 says, in volume 1:

No estimate is submitted for maintenance during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and it is expected that the completion of the above work, if necessary before the above date, will furnish adequate channels for the accommodation of the commerce of the harbor.

And yet you are asked in this bill to appropriate $111,000 for Bridgeport, Johnsons Boat Landing, away up the creek, that carries several thousand tons.

Let me refer again to Stamford Harbor here. Let me show what they say about Stamford Harbor. I am reading now from page 225 of the Report of the Engineers for 1918, where they reported favorably for the improvement. Here is what they say of it:

No estimate is submitted for maintenance during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, for the reason that the work to be done under the above estimate, if accomplished before that date, will leave the improvement in such condition that no further maintenance will be necessary during the fiscal year 1920.

There is no suggestion in this report but what, so far as present needs are concerned, these improvements are able to accommodate all the commerce.

Now, I have no objection to these projects any more than to many others that are there, but I do say that the Army engineers in 1918 determined that no appropriation for maintenance is necessary. They are not coming in and demanding these new projects. When they say they have enough money for the commerce there in that stream, and that they have enough for the maintenance for present needs, I say that you take it away from the President and from the Secretary of War to pass upon these things and you put it in the hands of the chairman of this committee, who comes to the committee with 70 new projects, and they adopt all that he recommends.

I say that is unfair at a time when we are facing a deficit of $18,000,000,000, when you have got to raise the money for these projects and others by the sale of liberty bonds and by a direct income tax. At such a time I can not see how any man can go to his constituents and justify this expenditure, in view of the report of the engineers.

Awhile ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] said, "You have not given a bill of particulars." He wanted me to make an hour's argument here in two minutes. I can give you project after project, and I ask you to answer if you can. Explain the immediate necessity, if you feel that it exists, some one, excepting those whose districts will receive all the money that is appropriated here for these different projects. New York is interested in what is in this bill. New York has important commerce, and I admit it; but in the substitute bill which I propose to offer for $12,000,000, which is more than the amount added here to the first report of the engineers, New York and everything else that has any real commerce is included.

These new projects are generally not needed and not important at this time. These are the things on which I could comment; I could comment on the Norwalk project in the same way. There are three new projects here. Let me suggest in passing that under this new system this committee embodies a number of projects in one paragraph, and all the projects in one paragraph, involving over $300,000, have got to be discussed in five minutes, if the committee members are technical, which I suppose they will not be.

In the Engineer's Report for 1918 there is no claim of immediate necessity. No one contends that there is immediate necessity for either of these projects, such as under present circumstances would justify this contribution out of the Federal Treasury at this time.

Mr. SMALL and Mr. MERRITT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SMALL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT.]

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, the report to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has alluded was made by the engineers during war time, and at that time the committee and everyone agreed that even necessary matters might wait. The gentleman has not alluded to the necessity for the improvement of these harbors in Connecticut. As he says, they are all treated together. The reason why they are all treated together, I take it, is that the same reason exists for the improvement of all of them.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MERRITT. I will; yes.

Mr. FREAR. The report which recommends these improvements was made in 1913. The report from which I read is this year's report of the Army engineers, which says that no money is necessary at this time.

Mr. MERRITT. For the completion of these projects?

Mr. FREAR. For the present projects, or for the use of commerce in the harbor, as I read.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What the gentleman read stated that two harbors out of five do not immediately need a maintenance allowance, but that allowance may be needed during the year for the five as a whole, and the amount is $23,000. That is the report of the engineers.

Mr. MERRITT. I was especially addressing myself to what I think the gentleman refers to, the new projects, and for the information of the committee I should like to point out that all these harbors are really a part of the great New York terminal. It has been shown during the war that the railway facilities for handling coal and merchandise into New England through the port of New York are absolutely inadequate to meet the requirements of commerce, and the physical conditions render it impossible to make those railway facilities equal to those requirements, because all that commerce for New England has to come over the New York & New Haven Railroad from New York. That railroad is already overburdened with passenger traffic, and the freight conditions must be ameliorated in order to help New England. Now, all these harbors need deepening and increasing, so that bulk freight coming into the harbor of New York can be delivered into Connecticut and so distributed through New England without burdening that small railroad throat from New York.

That in brief is the necessity for this increase. A further reason is that the schooners and barges which handle the commerce of New York are being made larger constantly, and where a depth of 9 feet was sufficient a few years ago a depth of 12 feet is necessary now. One member of the committee, who is familiar with that branch, being interested in it, so stated when I was before the committee, and that is the fact.

While this seems local, it helps the national commerce by relieving the port of New York, and by relieving the connection with the whole of New England through New York; and therefore, while in the case of Bridgeport it refers to Johnsons Creek, that is none the less a part of the harbor of Bridgeport, because the requirements of that harbor and of the country in order to meet the facilities of commerce have gone up by leaps and bounds, and this is not by any means a local project, but on the contrary is a New England project, and beyond that a national project, and therefore it is entitled to the support of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I would not consume the time of the committee except to point out as an illustration the fallacious argument made by the gentleman from Wisconsin against Stamford Harbor, and I invite the attention of the committee to it. The gentleman read from the annual report substantially to the effect that no recommendation or estimate was submitted, and none was required. The gentleman should know that that extract he read from the annual report referred to existing projects. The bill adopts a new project, and the gentleman deliberately attempts to have the committee believe that the Chief of Engineers has recommended no appropriation for this new project when the committee have deliberately adopted this new project with an appropriation. The annual reports of the Chief of Engineers discuss only existing projects which have heretofore been adopted by Congress.

Now, the gentleman was either ignorant or he was not sincere with the House. I have before me the Report of the Chief of Engineers, House Document No. 1130, Sixty-third Congress, submitted to Congress July 20, 1914, which contains an affirmative and strong recommendation for this project, with an estimate of an appropriation of $183,000, the same amount carried in the bill.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

East River, N. Y.: Continuing improvement, $4,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reply to the gentleman from North Carolina, who has six new projects in the bill, all added after the bill was first agreed to, and who gets a million dollars for his two canals that have practically no commerce. He says the gentleman from Wisconsin is ignorant or insincere, and I repeat that compliment to him, because he is unfair in urging his own projects.

Let us see. I did not say that it was a question of maintenance of the present projects, and to use his own discourteous terms I say that he deliberately misrepresents my statement. It was not in regard to the present projects, I said.

How shrewdly he dodged the proposition of the first and how quickly he got away from it.

Now, you can deepen a harbor to 35 feet if you want to. It is not a new project, it is not necessary for commerce, and you can not get away from it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Was the gentleman measuring his words when he said that the chairman of the committee had six new projects in the bill after it was completed?

Mr. FREAR. After it was reported by the engineers the first time, and the gentleman from Louisiana has five, almost as many, and he is going to be a very active assistant, and I shall be glad to have him because there is something else that I may want to say in regard to that. The gentleman has five, and will make a very good assistant to the chairman.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I hope I shall in the discussion of the bill before the House.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; and the gentleman at the head of a "national" waterways organization also comes from Louisiana, and is a distinguished Member of another legislative body. The vice president of another waterway organization comes from North Carolina, and happens to be the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, this improvement is of vital interest to New York City and to the Nation. I want to do a simple act of justice in connection with this improvement to the Member from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The Hon. Murray Hulbert, formerly a Member of this House, issued a statement in the form of a letter on December 23, 1918, the signature of which is typewritten, but I assume there is no question as to the authenticity of the communication. It contains this statement:

The press, and especially the newspapers, have been very generous in giving me full credit for the humble part I have had in these matters, but this reversal in the treatment of New York Harbor could not have been achieved without the splendid cooperation of Secretary Daniels and Secretary Redfield and the entire New York congressional delegation, of whom Hon. WILLIAM E. CLEARY, my successor on the River and Harbor Committee; Mr. RIORDAN, of New York; Mr. MAHER, of Brooklyn; and Mr. CALDWELL, of Queens, are deserving of special mention.

May I not suggest that a word of commendation for these gentlemen is not only their just due but would doubtless spur them to greater deeds for the future of the port.

The secretary to the commissioner writes as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The commissioner directs me to inclose you herewith a copy of a letter this day sent to the various newspapers, which is self-explanatory.

Yours, very truly,

WM. S. PRINCE,
Secretary to the Commissioner.

I do not speak in any spirit of criticism, but it is only just to other Members of the House that I call the attention of the House to the amendment which was offered in connection with this improvement. On April 9, 1918, at a time when Mr. Hulbert was not a Member of the House, because he had resigned as Member of the House on December 31, 1917, to accept a more lucrative position as commissioner of docks of New York City, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] introduced this amendment:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY: After the figures "$2,200,000," on page 2, line 24, add the following: "And the Secretary of War is hereby directed to prosecute the work of improvement, with a view to securing a depth of 40 feet in the channel through East River and Hell Gate as soon as practicable."

I was present on that day in the House when this amendment was under consideration. There were many Members in the House from different States who took an active part in bringing about the adoption of the amendment. Great credit is due to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] and to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] and to other Members of the House. The votes pertaining to the adoption of this amendment were fairly close. Upon the motion of the distinguished chairman of the committee that the committee rise, the vote, on division, was ayes 49, noes 58, and the vote on appointment of tellers was ayes 53, noes 59. The vote upon the amendment itself was ayes 62, noes 51. I do not wish to detract any credit from any person in reference to the institution of this great improvement, but I do wish to give credit where credit is due, and my observation and judgment is, and there is not any doubt in my mind about it, and I do not think there is any doubt in the minds of the Members of the House about it, that the adoption of this amendment by the House upon that day was due to the earnest and indefatigable efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], and I want to give him the credit which is his due. [Applause.]

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I want also to give Mr. DEMPSEY great credit for what he did that day. He did lead in this matter, and we supported him. My name appears in the letter which the gentleman from New York has just read. I might say that my own modesty would never have suggested that it appear there. I had nothing to do with it, and knew nothing of it, but while I am on my feet perhaps I might say one word for this bill. Before I do so, I wish again to state that Mr. DEMPSEY is entitled to all credit the gentleman asked for. He is a very fine gentleman, always in favor of these great improvements, and on that day he did lead the fight and we all supported him.

As the New York matter is up it brings various things to my mind. It brings the discussion of the New England coast, and the matters in respect to Connecticut, and so on; and as a man who has had experience in transportation matters for a lifetime, I might say that these projects are good; that they are necessary. The coal all does go up through New York from South Amboy and Elizabethport and Weehawken and these other New Jersey ports, through the terminals, through New York up to New England. We have often carried coal a long distance up the Sound much more cheaply than we did a short distance, because in one place we could load our boats full, had 9 or 10 feet of water, while in such places as Stamford and other places we would perhaps only have 6 or 7 feet of water. We had to have so much money for the trip, so that the places that had little water had to pay the excess freight, which, of course, is unfair and improper. That is one of the things that shows the necessity and the justice of these river and harbor bills. Wherever you see throughout the country great cities have grown up through their commerce, you will find that they are on the water. Take Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston—all of these great cities have grown up because of water transportation. Everyone who has looked up the history of it remembers that the city of New York was third in population and commerce when the Erie Canal was built. It is historically interesting to note that it was George Washington himself who first suggested a great waterway connecting the Lakes with the ocean down through the Hudson River by way of the Mohawk Valley. I might say here a word or two in regard to the great citizen who has just died. I remember appearing before him when he was governor of our State on two different occasions, urging improvement of this Erie Canal. Gov. Roosevelt appointed a committee, the result of whose labors was the improvement and enlargement of the Erie Canal. And we should never lose sight of the fact that he is the same Roosevelt who built the Panama Canal. Everybody recognizes that, and that will go down in history perhaps as his greatest achievement.

He was a great patriot; no one dare deny that. Yet he was a great canal man, and he never hesitated in small things. He wanted to improve them and make large things out of them. So when we can mention such men as Washington, Clinton, and Roosevelt as men who supported water transportation and who dug out harbors and made the cities and the country great because of its water transportation before it had rail transportation, then I think we should be liberal in all of these projects. I would rather make a mistake on the wrong side—that is, I would rather be more liberal and give every American city a good improvement in the way of harbor facilities in the rivers and harbors of the country—than to neglect the water altogether. Our business is here. This country is only very meagerly developed as yet in reality. When we have developed all of these rivers and harbors, built them up, the man who lives 100 years from now will not be able to realize how much has been done in his time, just as it is difficult for us as we look back 100 years. Let us not be niggardly; let us go ahead, and wherever there is a proper proposition, wherever there is a reasonable opportunity to improve the rivers and harbors of the country I want to see them improved, whether they be in Florida, in Massachusetts, or in New York. [Applause.]

It is a great national matter. Of course, New York does not need any talk from me. New York is recognized as the gateway of the Nation. Nobody will condemn the improvement of the harbors there, not even men who hate water transportation. No one will put anything in the way of New York's improvements. All of the Nation uses New York, every section of it, when you go abroad or when you come home, and all transportation, east, west, north, or south. [Applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have a good deal the same attitude of the Irishman who went to Paris. When he came home he was telling his friend of his delightful trip, how he enjoyed the sights and the interchange of conversation with its people. His friend said to him, "Why, what are you talking about? You do not talk French, do you?" "No," he replied, "I do not talk French, but I had with me an interrupter." [Laughter.] Like the Irishman, I feel that I am an interrupter in these proceedings, but at the same time I may in a small measure be an interpreter. I can not let the occasion go by without subscribing to the sentiments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] relative to the other gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], who in April last, when the rivers and harbors bill was under consideration, succeeded in procuring by amendment authority for a 40-foot Hell Gate channel. I think, however, that tribute is also due to another New York Member, Representative SMITH, and I know Mr. DEMPSEY will agree with me that it was largely through their joint efforts that said authority for the great and necessary New York Harbor improvement was consummated.

To my colleague, Mr. MAGEE, I am pleased to state that before this good day I have placed on record by written word to the mayor of the city of New York the substance of what he has just so well stated of the great work of Mr. DEMPSEY. I believe that I express the opinion of the entire New York City delegation, as well as that of his colleagues throughout the State of New York, who so ably assisted him, in paying a tribute of gratitude for the masterful manner in which he made that accomplishment. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. I will.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH. When the gentleman refers to Representative SMITH the gentleman is referring to Representative CHARLES B. SMITH?

Mr. DONOVAN. No; the gentleman is modest. I refer to Representative THOMAS F. SMITH. [Applause.]

I need not urge upon the committee the necessity and demand for the improvement of New York Harbor which the bill under consideration proposes. The port of New York, not only being the largest in this country, but in the world, should have added to its great natural advantages as a waterway and for the handling of its immense tonnage all the mechanical and scientific equipments that can be given.

The appropriation for the removal of Shell Reef, the dredging of Ambrose and Anchorage Channels, and the improvement of Newtown Creek will supply the needed improvements. Better navigation, lessening of congestion, and increase of commerce will then follow.

I would, in fact, be an interrupter if I were to continue longer to detain you with arguments, and therefore I will now conclude. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

New York Harbor, N. Y.: For maintenance of entrance channels and for continuing improvement of Ambrose Channel, Craven Shoal Channel, and Anchorage Channel, $300,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, let me not detract by anything I might say from the eulogies paid my friend Mr. DEMPSEY, a member of the committee, or any other member of the committee who can point to a very large amount or number of projects which he has secured in this bill, or any of the gentlemen who are outside of the committee who have been equally successful. I will say this, that the genial gentleman from New York is entitled to credit, because he certainly worked hard, but I can not conceive why the House of Representatives is paying compliments to this individual and that individual, however well-deserved they are, for their energy in getting projects or getting appropriations. Why, Mr. Chairman, it ought to depend and depend entirely, as I assume it does in New York, on the commercial necessity. Why, that ought to be behind it. I have never questioned appropriations for the commerce of New York, if they were deserving of support, urged by either Mr. DEMPSEY or any other Member on the New York delegation for their rivers. All Members of this House stand together—we all stand together—for waterway improvement. But I do not quite understand that sentiment which would pay a special compliment, except for a Member's arduous labors on this committee and every other committee, to a Member because of the appropriations which come for his community in this bill. I can not understand that method of reasoning, and that is without any criticism of those who have paid the high compliments to my friend. I agree so far as the general speeches are concerned. Now, Mr. Chairman, the question was raised a few moments ago about opening wide the Treasury doors, so as to improve the waterways of the country. Oh, yes, you have; you have given $150,000,000 to the Mississippi River, which has not got a boat line of importance. You have given $24,000,000 to the Missouri River, without a single boat line of any kind, with less than 15,000 tons of commerce last year. You have given seven or eight millions to the Hennepin Canal, which I think had 8,000 tons, including sand, last year; I may be mistaken in the exact freight. Why, you have not any commerce upon the inland waterways, so far as I can recollect, with one or two exceptions. Why, there is no boat line yet upon the $150,000,000 canal of New York State, and if any canal ought to be successful it is that, and I hope it will be. New York has shown its public spirit by paying for it out of its own treasury.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That $150,000,000 is appropriated by the State of New York.

Mr. FREAR. I say New York appropriated for it out of its own treasury. I want to give due credit; you are entitled to it; your State is entitled to it; but the canal is yet a doubtful experiment. I say some of these projects are desirable and worthy—we all know it—in this bill, but many are not.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word just to make this suggestion: The gentleman says $150,000,000 has been spent on the Mississippi River and no boats are there. He is not accurate as far as that is concerned. Boats are there, and there is some little commerce, not enough to justify the expenditure of $150,000,000, but this $150,000,000 of which the gentleman speaks has been spent there from the beginning of time down to date. There was a time when part of this money was being appropriated when the Mississippi River was the greatest highway of commerce in the world. There was a time when the commerce of the Mississippi River was 30,000,000 tons annually.

Mr. FREAR rose.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Now just wait a second. I just want, not denying what the gentleman said about the totals, to explain it. During those days certainly no man would criticize the appropriations which were then made. They were necessary in order to further commerce and to make it possible. Why, I remember the statement of the president of one of the great barge lines on the Mississippi River to the effect that there were 5,000 wrecks scattered along the banks of that river and in the stream at the time he testified, which was many years ago, caused by snags and bars which had been permitted to accumulate in the river. It was for the purpose of removing those obstructions to commerce that much of the money was appropriated and was justified then by the facts. Now, in recent years appropriations for the Mississippi River have increased and the commerce has decreased, but in fairness it ought to be said that in recent years the large appropriations made for the lower river were not for the purpose largely of improving the river for commerce, but were expended in the interest of flood control, so that whereas we have spent $150,000,000 in many years, I do not know just how many, but since we began these appropriations, and whereas the commerce now on the river is small, it ought to be stated——

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS (continuing). It ought to be stated that while this $150,000,000 was being expended in the years gone by, which was then justifiable on account of the large commerce then upon the river, in later years a large amount of it has been devoted to flood control. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not a fact before one dollar was ever spent upon the Mississippi River by the Government the commerce was then much larger than it is to-day, that there is not a boat line, not a single boat line, upon the river to-day, and that the $150,000,000 has not developed any commerce——

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No.

Mr. FREAR. And was for that purpose, at least according to the statement made upon the floor year after year, until the Flood Control Committee was appointed, of which the gentleman from Mississippi is chairman, and that up to that time it was always said that it was for commerce, and yet we have no commerce appreciably, compared with the enormous expenditures made upon the river?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Now, the gentleman asks a question as to whether or not this, that, or the other is not true. Now, I will answer, Mr. Chairman, in the negative. None of the statement is correct. There is more commerce to-day, very much more, though the river carries very little, than there was before the Government of the United States ever made any appropriations for the river. There are boat lines now on the river, a number of them. I have not looked into the engineers' report this year, but I take it that the commerce from Baton Rouge—and I think that is the point at which they divide it—south would show something like a million tons. When considering the commerce on the river it is difficult to avoid duplication. The reason I said from Baton Rouge south is because there can not be any duplication there. But there are many hundreds of thousands of tons of freight more. There are many boat lines on the Mississippi River to-day and local and through barge lines.

The third point, as I recall now, is that these appropriations, until I became chairman of the Flood Control Committee, were always predicated on the theory that the money was spent for the purpose of developing the commerce on the river. That is not the fact. The act of Congress which created the Mississippi River Commission in 1881 particularly and specifically states it is for the control of floods as well as for navigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will be allowed to proceed for two minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The fact that all the engineers agree that there was but one way to improve the river for navigation, and that was the identical method by which it was necessary to improve it for the purpose of flood protection, was frequently stated in answer to the suggestion by Members of Congress that Congress had no constitutional warrant for making the appropriation. That is all. The arguments were always made that here was a great enterprise, so great in its area, so great in

its possibilities for benefits to the whole people, that it did, in fact, involve the general welfare of the people, that it justified appropriations being made by Congress, $1 being given by Congress where the local interests put up $3. Now, these facts, I think, ought to be submitted in fairness, in view of the criticism in the statement of the gentleman that $150,000,000 had been spent without securing any commerce. The $150,000,000 does not go in this bill. Nothing is carried in this bill for the lower Mississippi from Cairo down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi be extended three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARD. I wanted to ask what was the total average of the commerce on the Mississippi River last year?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I do not know. The chairman of the committee can state it, probably. I imagine that the commerce on the lower Mississippi perhaps ran, if you could eliminate the duplications, probably around 1,000,000 tons. That is merely a guess.

Mr. GARD. I wanted to know whether there was a severance between the amount said to be appropriated for navigation purposes and the amount for flood-control purposes on the Mississippi River.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The flood-control act passed a few years ago contemplated an improvement on the Mississippi River below Cairo by the Mississippi River Commission, and the jurisdiction of that commission extends to the entire subject of flood control and navigation. I will state that perhaps $1,000,000 will be about the amount spent annually—perhaps not quite that much—directly in the interest of navigation, without reference to flood control, and the other would be spent for the construction of levees and revetments, both in the interest of navigation and of flood control. Now, that is about, approximately, the situation.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. In the appropriations made for flood control would not some of that money be spent in deepening and widening the channel in order to control the water?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. If so, it would not be necessary to appropriate money in the river and harbor bill for the improvement of the Mississippi River?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No. There is no appropriation carried in this bill for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Newtown Creek, N. Y.: For improvement of Newtown Creek and tributaries in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 936, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, $205,000: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands required for the purpose of this improvement.

Mr. CLEARY and Mr. FREAR rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is recognized.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The gentleman who has just spoken, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], chairman of the Flood Control Committee, was a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for many years, and a very active member. This House, in its wisdom, passed a bill giving $45,000,000 from the Treasury toward work on the lower Mississippi on condition that the people along the lower river gave one-third as much, if I remember correctly the condition made in the bill. I can speak from positive knowledge of portions of the Mississippi River when I say that on the upper Mississippi, with practically $30,000,000 expenditure—and that was for the purpose of improving navigation—the commerce to-day amounts to practically nothing in view of the enormous expenditure made; that the engineers figured, in order to get their commerce, the cost of automobiles ferried across the river, and added over $40,000,000 to it last year for automobiles ferried across the river. They do not have the item in it now, but they put in sand and logs floated down the river.

Mr. GARD. To what does the gentleman attribute the condition of the commerce?

Mr. FREAR. To the railroads, largely. The Government today is endeavoring to test it out by building boats and barges, because private investment will not do it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman advise the House how they float sand and gravel down the river?

Mr. FREAR. I will state that I went down the Mississippi from St. Paul to St. Louis, and paid my own fare, for the purpose of seeing how the commerce on the Mississippi River, which I had heard spoken of frequently on this floor, really existed. For 300 miles we never passed a freight boat on the Mississippi River—and that was three years ago—until we passed a barge of sand, and you have practically 6 feet of water there in the river at all times of the year.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Did you meet any?

Mr. FREAR. Nothing except Government boats. These were everywhere, carrying materials for the improvement of the river, and not a single boat carrying commerce, unless it was an excursion boat. But we met this sand. I put these facts in the RECORD at the time when I made the trip.

Now, the gentleman from Mississippi has been a very faithful and ardent supporter of these matters. No appropriation has ever been too large to excite his attention. He has been satisfied. I have no criticism to pass upon him. He has been very kind to me at times when I criticized these matters. But I do want to say that the $150,000,000 spent on the Mississippi was ostensibly expended for commerce, and you have not any commerce to speak of. I have tried to find out where it is on the lower river by reading page after page. There is a little commerce below. But one port in our State has over 50,000,000 tons, and the gentleman takes a great deal of satisfaction because, after an expenditure of $150,000,000, you have got possibly a million tons.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman will be fair enough to state that the $150,000,000 has been expended in the past 80 or 90 years?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; for a long period.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. And during that time there has been tremendous commerce on the river?

Mr. FREAR. Yes. I agree that before a single dollar was ever expended they had 130 boats on the upper river, but there is not a single boat there now. We spent $30,000,000 on the upper river, and we have had commerce there in the past; but now the commerce is almost completely wiped out, except for these proposed Government barge lines. Last year we gave $3,600,000 to Mr. Goltra, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, for barges built by the Government. We are still building them.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. You say "we." Who does "we" mean?

Mr. FREAR. I mean the Government—one of the so-called war boards—for the purpose of carrying ore from St. Paul to St. Louis.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Have conditions developed in the Mississippi River similar to those in Long Island Sound with respect to the railroads?

Mr. FREAR. I can not be interrupted for that. You must take your own time. The conditions are very different. In the Mississippi you can have only a limited depth. Beyond that the water is not there to fill the river, any more than in the Missouri or in the Cumberland or in the Ouachita. There is no commerce there. The railroads take it away.

Mr. CALDWELL. Did the railroads drive out the boats?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; frequently they have driven the boats out of business. That is a matter of public knowledge.

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Chairman, the last item read was "Newtown Creek." Inasmuch as it is called a "creek" I thought perhaps I ought to explain it to some Members present who may not know the facts.

Newtown Creek is only a portion of the East River, running up between the Borough of Queens and the Borough of Brooklyn. It has a tremendous business, which runs into the millions of tons. There are tremendous factories there, and there is a tremendous commerce on it. I want you to know it is not an ordinary creek. It is simply a great slip, a part of East River, in Brooklyn, built up for the advantage of the people so that they can get their water business up into the heart of the city of Brooklyn. That is what Newtown Creek is.

Now, while I am on my feet I want to call attention to another feature of this water transportation, which was suggested by a gentleman who said something about it, that even

where a railroad does parallel a water line and where as the result of the use of that railroad, which gets most of its money out of passenger traffic, and so on, it is able by its large capital for the time being to reduce the tonnage of that river to a small percentage, all the same in the judgment of the people of those localities, the industries that have been built up, the country that has been developed by the simple existence of that river, justifies the improvements that were put on it, if it never carried another pound. I want you to remember that. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is a great deal more popular to throw bouquets and compliments at one another here in this committee than it is to stand up and oppose the bill. It is not popular to oppose a river and harbor bill. If the engineer's report to the committee that $11,750,500 for waterway expenditures for this year is sufficient for all purposes, with a balance of $45,000,000 on hand, then under what reasoning do we propose to go to work and propose to spend $27,000,000? Why do we do that when the engineers, who have authority and whose judgment should govern appropriations, say $11,000,000 is enough?

I was in hopes that we could hold down the appropriations to the amount asked for this year by the engineers. I think under existing circumstances it would be far more popular to do that than to spend $27,000,000 in the face of the conditions that confront the Treasury of the United States. We are exacting every dollar we can get from the people by taxation, and we are trying to expend it in the most economical way that we can; and to propose to expend $27,000,000 for waterway improvements at this time, when the engineers say $11,000,000 is enough, requires a considerable nerve to override the engineers' recommendation and estimate.

Now, we hear a great deal of rates being regulated by waterway improvements. I have been on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for a number of years, and I have seen a great many millions of dollars expended for waterway improvements, but I would like to know who will contend that the ultimate consumer gets any benefit whatever from these improvements? We hear a great deal of talk about how coal is transported on water, and how the people are benefited by such transportation of coal because they can get a cheaper rate by water than they can by railroads. Does anybody believe that they can buy a pound or a ton of coal any cheaper, whether the coal is transported on water or by rail?

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow an answer to his question?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. CLEARY. I will say I know of one case. The Delaware & Hudson Railroad monopolizes the carrying of all the coal in northern New York, and it runs partly up into New England. I was for many years vice president of the Lake Champlain Transportation Co. We used to deliver coal parallel to the Delaware & Hudson Railroad right up into Vermont, and we sold coal right straight along for a dollar a ton less than the railroads. Coal in the village of Whitehall was continually $1 a ton less than it was in Fairhaven, 20 miles away, and the farmers used to haul it from there in sleighs in order to get the benefit of the dollar a ton difference in the price. The railroad had a regular rate. The canal had no rate. It carried it the cheapest it could.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That was some time ago, was it not?

Mr. CLEARY. Up to five or six years ago. I have not been in that business since then.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I have been buying some coal since then.

Mr. CLEARY. I do not mean the last year, during war time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Everybody who has to buy a ton of coal knows that the price of coal is regulated at the mines.

Mr. CLEARY. Oh, no.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is regulated by transportation.

Mr. CLEARY. By transportation; yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. And the small dealer in coal who sells you a ton of coal below the regulated price is put out of business.

Mr. CLEARY. That is governmental.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is the way they are doing business now, and you are proposing to spend millions to open up water transportation for coal, when the price is regulated to the consumer.

Mr. CLEARY. It can only be lowered by water competition.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The consumer can not buy it unless he pays the price put upon it by the manipulators in the market.

Mr. CLEARY. That has only been during the war. I have been cutting the price of coal all my life, and selling it here and there for whatever we could get for it, and selling it more cheaply because of the water transportation lines.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is known by everybody who has to buy coal that the price is regulated. So it is with other commodities. After we have spent millions of dollars in opening up creeks and rivers for the improvement of water transportation, everybody knows that we can not buy anything a dollar or a cent cheaper than the regulated price.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEARY] spoke about the Erie Canal, and what a great benefit it is. The State of New York has spent millions of dollars to develop the Erie Canal, but where are the boats? They have got no boats on the Erie Canal, and there is no transportation on the Erie Canal.

Mr. CLEARY. That is not true.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Not any to speak of.

Mr. CLEARY. The Erie Canal was only finished this year.

Mr. GALLAGHER. But one of the alarming conditions about the Erie Canal is that after it was finished they found they had no boats for it.

Mr. CLEARY. They had to build new ones, but they will come on, just as the rivers produce the commerce when they are deepened.

Mr. WHEELER. There have been about $24,000,000 expended on the Missouri River. How much benefit have the people received in the way of decreased freight rates there?

Mr. GALLAGHER. They have not received any benefit, and there is no boat line on the Missouri River.

Mr. SNYDER. I should like to say a word about the Erie Canal. I live on the Erie Canal, and the gentleman is absolutely correct about there being no boats on it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They have made no preparation for boats for it.

Mr. SNYDER. The Government has been operating that canal for the past year, and I have ridden up and down beside it 40 or 50 miles day after day during the summer, and nine times out of ten I never saw a boat on it. A year ago I suggested here how easy it would be for the Government to arrange it so that we could get some benefit out of it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is the condition practically of nearly all these rivers. There are no boats on them. Here is the Missouri River, on which we have spent millions, more than $20,000,000 in all, and a short time ago they were going to put a boat line on the Missouri River. There is an appropriation of $400,000 in this bill for the Missouri River, and not a boat on it, and no possible chance for a boat to be operated on it.

Mr. SNYDER. Thirty years ago all of our coal was carried by canal, and many times in those days we received our coal at a cost of not to exceed $2 a ton on the yard. This year, by reason of no boat transportation and several other reasons, I received the coal on my yard inventoried at $7 a ton.

Mr. CLEARY. By reason of no boat transportation—the best possible argument in favor of boat transportation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The trouble with the Erie Canal, like the trouble with the rivers, is that there are no boats on them. We have been pouring millions of dollars into these waterways to make them ready for transportation, and there are no boats.

Mr. WHEELER. Is it not true that the owners of the boats that were on the Missouri River disposed of them to the Government, so that there are no boats there to-day?

Mr. GALLAGHER. They sold them out to get rid of them, because they were unprofitable.

Mr. PLATT. Is it not true that the Railroad Administration have fixed the rates on the Erie Canal, and other water-transportation lines, so high that nobody will use them?

Mr. GALLAGHER. There are no boats on the Erie Canal.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some kind of a malignant feeling about the Missouri River, and I wish to notify the Chair that I would be grateful if gentlemen would discuss the paragraph under consideration, in accordance with the rules of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLAGHER. A gentleman asked me about the Missouri River, and I want to tell him about it. There is an appropriation of $400,000 in this bill for the Missouri River, and there is not a boat line on the river, and no prospect of a boat line. I asked the engineer, "What are you going to do with the $400,000 appropriation for the Missouri River?" He said: "The soldiers are coming home, and there is great need for opportunity to put men to work. You can use it very nicely by putting men to work." "For what purpose?" "To improve the river." Yes; and there are no boats on the Missouri River.

Mr. RUCKER. Does the gentleman say that there is no boat line on that river?

Mr. GALLAGHER. There was one; but it was unprofitable to the Kansas City people, who put up the money for that boat line, and they were glad to sell it and get rid of it.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman is assuming part of that. The Government recently took possession of a great many profitable businesses.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They were very glad to get rid of the boats, a great many people that had stock in the company.

Mr. RUCKER. When the Government gets through improving the Missouri River I want the gentleman to come there and ride down that majestic river, and then he will change his mind about it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I have been up and down that river.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague's time be extended five minutes and that he be given at least one minute of that time for himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to quote from the Engineer's report to show that the boats were laid up for the winter and that the boats were there then. That was before the Government took them. We have spent $24,000,000, as shown by the report, and after deducting the sand, the commerce was less than $15,000.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the whole question resolves itself into this: The people are paying taxes and the Government is trying in every direction to get money to pay our war bills, and now, notwithstanding these enormous amounts that we have to raise, we propose to spend a number of million dollars for the improvement of rivers where there are no boats and no commerce to speak of. I have been on the committee for years, and we have been making appropriations every year for the improvement of rivers. But there are no boats on any of the rivers worth speaking about, and we are simply throwing the money into the rivers and into the creeks without getting any return for the people's money. Now, if we would take the millions that we are spending on rivers and creeks and put that money into good roads, does anybody doubt that that money would bring great returns to the farmers and everybody else? They could not control the farmers coming to town with produce; they could not control the traffic on the highways, and we would get some benefit from the money put in good roads that we now put into rivers and into creeks. We put the money into waterways where there is no attempt by the people along the rivers to make any provision for harbors. How are you going to tie up boats where there are no harbors? If there were boat lines or prospective boat lines, I would be in favor of improving the rivers. If there were boat lines I would be in favor of appropriating this money, but that is not the case. Why should we spend enormous amounts of the people's money in the improvement of rivers every year where there is no commerce. I am opposed to it. I am in favor of improving every harbor where there is commerce to justify it. I do not find any fault with the improvement of the harbors of New York or Boston, or any great port where they make provision for commerce, but I do object to the present bill in the face of the report of engineers, and I say it is not fair to the public to expend millions where we do not get a cent of return.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understand, the committee recommended $15,000,000 more than was recommended.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think the engineers reported a recommendation of $15,000,000 and said it could be reduced to about $11,000,000, and the bill carries $27,000,000.

Mr. DUPRÉ. When was the Engineer's report made up and sent to the Congress?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I can only tell when it reached the committee.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The gentleman knows when the annual report is made up, does he not?

Mr. GALLAGHER. No; when I am called upon to act on the report of the engineers is when it is presented to the committee.

Mr. DUPRÉ. If the gentleman does not know about the law and the practice in that respect, that is all right.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I know all about the engineer's report and when it was presented to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALDWELL was recognized.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, we are not discussing any amendment to the bill, the amendment is a pro forma one. I ask unanimous consent that after the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] concludes that we proceed with the reading of the bill. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania want time?

Mr. ROBBINS. I want to answer the argument in regard to the rates on coal. I am willing to do it on the next paragraph.

Mr. SMALL. Very well; Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Newark Bay, N. J.: Completing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 2110, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, $105,600.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER], who just addressed the committee, made the assertion that the waterways of the country were of no benefit in the transportation of coal, and indeed he took the stand that the waterways of the country were declining in the matter of transportation everywhere. The district that I have the honor to represent has bordering it and adjoining it two navigable streams—the Allegheny and the Monongahela. The Government has expended approximately $6,000,000 on the Monongahela River and has installed therein 15 locks and dams and carried slack-water navigation from Pittsburgh to the city of Fairmont, in the State of West Virginia. The average freight on coal within 40 miles radius of the city of Pittsburgh by rail is 40 cents per ton, and it has been that for the last 10 years. The average freight by water transportation, not for 40 miles but for 80 miles within a radius of the city of Pittsburgh, which is the great consuming coal market of western Pennsylvania, is 18 cents per ton, and as proof of the fact that industrial interests that are available and accessible to this slack-water navigation make use of it as a means of carrying coal let me read to you from the lock master's report of Lock and Dam No. 3 in my district to show the amount of coal the industries and consumers of coal generally take by water, because they can purchase it at lower rates, and in order to show that the rivers are not declining in their commerce. I may say parenthetically that when the Government took this system of navigation on the Monongahela over in 1887 the entire traffic of coal, freight, merchandise, and miscellaneous freight was less than 5,000,000 tons. In 1913 12,000,000 tons of freight passed through this lock and 43,598 passengers on passenger boats. In 1914 there were 37,092 passengers and 10,374,000 tons of freight. There was a decrease there because we were coming into the war.

In 1915 there were 27,800 passengers and 11,816,000 tons of freight; in 1916, 32,513 passengers and 12,876,000 tons of freight; while in 1917 the latest available statistics say there were 23,078 passengers and 16,900,000 tons of freight. This freight, according to the lock master's report, was made up as follows: Coal, 76 per cent; coke, 2 per cent; building material, sand, gravel, and so forth, 12 per cent; waste from our furnaces, 7 per cent; miscellaneous 2 per cent; showing that the river traffic, at least in western Pennsylvania is not only increasing in volume and value, but is a positive benefit to our manufacturing industries, and that coal is procured there at so much less per ton that our industries and consumers of coal resort to and use this navigable stream in order to procure fuel.

Talk about river traffic declining! Listen to this: The lockages upstream in this lock—and I give it because it is in my district—were 5,720 in 1917, and the lockages downstream were 6,045. The steamboat lockages upstream were 4,398 and downstream 4,369. As further evidence of this important river traffic and of its constant, continuous, and great increase, let me cite the number of barges that these boats tow. The upstream lockage was 21,000 and the downstream lockage 21,046. When a gentleman gets up on the floor of this House and asserts that we are wasting money on these improvements and that the people receive no benefit from them he is talking either without accurate information or the district that he represents does not avail itself of what the Government is endeavoring to make available for its benefit. Western Pennsylvania has no greater improvement, no greater stimulus to the great industrial center of Pittsburgh, than its water transportation, bringing cheap coal, cheap transportation, cheap raw material to the furnaces and forges of that great industrial center and workshop of the world, the city of Pittsburgh. [Applause.]

Mr. FREAR rose.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who last spoke selected the one project in the United States—the inland waterway that is not a ship canal—that is known as a success, and that is the only one, so far as I know, unless he calls the Ohio River a success, which, with $59,000,000 of expenditure, has an average traffic of only a few miles; but a gentleman from Pennsylvania, not far distant from the gentleman who has spoken, suggested to me that I look at the other locks and see what is doing there. I hold in my hand page 2989 of the Engineers' Report, the last one, and of the 15 locks only those that are down near the mouth are the ones that carry commerce. The upper ones average four and five thousand tons, and so on, and they have cost an immense amount of money. I got the suggestion from a gentleman from Pennsylvania, and he says he knows the condition thereof.

Mr. ROBBINS. Does the gentleman deny the statistics that I have given as to Lock No. 3?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman has taken the statistics of the lower locks, of course, but on the river itself——

Mr. ROBBINS. I took only one lock.

Mr. FREAR. I have got them all here.

Mr. ROBBINS. I do not care; the commerce there will be developed, just as it has been developed in pools Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman from Illinois told the fact and called attention to the decrease. Here are nine locks where there is an infinitesimal commerce to-day. It is only near the mouth where commerce is important. The Monongahela is known as a peculiar river, because it has coal close to the place of manufacture, and it resembles in that particular the Rhine River in Germany, which is practically the only river over there which is a success. The gentleman from Illinois in making his comparison of the Mississippi and the Missouri and the Cumberland and the Tennessee, the conditions are as he states, and in North Carolina and in the lower reach of one of the rivers, of course, the traffic does exist, but it is practically the only river which has been cited——

Mr. WHEELER. Is not there a canal to Philadelphia supposed to haul coal to Philadelphia?

Mr. FREAR. I do not know——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That shows how carefully gentlemen study river and harbor matters.

Mr. FREAR. I do not know to what the gentleman refers. That is all I care to say about this, except that the Monongahela, because of its peculiar situation, with the mines close by and the great industrial center of Pittsburgh, is a success, but it is not a success on the rivers generally. The gentleman from Illinois stated the fact, I believe, correctly, as can be evidenced by the statistics. On the Monongahela, I believe, it is only near the mouth where they use it, according to the figures I have read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Keyport and Shoal Harbors, Woodbridge, Cheesequake, Matawan, and Compton Creeks, Elizabeth, Raritan, South, and Shrewsbury Rivers, and Raritan Bay, N. J.: For maintenance, $15,000; for improvement of Raritan River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1341, Sixty-second Congress, third session, $250,000; for improvement of Shrewsbury River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1296, Sixty-second Congress, third session, $100,000; in all, $365,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to make a statement. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the committee that we are exceedingly anxious to conclude this bill to-day, and if gentlemen will confine their remarks to the paragraph under consideration and will not make pro forma amendments, for the purpose of discussing extraneous matters or matters not involved in the paragraph under consideration, we will save a great deal of time. There is no purpose on the part of the committee to curtail discussion or bona fide criticism of the bill or any inquiries for information.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. And I would be glad if we could make some substantial progress. The gentleman from Wisconsin has the floor. He yielded to me for the purpose of making a statement.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. SMALL. If I have the time.

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I only want five minutes to speak on another matter, which I believe is very important, something I very seldom do, and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. SMALL. Well, the gentleman can make his request to the House when the gentleman from Wisconsin has concluded.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, this is the Raritan River, which carries a quarter of a million dollars in this new project, on page 5 of the bill. The gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the committee, took me to task a little while ago because I read the last Engineers' Report, which is old. I read the report of 1918, of the conditions there to-day. Page 360 of the Report of the Army Engineers of 1918:

Proposed operation. The balance available will be expended in maintenance dredging.

There is a small balance they have there, and there has been an appropriation for this work.

Channels of the present completed width will conveniently accommodate present and reasonably prospective commerce.

That is the Engineers' Report of this year:

It is accordingly not proposed, at the present time, to prosecute the project for its completion.

They will not complete the project, and yet we have a proposition facing us when the engineers say they have enough money, that the harbor will accommodate present commerce, we have $250,000 for a new project coming in here. Let me take up another. The Shrewsbury project. There are two or three others I want to speak of incidentally as I am passing. The Shrewsbury: How much is added here? A hundred thousand dollars. I do not know but what there is more, but that is all that appears in the bill here. Now, let me read from page 375:

The funds available will be expended for maintenance, dredging of shoals at the Highlands Bridge, in Reeves Channel, and in the Upper and Lower Crossovers, provided a suitable contract can be secured.

It is proposed to expend the fund appropriated by the river and harbor act of July 18, 1918 ($10,000) for maintenance dredging by contract where needed in any part of the river covered by the project.

Now, remember, $100,000 in this bill, in addition to $2,805,000 that has already been expended, and a gentleman, a member of the committee, within my hearing says that they have got fine commerce there now. Let me tell you what they have: 411,000 tons in 1917, 95,000 tons last year, a failure of over 80 per cent of reasonable tonnage, and you are asked for another new project on an 80 per cent loss showing.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. What is the value?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, its value. They do not ask anything more; they do not need anything more, and yet with a loss of 80 per cent in their commerce there is added another project to this bill, and you are going to tax the American people and sell liberty bonds for that purpose.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, while I was home Christmas a neighbor of mine informed me that she had received a letter from a comrade of her husband in the Marine Corps informing her that her husband had been killed. She telegraphed the Navy Department, but received no reply. At her own expense she cabled the chaplain of the regiment, the company commander, and tried for a month and a half to get some word concerning her husband, but was unable to get any replies to her cables. Finally, just at Christmas she received this letter from the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

It is addressed to Mrs. Catherine Euphrasia O'Donoghue, 270 West Eleventh Street, New York City. It says:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE,
Washington, December 21, 1918.

In re: #2,186,969. O'Donoghue, Michael Thomas, MCR, MB. Paris Island, S. C.

Mrs. CATHERINE EUPHRASIA O'DONOGHUE,
270 West Eleventh Street, New York, N. Y.

MADAM: The award of $30 per month granted in your favor on the application of the above-named enlisted man was paid up to and including October 31, 1918, but as this man died October 4, 1918, there resulted an overpayment of $26, which amount you will please refund immediately.

This refund should be made by money order or draft, drawn to the order of the Treasurer of the United States, and mailed to the Office of Receipts and Disbursements, Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Washington, D. C., with this letter or a copy thereof.

Respectfully,

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE,
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, ACCOUNTS.
By W. DU R.

5
A. D. 104/sw
Form #2002
Feb. 5/19.

This is a regular shyster-style demand for a refund made upon a poor woman, and the first official notification from her Government that she received of the death of her husband. To my mind, a most disgraceful procedure. Gentlemen, hostilities have ceased for over a month and a half, and there is no reason why these records are not in shape and why the people of this country can not have timely and complete information concerning their boys.

Here is my reply to the War Risk Insurance Bureau, and I ask that the Clerk read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 30, 1918.

BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: In reference to your letter of December 21, in re No. 2186969, O'Donoghue, Michael Thomas, Marine Corps Regiment, Marine Barracks, Paris Island, S. C., marked "5 A. D., 104/sw, Form #2002, Feb. 5/19," signed Deputy Commissioner, Accounts, by W. du R., addressed to Mrs. Catherine Euphrasia O'Donoghue, 270 West Eleventh Street, New York City, you are informed that I have instructed Mrs. O'Donoghue to ignore that letter and all similar communications from your bureau. You will hereafter communicate in this matter direct with me.

You will inform me at once who is the author of this crudely drawn, shyster-style form letter. You will also inform me at once why it is that an overpayment of this nature is not debited to the account of the insurance and taken out of the final payment when it is made.

I want an immediate reply from you, inasmuch as I shall take this matter up in the House.

Very truly, yours, FIORELLA H. LAGUARDIA.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No reply as yet has been received by me from the bureau.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Was the boy killed in action?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; killed in action, or died of wounds received in action. He was a marine.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. For just a question. I have something more to say.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman can get more time. First, I want it understood that I do not approve of this character of letter.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Which one? Mine or the department's?

Mr. McKENZIE. The one that was written to the widow.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Thank you.

Mr. McKENZIE. But I do think in the interest of truth we ought to get the facts before the House and the country. What I want to ask you is whether or not under the law that the Congress enacted some time ago this widow would not be entitled to compensation under that law from the date of the death of the soldier, and whether or not, if she received allotment pay after the death of the soldier, and then entitled to compensation, she would not be getting double pay?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is true. My reply was, as I stated in the letter, that there is insurance coming to this widow and compensation coming to her. Now, with all the clerks that we have, with all the officers that we have, and all the bookkeepers that we have, they can at least debit that account with $26, and when they pay the widow the insurance deduct that amount and not write a letter of that kind.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the gentleman know that the compensation, allotment, and insurance features are all kept separate, and that no one department can keep everything of that sort?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not care. If it is wrong, let us fix it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the fault is in the Congress, then your letter is not justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] that the gentleman from New York may proceed for five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not care where the blame is; we must correct it. Surely a system of credit and debit between these departments can easily be established. I do not believe legislation is necessary for that—common sense and ordinary intelligence is all that is required. What I want to make clear is that I do not want to blame any department. If it is up to us, let us get together and do it; but I do not see that there is a tendency here to do those things.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No. We passed a sloppy bill yesterday with the pretense of taking care of honest claims. We passed a bill by which every dishonest profiteer and crooked money grabber can catch onto the wagon and get his bills paid. And the tendency is keeping on.

If a Congressman goes to a petty officer of the Army he is treated with arrogance and impertinence. Now, there is no reason why we can not take matters in our own hands, and it is up to us to do it. If we do not do it, there is no use of complaining about the attitude of the departments.

Mr. DUPRÉ. If they treat brother officers in that way, what does the gentleman think of the way they treat ordinary civilians who have never been in uniform? [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Just think of it! I can imagine. The gentleman has my sympathy.

The War Department has issued a circular, known as Circular No. 77, in which they stated the policy by which they would discharge certain classes of men, and yet when an application is made and the man is squarely within the requirements of that circular the answer comes back that "the services of the man can not be spared." I had a case where a boy is detailed to selling tickets for the Long Island Railway, and they told me that his services could not be spared, and yet he is a former employee of that railway, and if he were discharged he would be placed in exactly the same position where he is now as a soldier—except, of course, the railway company for whom he is selling tickets would necessarily have to pay him and not the United States Government.

Mr. KEARNS. And get more money, too.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course.

I introduced a resolution yesterday authorizing the employment of civilians in all positions of a clerical nature or where it is just purely manual labor and not of a strictly military nature. It will cost the Government less than it does under the present system of maintaining ten soldiers to do one man's work.

If you consider the pay of a soldier, his food, his clothing, the cost of administration, and the overhead charges, we can employ men in the localities where the services are needed at the standard wages for such services and save money, besides discharging thousands of men who are now involuntarily kept in the Army away from their families and their usual productive pursuits. The resolution has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I sincerely hope it will not be kept there until the war is over, or until demobilization is complete—in about two years from now, at the rate we are going.

But, gentlemen, these men can be spared. We can get every soldier in Europe back. I will tell you how to begin demobilization and actually produce results. Take every officer of the Army and put him back to his original rank in the Regular Army and you will see how quickly demobilization will start. There is no need of that army in Europe. There is no need of that army in Russia. Their duty is completed; it has been gloriously performed. The thing to do is to get the men back as quickly as we can and to demobilize the troops that we have here now. The purpose of our National Army has been served and there is no reason for the continuance of this large number of men in the Army.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is it not because all these regular officers have been elevated in rank and hold commissions with larger salaries? Is not that the reason why they do not want the demobilization?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes. Put them back into the Regular Army at their regular rank. Why, there are mere lads out of West Point but a few years holding the rank of lieutenant colonel. And as for generals, there are hundreds of them. Take the Aviation Service—all Regulars holding high ranks and very few of them flying across the lines; it was the civilian soldiers who did that.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I know of a lieutenant colonel who, with his friends, is doing the best he can to get out of the service, and he can not do it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is he in the Regular Army?

Mr. SNYDER. He is in the National Army and serving as adjutant of a division. Everything under heaven has been done to get him out, even offering to pay his transportation home, and they will not let him come.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly. They want to keep a large establishment over there. No large Army; no high ranks. We must take the matter in hand and compel prompt return of our troops from overseas and immediate demobilization at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. HASKELL. I do so, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to some correspondence which I have here, in brief two letters, in which it is charged

that Maj. T. M. Lynch, of the Quartermaster Corps, died of pneumonia in the Walter Reed Hospital through neglect.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to know if this appertains to this bill or not?

Mr. HASKELL. Oh, no.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Then I object to it.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman from Maryland is too late.

Mr. HASKELL. This correspondence makes the charge that Maj. T. M. Lynch, of the Quartermaster Corps, died of pneumonia in Walter Reed Hospital because of neglect and inhuman treatment, and I ask that these letters be read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read them.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I object.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from New York has the right to have them read.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I hope the gentleman from Maryland will not do that.

Mr. HASKELL. I will read them myself.

Mr. MADDEN. It will take more time if you object to this than by letting it go.

Mr. LINTHICUM. My only object is to get through with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland withdraws the objection. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, *December 27, 1918.*

Congressman HASKELL,
Care Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HASKELL: I am taking the liberty of sending you herewith copy of my letter to Mr. William A. Graham, Chief of the General Supplies Division of the Quartermaster Corps, in which department my brother and associate member of my company, Maj. T. M. Lynch, worked for the past seven months in the position of chief of the administrative branch.

The facts mentioned in the inclosed letter all came under my personal attention at the Walter Reed Hospital, where my brother died solely because of lack of attention and inhuman treatment—the same kind of inhuman treatment, I have since learned, is existing throughout various other hospitals on this side.

I have also since learned, from first-hand evidence of physicians and laymen, who have recounted to me their personal experiences, that they have seen instances almost without end that were even much worse than that mentioned in my letter to Mr. Graham.

I sincerely hope that you can and will take such measures as you deem best to throw the light of publicity on these conditions, and thus minimize, at least, the terrific loss of life that is being needlessly wasted daily, but which fact is being kept hidden from the public.

Nothing can be done, naturally, to bring back my brother to his wife and family; but I would feel that I was remiss in my own personal duty if I omitted taking this step in asking your good offices to try and prevent a continuous recurrence of such catastrophes among not only those who are at the present time in these hospitals, but also those who, in all likelihood, will be accorded similar incompetent treatment for the future if something is not done to change the situation.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPH J. LYNCH.

NEW YORK, *December 23, 1918.*

MR. WILLIAM A. GRAHAM,
Chief General Supplies Division, Quartermaster Corps,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAHAM: Permit me to express, in behalf of Maj. Lynch's wife, his mother, and myself, our sincere appreciation of the courtesy and service rendered his immediate family subsequent to his death, as well as for the representation the division accorded him at his funeral.

We all feel very kindly toward you and the division. Likewise did my brother, whose almost last conscious thought was given to the handling of his work and how best to administrate the duties intrusted to him. He had no idea whatsoever that he was going to die, and his mind was almost continuously given to the work needing his immediate attention.

I am very sorry indeed, however, and if I were to permit myself to give free rein to expression I am afraid I might say something with reference to the medical attention given my brother which would not look well in type. I had a five months' experience last winter with a very virulent pneumonia case of my youngest son, and consequently am a little qualified to pass judgment on the methods of treating pneumonia cases. I had, in all, 8 physicians and 16 nurses ranging over these five months, not to mention a number of specialists. There is hardly a phase of the case which I have not studied, because it meant a matter of life and death with my son, and I left nothing undone, from a human agency standpoint, to bring him back to health, which, with God's help, was accomplished.

The surrounding conditions in which I found my brother on my arrival at the hospital absolutely forbade his recovery. In the first place I am not at all in sympathy with the allopath treatment of pneumonia cases. Their record of "cures" is so terrifically low on a percentage basis when compared with the homeopathic treatment thereof as to leave no doubt in anyone's mind (other than an allopath) of how very abortive are their ideas and how dogmatic they uniformly are in adhering to them in spite of the terrific loss of life accruing from their treatment.

Nothing, of course, can be done to bring back my brother and business associate to me or to his wife or his mother: that is all past. But I would like to, in some measure, at least, try to help, if possible, to remedy the situation for the poor devils that have to undergo such treatment as I saw given my brother on my arrival at the hospital.

Under the plea of, "he needs fresh air," my brother's cot was placed on a screened piazza, and, while the folding doors on this piazza were both open and the temperature very low, a window back of his cot was also open, permitting a terrific draft over his bed. Moreover, insufficient clothing was on the cot, with the consequence that the vitality needed to offset the effect of the pneumonia disease itself had to necessarily be dissipated in counteracting the effect of the terrifically cold draft blowing over his bed from the open window. My wife and I called the nurse's attention to this condition immediately on arriving at his bedside. No justification was attempted for such a condition, as no justification was permissible.

Notwithstanding the fact that I had previously telephoned the officer of the day or the adjutant (Maj. Roberts) offering to bring on two or three nurses from New York with me on the 3.30 Congressional Limited, he told me that he had plenty of nurses and did not need them. I found to be the fact that two nurses only were employed in ward No. 21, where my brother was located, and these two nurses were supposed to look after all the patients in that entire building—a physical as well as mentally impossible task for them to do and render service to any given case like my brother's.

By feeing the nurses and getting them interested in my brother's case, I succeeded in getting an additional special nurse for the remaining few hours of his existence—too late, however, to undo what had gone before.

Toward the end I asked permission to have oxygen administered to my brother, and Capt. Durgin, who was on night physician duty, told me I would have to take this up with the chief. He admitted that the chief was not on duty at night and would not be there until the next day. He suggested, however, I take it up with the captain on the desk at the "entrance" section of the hospital—I believe his name is Haxes—which I did, with the result that he also claimed having no authority to even suggest, let alone request, Capt. Durgin to use some oxygen, and, of course, did nothing. An hour or two later my brother died.

In connection with the handling of pneumonia cases I was further shocked to learn from Capt. Durgin, as well as the nurses, that trips to the ward were made but once every three or four hours, if then, hardly a method of medical procedure that will give any assurance whatsoever of successful results, particularly in the treatment of pneumonia cases wherein the heart becomes such a vital factor, needing close, immediate attention continuously.

Further, one of the nurses admitted frankly that even in a case of necessity they were supposed not to notify or call the physician or to make any suggestions regarding a patient's condition, which would warrant an additional visit of the physician; in other words, medical attention was to be given at the specific periods of the three to four hour interval visits and at no other time. You can imagine my feelings in the matter when I learned this phase of the "treatment."

The whole hospital "treatment" from the start to the finish is absolutely the most incompetent and inhuman I have ever seen or experienced and among my many business clients I have numbered quite a few representative hospitals, and I know whereof I speak.

The foregoing incidents are but a few of the things that I encountered during my comparatively brief stay at my brother's bedside. One further illustration of the obvious incompetency that exists throughout was evidenced to me before I even left New York. I telephoned the officer of the day, or the adjutant, and I had to be very insistent in my statements that my brother was registered at their hospital and, in reality, compel them to go and look it up three different times before they were in position to verify my statement as being correct—hardly what one might term an "efficient" method of administration, particularly so in reference to cases like pneumonia that need continuous, close, personal contact and supervision if the patient, whoever he may be, is to get any show whatsoever for his life.

I am very sorry, indeed, that such a situation as this should have eventuated, not only for my brother's and his family's sake but also for yours. I don't want you to think for one moment that I have any feelings whatsoever toward any other than the hospital administration. I admit frankly, however, that the hospital phase of the matter is one concerning which I have very strong opinions—opinions which are irrefutable because they are backed by indisputable facts, knowledge, and experience that can not be gainsaid by anyone. I only hope that my bringing this matter to your attention may in some way alleviate the condition for those who may have the ill fate to follow Maj. Thomas M. Lynch.

It certainly has been a terrific shock to me to realize, as I have in this case, at least, how apparently unappreciative the Government is of the personal sacrifices, superhuman effort, and work rendered it by men like my brother, whose only fault is that ultraconscientiousness in sticking too long to their task at the expense of their health. For any man, whether he be officer or private, to be accorded the "treatment" mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs of this letter is, in my opinion, a stain upon our Government's glorious record in this war—a stain which I am loath to believe it would willingly permit to continue.

Sincerely,

J. J. LYNCH.

P. S.—I have about decided to bring this matter up for congressional action. I would feel personally responsible otherwise for the murder of others who may follow my brother and be accorded similar "treatment."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance from Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, to the sea, $2,500,000; completing improvement at Camden, N. J., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1120, Sixty-third Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, $71,080; in all, $2,571,080.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I speak on this item because it is somewhat different; it is not a new project; it is not an old project, but it is an important one, so far as commerce is concerned. I wish to call attention to a phase of this item as it was presented to the committee. On page 9 of the committee book report submitted by the Army engineers is an item of $500,000 for this project. That is for the Delaware River from

Philadelphia to the sea, and $400,000 on the Schuylkill. As the bill stands to-day it carries $2,500,000, or five times as much for the Delaware River, and $1,000,000, or more than double, for the Schuylkill.

I have spoken about the conditions to-day, which it seems to me call for some reasonable attempt at economy, and, referring to page 391 of the record, I find that there was available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, for this Delaware River $2,916,123, or almost $5,500,000 that will be carried by this proposition, counting this balance on hand, if we vote this $2,500,000, which I expect the House will do. I refer to page 389 and read from the report of the engineers for 1918:

Owing to the inability to secure advantageous contracts, the balance remaining on hand (of $2,900,000) is larger than was anticipated. It is estimated that the sum of $500,000, in addition to the funds now available, can be profitably expended during the fiscal year 1920 in continuing the required maintenance and new work under existing projects.

And yet, although the engineers only asked for $500,000, with $2,900,000 on hand, the committee is adding $2,500,000 in this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede that we are not at war and that the engineers' report for $500,000 may have been founded on that basis; but the conditions of the Treasury are no different. We are going to raise the funds in the same way that we would have raised them then.

And if the Army engineers at that time thought it sufficient, with $2,900,000 on hand, to add $500,000 more, it seems to me that the committee, in adding $2,000,000 to that amount, is largely burdening this bill with a very big item.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. In just a moment. Now, I realize that this is a large port. I realize that the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. MOORE, who is a very industrious and eloquent Member, is very anxious about this, and that other Members are; but let me say, it is the largest one item that has been added in this bill, and with the Schuylkill River, adding $600,000 to that, although they have expended only some $1,500, I think so far, it is $2,500,000 added to this bill over the report made by the engineers to the committee, as shown by the books of the committee.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I want to ask the gentleman if he has read page 25 of the hearings, where Gen. Taylor, who represented the Chief of Engineers, himself suggested this increase?

Mr. FREAR. I have no doubt you can get the engineers to suggest anything; but here is the report made by the Chief of Engineers, and that is the report that is official, and he says that $500,000, in addition to the $2,500,000, is all that is necessary. Yet the committee has added $2,000,000, making about $5,500,000 for the Delaware River. Now, I suggest that this is a different kind of an item, and as it appeared here I thought it was proper to present to the House at this time in order to show the significance of such methods of preparation of the bill. Of course, you can say it is important, but I can not understand how, with that large amount of money on hand, more than has ever been held on hand for that river before, this large appropriation is added.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I think it proper, just after the gentleman from Wisconsin has concluded, to read from the hearings. It has been suggested that possibly the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] has not attended all the meetings of the committee; but I want to say that he has been very attentive in his presence. But possibly he does not recall, or may not want to recall, some of the things that took place there. I read from page 25 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. The next is Delaware River, from Philadelphia to the sea, for which $500,000 is submitted as an estimate for further improvement. Is that all that can profitably be used during the next year on that great river?

Gen. TAYLOR. I think not, sir, under the existing conditions. The original estimate by the district engineer was $2,500,000, but in view of the conditions that existed at the time the estimate was submitted to Congress—

That is when we were at war—

we cut this down to $500,000. With changed conditions, with the armistice having been signed and the probabilities of additional plant becoming available in the near future, I would recommend that that be put back to the original amount—$2,500,000.

So spoke Gen. Taylor, assistant to the Chief of Engineers. That is all I want to say in reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think we are ready to have the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Schuylkill River, Pa.: Continuing improvement, $1,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I just want to call the attention of the House to the answer, and the only answer, that has been made here—that after the Chief of Engineers and the Army board have passed upon this item and have recommended the amount of $500,000 the chairman of the River and Harbor Committee, according to the hearings, says:

Is that all that can profitably be used during the next year on that great river?

And with that invitation Gen. Taylor said, "Oh, as long as the war is over, we can put in the full amount," and to the $500,000 is added $2,000,000. That one statement of Gen. Taylor is allowed to set aside not only the views of Members as to public economy but the view of the Board of Engineers, according to the reports sent here for our guidance.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Referring to the Schuylkill River, which has just been referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin, I think it is proper to proceed in the way that I have before and to call attention to the difference between the gentleman from Wisconsin and the Chief of Engineers, or his representative, and to the difference between the gentleman and the record as made up in the committee. I read from the hearings, at page 26:

The CHAIRMAN. The next item is Schuylkill River. The estimate there is $400,000. Have you any modification?

Now, the gentleman said that the chairman of the committee had extended an invitation to Gen. Taylor, which he evidently accepted. Personally, I resent that imputation on Gen. Taylor; but I will read Gen. Taylor's reply:

Gen. TAYLOR. I recommend that that be increased to $1,000,000. That estimate of $400,000 was submitted under the same conditions exactly as the Delaware River, when we were doubtful about being able to get dredges, and we put in the minimum that we could get along with, and we now think we will be able to obtain dredges, and that is a very important project.

And he goes on to state what the project is. I just mention that for the benefit of the House, to show how the Committee on Rivers and Harbors acted in making up this bill, which seems to have aroused so much of the opposition of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, much of the foreign and domestic commerce that comes into and goes out of the Delaware River arises on the Schuylkill. That is a very important branch of the Delaware River. It is unquestionably one of the largest oil-shipping ports in the United States. Just for the information of the House, before this item is passed, I wish to say that the reports of the engineers show that the value of foreign exports from these rivers last year was $501,000,000. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that the port of Philadelphia, of which the Schuylkill River is a part, has come to be the second port of the United States. I do not say that with a view of arousing contention, but that is the fact. Upon the Delaware River, in the vicinity of the Schuylkill River, we have very many shipyards upon which the Government is now dependent. There are on the Delaware River, from Trenton down to Wilmington and below, 27 shipyards at the present time. There are 9 docks and 179 shipbuilding ways. At these yards are employed 80,000 men. The revenue collected by the Government at the customhouse in Philadelphia for the port of Philadelphia for the past year is a little more than $14,000,000. That was due to the fact that our exports were heavier than our imports, and to other conditions which I need not explain at the present time. Prior to 1913 it was usual for the port of Philadelphia to collect from the shipping that came into that port for the revenue of this Government as high as $21,000,000. It has fallen off during the war because of the difference between the imports and exports and the laws. I mention the fact, however, to show that while Congress is proposing to appropriate $2,500,000 to build a project that has not been worked upon during the war, and $1,000,000 toward bringing the Schuylkill up to date, the Government of the United States is getting its appropriation back tenfold, and that is one of the methods by which the revenue of the Government is raised. I am aware that some gentlemen say that that is not a fair contention, but I assume that if the waterway is working and bringing revenue to the Government it is mighty good investment on the part of the Government to spend probably 5 or 10 per cent in order to get that revenue.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania about the port of Philadelphia, I want to have read in my time an editorial from the Baltimore American of December 16, 1918, which may enlighten the gentleman from Pennsylvania and some others as to the port of Philadelphia.

The Clerk read as follows:

A BIT OF PORT NEWS.

According to a statement in the Philadelphia Ledger, Maj. Gen. Goethals told Mayor Smith, of Philadelphia, a few days ago that the Government will discontinue the use of Philadelphia as a port for handling Army supplies, as likewise Boston and Newport News, and that all such shipments hereafter will be made from New York, Baltimore, and Charleston. The reason given by Gen. Goethals to the Philadelphia mayor for discontinuing the use of that port is that experience has shown that the cost of handling Army supplies for shipment from Philadelphia and Boston is greater than the corresponding cost as pertaining to Baltimore and New York.

The Quartermaster's Department has, by actual tests, proven what was apparent on the face of things, namely, that Baltimore has an advantage in interior connections and developed harbor facilities which constitute an economic advantage in the handling of export trade. The statement made to the Philadelphia mayor by the quartermaster general will doubtless be a very cold douch for Quakertown, for there has been much talk recently in shipping circles along the Delaware about making the Delaware River port a hot rival to New York in respect to foreign commerce.

Generally speaking, seaports are born and not made. Baltimore, we believe, is one of the born world ports. It has a harbor layout upon a grand scale equaled by few other ports, excelled by none. And it has three systems of dockage terminals functioning in connection with three extensive railroad systems. It is not to be overlooked that the Western Maryland is in alliance with the New York Central system and that the shortest port connection for that system for interior business is at Baltimore.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cooper, Salem, Cohansey, and Maurice Rivers, Woodbury, Mantua, Raccoon, Oldmans, and Alloway Creeks, N. J.: Completing improvement of Raccoon Creek in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 800, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $39,770.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. No one rejoices more than I do that Baltimore has come to the front. [Laughter.] It is a growing city and extremely popular for a while. It will continue to be popular in Washington and elsewhere until the end of the wet season. [Laughter.] This may account to a certain extent for the exuberance of the editorial writer from whom my friend from Maryland has quoted. All the editorial writer has said is not exactly in accordance with the facts. We glory in Philadelphia, now that we occupy the second place amongst the ports of the United States, in the gradual advancement that is being made by our neighbor. We have been working hand in hand so far as we could, except occasionally we have found by reason of the activity of Baltimore's mayor and the energy of Baltimore's Congressmen that they have slipped a few things over on us. [Laughter.]

It is a good thing to have this sort of rivalry along the coast. It is not pleasant to find an Army officer permitting himself to be quoted in favor of one port against another, because if we consult the Constitution of the United States we find that no one port is permitted to have a preference over any other port. Natural conditions prevail to the advantage of some ports, and social conditions, as in the case of Baltimore, sometimes give an undue advantage to a city.

But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, the controversy between Gen. Goethals and the mayor of Philadelphia, referred to by the Baltimore editor, is not fairly stated. There has been a controversy between the mayor, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of War because of certain conditions in Philadelphia due to an overflow from the city of Baltimore. [Laughter.] What prevails at Baltimore seems to be sweeping over into Philadelphia, with the result that the mayor has been obliged to take the matter up with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and in the due course of time the responsibility will be fixed and the invasion will be suppressed. [Laughter.]

But I wish at this time to take advantage of a part of my five minutes to say that I have certain communications from Gen. Goethals and others in respect to the controversy which I would like to put in the RECORD, as they completely refute the statement of the editor that Baltimore has taken the second place from Philadelphia. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Philadelphia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, there is a very pleasant rivalry between Philadelphia and Baltimore, and Baltimoreans love Philadelphia just the same as the Philadelphians love Baltimore. When it comes to the question of particular facilities and cheapness of transportation from Baltimore with the Central West, Baltimore has it all over Philadelphia. As to the hospitality and the wet goods of Baltimore at this time, I want to say that we do sell squirrel whisky, which makes a fellow jump around a little, but we do not sell, as they do in Philadelphia, a brand called Eagle whisky, which makes him fairly fly.

The Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy told the mayor of Philadelphia that if he did not clean up a little he would have to do it for him. I think that is the matter the gentleman refers to. The Secretary of War or the Navy has never had to tell Baltimoreans that we keep clean.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I was willing to submit to two interjections by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] because a few moments ago he raised the point that we were not discussing the particular project, and I wanted to see how far afield he was willing to go.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have been discussing port facilities.

Mr. FREAR. The port of Philadelphia is not in controversy.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, so that I may make a request?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Very well; make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the interesting part of the discussion by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] and also by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] in regard to Schuylkill River is of no avail, because I made no suggestion about the Schuylkill. I was discussing the Delaware River, and they both jumped to the Schuylkill immediately. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] rightly says that Philadelphia has a large item of $14,000,000 which is received every year and goes into the Government Treasury. That is a large amount of money, but they have some large shipyards down there. That is also true; but the gentleman fails to tell us that there is to be taken from the Government Treasury over $34,000,000 to make up a shortage in the Hog Island shipyard proposition that no one can explain, and that is right in sight of Philadelphia, so that this money in the Treasury can not all be used for carrying on this waterway, when we have to pay for a shortage in the Treasury that comes from that immediate neighborhood.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is going a little afield.

Mr. FREAR. I will yield later, but I want to get back now to Raccoon Creek.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman has made a charge.

Mr. FREAR. I know; and the gentleman can answer it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no time, because the time has been fixed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I object to being interrupted, because I have not the time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then I shall have to take some time.

Mr. FREAR. Why, certainly that is all right. I would not make any charge at all that I would not want the gentleman to answer if he can. I am now referring to Raccoon Creek. Raccoon Creek is an important proposition. It gets $39,000 in this bill. It has lost over 80 per cent of its commerce within four years, and half of that important commerce was manure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is going out to Wisconsin to fertilize the land out there.

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no; we do not need it. We grow things without it there. Page 5 of the report says that the traffic of the stream is carried by gasoline boats and barges, and by one steamboat plying daily between Bridgeport and Philadelphia; but before that let me throw a little light on this Philadelphia situation. In the Washington Star of January 3 there is a reference to a Government investigation of alleged discrimination against Philadelphia as a port for overseas trade and for disembarkation of troops, and we find it reported that Philadelphia and Boston alone of all of the principal ports in the country have not been represented upon the shipping control committee of the United States Shipping Board, notwithstanding such representation has been earnestly urged, and that neither of these ports has received what it believes to be its proper allotment of Gov-

ernment overseas trade. In other words, the disembarkation of troops must await until Philadelphia has been given its fair proportion and Baltimore its fair proportion with Boston and New York. Oh, no; that is not the purpose, and if that is the suggestion in this report it is a mistake. But let us get back to Raccoon Creek. There is reported a small tonnage, with drafts between 4 and 6 feet. The traffic of the stream is carried by gasoline boats and barges and by an occasional steam tug. A greater width at bottom than 40 feet would be impracticable, it is said, without endangering the stability of the banks. On page 7 of the report I read:

The stream is tortuous in its course, but can not be advantageously straightened by cutting off points or shortened by making cut-offs, because the meadows along the banks have been protected by levees and have been reclaimed to a greater extent than on any other stream in the district. Instead of the worthless marsh land usually acquired for cut-offs valuable farm lands would be destroyed and the price would be out of proportion to the benefit expected.

Mr. Chairman, here is little Raccoon Creek, and the committee has put this in for $39,000, in addition to all the money that has been spent on the creek, which lost 80 per cent of its commerce during the last four years. That is a proposition added to this bill by the committee.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], I want to say that Raccoon Creek, I suppose, would be spoken of as a river in his district, because it is a large stream. It carries one of the largest volumes of commerce of any tributary of the Delaware River. The Board of Engineers in 1913 reported that there was an average daily tonnage of about 4,923 tons; that in 1912 the commerce amounted to 92,688 short tons, valued at $1,163,700. There are 21 landings and wharves used, and I think 34 boats ply the stream. The farmers use it almost entirely to ship their products to Philadelphia, Chester, Wilmington, and Baltimore. There is more farm produce shipped from the city of Swedesboro, on this creek, than from any other one point in the State of New Jersey. Produce also goes to New York and Boston, but that freight goes by rail.

This provision is for a jetty at the mouth of the creek; it has been highly recommended by the Board of Engineers and it was in a river and harbor bill which passed this House and died in the Senate. I am surprised that the gentleman makes this attack upon an item for the improvement of a creek which is doing business for the benefit of the farmers in south Jersey.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that there is only one railroad running down to serve this farming country?

Mr. BROWNING. There is but one.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that if this stream were not open so that the farmers could get to it by boat they would have to pay the highest possible freight rates?

Mr. BROWNING. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that if they had to do that the price of living would go up to all of those who purchase these food products?

Mr. BROWNING. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Why did the Lord ever arrange that the Delaware River should have tributaries so that the farmers could get to it? Can the gentleman answer that?

Mr. BROWNING. I do not know.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cold Spring and Absecon Inlets, Absecon and Tuckerton Creeks, and Toms River, N. J.: For maintenance, $20,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "Absecon Inlets," in line 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa moves to amend page 6, line 6, by striking out the words "Absecon Inlets."

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors refused to allow an estimate for maintenance of $30,000 for Absecon Inlet. Now, under this policy of grouping projects in a district for maintenance of projects the engineers could use any or all of this $20,000 at Absecon Inlet. It seems to me that to carry out the intention of the committee these words should be stricken out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that the motion made by the gentleman from Iowa will not prevail. The gentleman who represents the district in which this inlet is, Mr. BACHARACH, has been called away by illness. I know that he sincerely desires that this item shall stand as written, and as it is for maintenance I see no reason why it should not stand. Absecon Inlet is an inlet at Atlantic City, N. J., the great coast playground of the world, and efforts have been made there for years to establish boat lines, and they have been established, and they were running up until the war. Efforts to establish a 12-foot channel were made, and were successfully made. That channel is outside where the sea sweeps back and forth and tides flow, and it is very difficult to maintain it. Any gentleman who has been to Atlantic City and gone up to the inlet and out on one of the pleasure craft will understand the difficulties of this proposition. There is a harbor there, and there is every reason why commerce should be encouraged to go there. There is no other way to get there except by rail, and that is very expensive in these times. To strike out this item and leave Cold Spring Harbor in would simply mean to cut out Atlantic City.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Does the gentleman think the Government is justified in spending $40,000 a year there, which it has been doing for four or five years?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The item is for the maintenance of Cold Spring, Absecon Inlet, Absecon and Tuckerton Creeks, and Toms River, N. J., not for Absecon alone.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I am not asking to strike out the appropriation; I am asking to strike out the words "Absecon Inlet," because there is no commerce there that requires continuing the work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. There is no commerce; there are no steamboats. It is a channel made by a sea-going dredge. The dredge is the only boat to be seen in the channel.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know steamboats were running from Philadelphia into Atlantic City——

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. When?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Some time before the war.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. There have been no steamboats there for two years. We are spending $40,000 per year wearing out a dredge and getting absolutely no returns in the way of commerce.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That substantiates my statement.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I call attention to this fact——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I mistake not, because I have not followed this matter closely, I saw it announced recently that a steamboat line had been started by some business men to connect with New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. If that is true the dredge could be put in commission again, but there is no occasion for doing work there at present. It has developed no commerce.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that a large appropriation has been made for Pollock Rip Shoals, out in the open sea, which the gentleman and I both supported and which the committee approved, where the sea sweeps back and forth and where there is a possibility always that maintenance will have to be provided.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Yes; but there are millions of tons of commerce passing through Pollock Rip Channel.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is true, and I approve the appropriation and would fight for it, because I believe it to be necessary; but the geographical conditions are substantially the same as to the ebb and flow of the tide and the possibility of filling in the channel. Why, you might as well say that a house would keep clean forever without sweeping as to say that an inlet that the sea breaks over back and forth would keep open without assistance.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. If there is any commerce that is using it now, the engineers do not know it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There are hundreds of boats at Atlantic City using this inlet——

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I beg the gentleman's pardon, that is not the case. I was over there a year ago last spring and I talked with fishermen and also with the people working on this dredge, and they said there was absolutely no use for that channel except for the sailboat that took people from Atlantic City out over the bar and back.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] hands me a report showing that in 1914 there was an increase in commerce at this point from 27,500 tons in 1913 to 30,500 tons, so why close it up, why stop business that has just started after this vast expenditure?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. The commerce that they have there does not use the channel the dredge is maintaining.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman again calls attention to the value, showing that the commerce advanced from $1,700,000 to $1,800,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps there is no difference between the gentleman from Iowa and myself. It

is only a question of how such mutual purpose shall best be carried out. What the gentleman has in mind, as I understand, is to provide that no part of this $20,000 shall be spent on Absecon Inlet; but I do not think that ought to be accomplished by striking out "Absecon Inlet" from the bill, because there is available, or was on July 1, 1918, $20,000. The words "Absecon Inlet" may remain in the bill. I will ask the gentleman if this proviso, which I will read, would not accomplish the purpose he has in mind: Strike out the period at the end of line 8, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended on Absecon Inlet."

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That it the purpose I seek to accomplish. I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman withdraw his amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. No; I accept the amendment to my amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask whether that does not contemplate the abandonment of the maintenance at that point?

Mr. SMALL. I will say to the gentleman, pending the reading of the amendment, that Absecon Inlet has been discussed by the committee a great many times. The original improvement was taken up as an experiment, and with the assurance that the commercial interests of Atlantic City and other localities would see that a commerce was established between Atlantic City by water and other points. There is no such commerce to and from Atlantic City through the inlet.

The commerce is confined to small fishing boats and pleasure boats, and for their purposes it is not necessary to maintain a deeper channel than would exist naturally.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That involves commerce, as I stated, and it involves the saving of life.

Mr. SMALL. There is no need of any further improvement for these pleasure boats or these fishing boats. There was a steamer placed in service at one time between Atlantic City and New York, I think, but that service has been withdrawn for some time. And my understanding is that there is at present no commerce by steamboat of any size between Atlantic City and any other point.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman what becomes of the dredge?

Mr. SMALL. The demand for dredges is so great it can be used in other improvements.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has not been working there for some time.

Mr. SMALL. That is probably true.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has the inlet been going back?

Mr. SMALL. Up to this time the project depth has been maintained, and will be so long as the available funds will permit. The committee concluded that the existing commerce did not justify further appropriations. Under the general provisions of the law the dredge formerly used on this project may be diverted for other improvements.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in view of the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee, which serves the purpose I have in mind, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENNEDY] asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 8, strike out the period at the end of line 8, insert a colon, and the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended on Absecon Inlet."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appoquinimink, Smyrna, Leipsic, Little, St. Jones, Murderkill, Mispillion, and Broadkill Rivers, Del.: For maintenance, $10,000; for improvement of Mispillion River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 678, Sixty-second Congress, second session, except that part of said improvement known as Cut-off No. 2, which is hereby eliminated from said project, $70,400: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands required for the purpose of this improvement; in all, $80,400.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In addition to $219,000 or more that has been spent upon this little creek, or river, as it may be called, the Mispillion, this bill carries $70,400. Let me say in reply to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING], who talked just a few minutes ago, and who questioned whether or not we had a transportation waterway out there, that the greatest river in the world passes by my district, and I think most of the money spent on it has been wasted. We have a port that carries 52,000,000 tons, or practically twice what Philadelphia carried last year.

But I want to address myself, if I may, to the Mispillion River.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. My rising, Mr. Chairman, seems to be a signal for interruptions. I trust I am not, intentionally, at any rate, intruding on any of these projects belonging to the gentleman, but I want to talk about the Mispillion River now.

The district officer presents a project for the improvement of the Mispillion River. Understand that this project was in the 1914 bill, which was defeated. Now it is up here again. It was the same kind of a project. It has not changed at all, and it is not improved at all, but we have lost 40 per cent of the commerce we had at that time.

I am reading from page 4:

The improvement now desired and needed is the making of a number of cut-offs in the river to shorten the distance between Milford and Delaware Bay, the elimination of some sharp bends, and the increase in depth across the flats to 6 feet at mean low water to conform to the project depth in the river—

And so on. And then down further it says:

The Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad passes through the town and shares with the river the transportation of the town and vicinity.

Of course, the suggestion was made that the railroads are held down in their prices by the waterways. That is not so, unless you have a railroad commission that will hold them down to a reasonable expense. Why should the Government be continuously putting money in there on the theory that it is going to affect freight rates? That was once a common argument, but it has been exploded now, Mr. Chairman, and it is not indulged in in these debates, and particularly it is not indulged in by the Army engineers, who now make their recommendations on a different basis.

I am reading from page 4 again. I read:

There are no public wharves on the Mispillion, but all the private wharves are free to those who wish to use them, and space along the river bank is too abundant to permit of any monopolizing of the terminal facilities.

Notwithstanding this money that has been expended—over $200,000—there is not a public wharf on that stream yet; and in order to shorten the distance up to Medford—that is the purpose here—for these people who do not contribute a nickel toward this project, we are asked to give $70,000 more, in addition to the $200,000, to be derived from the sale of liberty bonds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.: For improvement to a depth of 12 feet at mean low water, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 196, Sixty-third Congress, first session, $3,000,000: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount so much as shall be necessary, not to exceed $2,514,289.70, may be paid for the purchase of the existing Chesapeake & Delaware Canal and all the property, rights of property, franchises, and appurtenances used or acquired for use in connection therewith or appertaining thereto.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. SMALL: Page 7, strike out the words "the purchase of" at the end of line 7.

Mr. SMALL. I will explain the purpose of this amendment. Condemnation proceedings are now pending for the acquirement of this property, and they were pending when the agreement was made, about a month ago, as to the purchase price of the property. It is quite probable, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers and the Department of Justice, that it may transpire that the best way to obtain title so as to quiet any outstanding claims would be to have the condemnation proceedings continue in a friendly way to an award and final judgment; and that being true, the words "for the purchase of" ought to be stricken out, so that it will read "may be paid for the existing Chesapeake & Delaware Canal."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would the effect of the gentleman's amendment be to leave open the condemnation proceedings in the event there should still be any differences between the Government and the owner?

Mr. SMALL. It leaves it entirely in the discretion of the Secretary of War, to acquire it either by purchase and the execution of proper instruments or by pursuing the condemnation proceedings, as may be deemed desirable.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In other words, there will be two strings to the bow?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I would not pass over this item in this quiet way, but——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman intends to debate the item?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am very glad to hear it. We did not expect the gentleman to pass over it.

Mr. FREAR. And the House would be indebted to the gentleman from Philadelphia without a motion on my part to strike out the last word. I hold in my hand Document 196. That is of the Sixty-third Congress, first session. This is for $3,000,000 for a bankrupt canal. That is only for the first payment. You are going to have $12,000,000 or $15,000,000 or possibly $20,000,000 to pay for a 13-mile canal, 25 feet deep or over, to connect the Chesapeake with the Delaware River. It will eventually amount to that.

Col. Bixby recommends the Raritan, running across New Jersey. That is to cost $45,000,000 if you put it at a 25-foot depth. That is in the same document as the one in which he recommends the 13-mile canal we are now discussing.

Mr. Chairman, we have had this project before us for many years. When it was originally built the Government put $450,000 into that canal. Now the Government is to buy it outright, to spend $3,000,000 in this bill, and possibly $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 eventually to get the deep channel that they want in order to connect Philadelphia with Baltimore. They will come in here with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to show why it is needed for naval protection, so that our great battleships can run in and out, so that no hostile vessel can come across the seas and catch them. [Laughter.] It is needed also, it is said, for the transportation for troops at the rate of 4 miles an hour, in order that the troops may be transported from Washington to Baltimore. That is from the engineers.

There is a little commerce there, a small commerce; but for this $3,000,000 you will assess the people of the Hawaiian Islands and compel them in part to pay, and the people of Sandusky and the people of every harbor out in the State of Oregon and the State of Washington, and say they shall pay half or a large contribution toward the improvement of their projects.

Why do we say, "We will give to Pennsylvania and Baltimore $3,000,000 in this bill and follow it up with an unlimited amount—any amount you choose to put in, depending on the width of the canal and the depth" without asking for contribution?

Mr. Chairman, I have moved to strike out this item many times. It is no better and no worse than many other items. But my distinguished friend here from Philadelphia, Mr. MOORE, with his eloquence can almost convince a man against his will concerning the merits of a proposition, and no doubt he will do it with respect to this. The Government paid $450,000 originally, and now when the company is bankrupt, when the bonds are worth only 68 cents on the dollar and the stocks are valueless—and the stocks and bonds are all practically held by the city of Philadelphia—we are to buy it. I do not care to discuss or to criticize it any more. I have done so time and time again, many times. As my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] once said, it is to take the seasickness out of the sea in going from Baltimore to Philadelphia, a delightful trip to take. [Laughter.] Of course, lives have been lost in going from Baltimore to Philadelphia by water, but Christopher Columbus in a comparatively small boat crossed the ocean several times. He was never afraid, and yet we must have a 13-mile canal between Baltimore and Philadelphia in order to make them more accessible to each other. The people over there want it. The people who own the stocks and bonds of this company want it. But I feel that they should make some contribution first of all.

Now, we are going to have the proposition elucidated with more eloquence by the gentleman from Pennsylvania than by anyone else who could attempt it. He has brought out a map illustrating the course of the canal. I suggest this to the gentleman, that all the while he is speaking on this subject the people who are to pay for this are the people not only of my State but the people of every State in the Union, and we will have to buy liberty bonds to build this Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, and we are now facing $18,000,000,000 indebtedness in order to buy this canal and meet other expenses. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I intend to give the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] the surprise of his life. He has been so generous in his adulation of this project that I feel that I ought not to take up the time of the House to answer him. [Applause and laughter.] To be sure, there have been one or two misstatements; I will not be so severe on the gentleman as the chairman of the committee is at times, because they love each other in the House and in committee; but several of the gentleman's statements are so utterly at variance with the—I will not say that [laughter]; but some things that the gentleman said so lack knowledge and information that I feel I would like to extend my remarks on this subject. I ask unanimous consent to do so. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman is so eloquent, so full of facts, so full of oratory, and so full of jokes, and that the subject matter of his speech is so well portrayed on the map that tears are dropping down from the clouds on certain parts of the map. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The map speaks for itself.

Mr. MADDEN. And it cries to itself. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, no.

Mr. MADDEN. I am inclined to object to the request for an extension of remarks on the part of the gentleman, and insist that his remarks be uttered on the floor. I do not like to have gentlemen make these speeches under cover, so I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be given 15 minutes in which to utter his remarks, so that we can hear what he says instead of having them hidden away in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to say that a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still. I feel that I ought not to say anything on this subject, important though it be.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman knows that I come from Pennsylvania and that I have served in public bodies up there. We have always been pretty liberal up there to encourage many enterprises. This, I understand, is what is called a "pork-barrel bill," is it not?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Such bills have been so called. I think the gentleman has been in error about the facts sometimes.

Mr. FOCHT. I am very liberal by my vote, and I do not want to have any conscientious scruples. I should just like to know what Pennsylvania is getting out of this. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If you will listen to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] you will find that we are getting more than $6,000,000 for "the vicinity of Philadelphia." I do not quite agree with him, because I believe every one of these projects to be national projects.

Mr. FOCHT. Since allegations are being made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] that Pennsylvania is being taken care of to that extent, I think possibly I will be able to arrange matters with my conscience and vote for the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I welcome the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] into the fold. We are gradually making converts for a worthy cause, and the longer we stay here and the more persistent we are the more friends we have and the more meritorious does our cause become.

Mr. FOCHT. Do you not think that some other Members might make a similar acknowledgment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think so.

Mr. FOCHT. And that possibly some of their enthusiasm is inspired by the pork coming into their immediate neighborhood?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Wisconsin has been so self-sacrificing regarding his own territory and so condemnatory of his own rivers that sometimes I think it might be well for other Members to praise theirs.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I object to this Pennsylvania colloquy. There are other States represented here besides Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Illinois is always welcome in a controversy of this kind, and New York likewise.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman seems to be carrying out his first idea, of not saying anything about this project.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the fact, owing to these interruptions. The gentleman is as lucid as usual.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appreciate the compliment of being invited to say something on this subject. It is one very dear to me, and one in which I have come to believe thoroughly. The agitation to accomplish this great work has extended over the period of my entire term in Congress. I believe it to be of national moment, or I would not stand here advocating it.

Much has been said about the extravagant expenditures of the Government at the present time. River and harbor bills have been inveighed against because of the allegation of "pork." No one has contributed more to that unsavory reputation of river and harbor bills than the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] and naturally it has brought responses and countercharges from gentlemen who are interested in improvements of this sort. It is not known generally that under the auspices of the waterways association, of which I happen to be president, and which has often been referred to by my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], a waterway regiment was organized for service in France. I have in hand a letter from one of the officers of that regiment which to me contains a moral for the people of the United States to heed. This letter comes from the Seine district in France, and it leads me to say that the Rhine is not the only river in Europe upon which there is a great barge traffic. Only a few days ago we read that owing to the floods in the River Seine the people of Paris were being shut off from food supplies; and I stop to interpolate that every nation in Europe to-day is preparing to reconstruct or to construct canals for the purpose of carrying food supplies and lessening freight costs. This is the only country that has not been doing it extensively in recent years.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman spoke of his long experience in this matter. Does he not think it has assumed a position of greater importance at this time, in view of the extraordinarily high freight rates which we have been having as the result of the Government administration of the railroads?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think there is a great deal in that statement. It is an argument that I would support.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose the gentleman would not care to have that particular controversy discussed just now?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would, because waterway development was a part of the railroad-control bill as it passed this Congress, and instead of waterway development being encouraged, as it should have been encouraged, we discovered that railroad management remained with the old railroad managers, and substantially every movement to develop waterway transportation, and to furnish competition, was not encouraged, if it was not throttled.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the last statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania indicate that he is against the railroads being managed by those who have special knowledge of railroad business?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am certainly not in favor of Government ownership, and I believe the railroads should be managed by men who are best able to manage them and who know the business. [Applause.] But I believe that when we appropriated $500,000,000 to the Director General of Railroads to take over the railroads of the country, and in that bill authorized and directed him to take over the waterways and use them, if the result of that has been that when the great State of New York has spent more than $150,000,000 to build canals to be of service to the people, upon which freight can be carried for less than it can be carried upon the railroads, it does not become the administrator of the railroads under Government direction to provide and insist that the freight charges upon the waterways shall be equal to the freight charges upon the railways.

Mr. SNYDER. I should like to make a suggestion on that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the reason I say that in some instances it may be that water transportation has been throttled by Government control of railroads.

Mr. SNYDER. The Railroad Administration took over the Erie Canal after the expenditure of $150,000,000 by the State of New York, and then refused to have that canal used.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman's statement is a fair one. The rates were to be forced up to equal railroad rates.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish the gentleman would tell us something about the proposition that is delineated on the map.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will do that; and I think I can convince the gentleman in due course of time. But I want to read about the American soldier boys in France who are developing waterways there while we have been sitting idle, refusing to make provision for new projects in the United States:

> We have American crews on towboats and barges that we bought or have hired from the English and French, and it looks good to see our flag on the river. Of course, we got started long after the British in this river game and had to patch up old boats and improvise ways and shops, repair old machinery, and do a lot of things late comers usually have to do. It has been an interesting game so far, and never fear but what Americans can operate boats and barges with any of them. * * *
>
> As you know, these French and Belgian barges operating on the canals of the first category are all of a standard dimension and are approximately 250 tons displacement.

I read that much only to show the truth of the argument that has been made here for a long while—these many years—that these foreign countries have been utilizing waterways and using them to the full while we have neglected ours. And the gentleman from Illinois wants to know about this particular proposition.

I want to deal with it in this way: Is it too expensive? That is the proposition. That has been the sole objection to it when all is considered. Too expensive! What is the proposition? Utilizing the natural waterways along the coast inside the ocean line. Great steamships can go up along the coast when not interfered with by submarines, of course. They could come and go here inside. If we had these waterways open they could penetrate the very territory they are intended to serve without rehandling of cargoes. It has been but a few days since you read with intense enthusiasm of the President of the United States riding on the deck of an ocean greyhound up from the Mersey River to the city of Manchester, in England, amidst the huzzas of the people along the way. The people from the various towns saluted him and his trip ended with grand acclaim in the center of that great manufacturing city, 33 miles inland from the sea—just about the distance from Trenton to New York, which we propose to utilize when the upper part of the canal is authorized. Vessels carrying beef from Chicago, vessels carrying wheat from the Dakotas, vessels carrying cotton from the South, vessels from the ports of Galveston and Savannah and New Orleans carrying food to feed the people of Europe, providing them with raw material for manufacture, go up the Mersey River by the port of Liverpool to Manchester, thirty-three-odd miles away. Our own President stood on the deck of an ocean steamer only a short time ago—up through the fields of England into that inland city of Manchester. I mention this because we have even superior waterway facilities in the United States but have failed to take advantage of our opportunities.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman recall whether or not England as a country built that canal to Manchester, or did the city of Manchester build it?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will tell the gentleman how it was: Liverpool stood like a dog in the manger at the port, one of those ports to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] referred a little while ago, like those over yonder on the coast, when he said, "Give them all the money on the coast, but nothing for inland waterways, because they have no boats." How, in the name of Heaven, could boats get to Manchester or to our own inland ports if we do not give them the water to get there? Here stood Liverpool on the coast barking like a dog. You can get to Manchester; oh, yes; but through Liverpool—and then by rail—unload at Liverpool and pay the difference in freight on the railroad that will bring you up to through railroad rates. Thus Liverpool could crush Manchester. Manchester was compelled, as a matter of self-defense, to contribute, and the board of trade of England helped, and the result was that the canal was cut through, and now ships laden with the meat products of the packers of Chicago pass through to Manchester. I have seen them myself unload the sides of beef at Manchester, on the dock 33—or maybe it is 36—miles from the sea, coming up by Liverpool and virtually telling that port to mind its own business. Manchester gets the meat at the same rate that Liverpool does, and the brokers in between are cut out of business. [Applause.] We could do that here at a dozen different ports.

Gentlemen ridicule the proposition, not realizing that other people are doing what we refuse to do. What is the proposition that the gentleman from Wisconsin says I am personally—and I hope patriotically—interested in? It is to connect up a part of the Delaware River, that has 27 shipyards on it this very day, with the Chesapeake, that affords admission to Baltimore, and by this route [indicating on the map] to Washington and then down through here to Norfolk and Hampton Roads to the South. Gentlemen ridicule it. They do not know and will not understand, unless they inspect the situation for

themselves. Time and again we have begged them, even challenged them, to come over and look at this geographical condition that God Almighty has laid down for us to avail ourselves of. [Applause.]

The expense! The gentleman from Wisconsin worries—and I say this in all kindness—worries about the cost of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal—two and a half millions has been agreed upon by the engineers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I shall not ask for any more time.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended as much as he wants.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I shall not discuss whether there was a defalcation by a crooked officer of the company many, many years ago. That has absolutely nothing to do with the value of this property. It does not affect the standing of any bank to-day that one of its cashiers 25 years ago robbed it of $100,000. What has that to do with the main proposition? Gentlemen have used this argument from the beginning of this discussion to destroy this project.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman name anyone who has done that?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman himself has called it a bankrupt canal, and he referred to it time and again as such, and refers in the report to the fact of the defalcation.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; it is bankrupt, because for a number of years they could not make expenses.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is where the gentleman is wrong. The canal has been self-sustaining since its construction and it pays 4 per cent on its bonds now and takes care of its own improvements. These are the things that aggravate when you come to discuss these matters. I shall put into the RECORD the facts, because having heard these things hurled on this floor so often I have had special inquiry made about this concern back to the days of its construction in order to get the exact truth and the facts might be ascertained. I propose to put into the RECORD the facts, so that gentlemen here and elsewhere may labor under no delusions that will affect the merits and the truth.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is not this a great saving in distance between Philadelphia and Baltimore?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; the difference between 90 and 325 miles between Philadelphia and Baltimore; but I would prefer to put it this way: Say that it is a great saving in distance between this great manufacturing center of New England [pointing] and this great productive center of the South. [Applause.]

And say this, that if that waterway is taken and worked at a depth which is standardized, so that a man or a company can know that his ships will go through without running on a sand bar, or being held up somewhere in the night, a service will be provided that will be as good as that of the railroads for heavy freight and those raw materials that do not need speedy transportation. And dealing with foodstuffs, just let me carry you back to the spring after the worst winter through which we ever passed. When the fertile fields of Florida were abloom, when the orchards were full, when the rich grounds were producing potatoes by the carload, when the people in the North were being gouged at the highest prices, when the people of New England and the soldier boys coming back from abroad were being charged $1.50 a dozen for the oranges they begged and craved for and which could not be had, it was because the railroads had issued embargoes, saying they would not carry perishable freight, and because the submarines were outside and the inland waterways were not available. You were told that you must depend upon your own locality, that you people of the great metropolis must get your fresh eggs from the henroosts in the city of New York, that you must dig your potatoes out of Broadway. The railroads could not carry them from Florida or bring them in from Iowa, and they rotted and went to waste where grown because neither the railways nor the waterways could carry them. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, my friends, it is broader than the mere question of Philadelphia and Baltimore. It is bigger than New York and Norfolk. It is a national, humanizing, protective proposition. [Applause.] I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman has referred to the earnings of the canal. I would like to ask if he has the figures.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not going to discuss that, because it is so far afield from the main problem that it would take up all of my time; but I shall put every line in the RECORD, and I shall beg the gentleman to read it carefully.

Mr. GOOD. Can the gentleman tell us how many bonds are outstanding?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The same amount that is mentioned in the report. All that is proposed to be paid for this property is what is represented by bonds. All this so-called worthless stock is to be disregarded; every old back debt is cleaned up. The bonds that are paying 4 per cent constitute the value of the property as appraised, and the Government acknowledges it.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman made a statement a few moments ago, in response to a question of mine, to the effect that it had been constantly referred to in respect to this defalcation by an officer of the company. I asked him who made that statement, and the gentleman suggested that we were all making it. Now he makes the statement that that canal has been paying expenses constantly. I call his attention to Document No. 215, which is an official report, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session, wherein it is shown that in 7 of the 12 years, according to the statement, the official statement that was submitted, there was a deficit in the handling of that canal.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. That is not on the stock; that is on the bonds.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; they did not earn money in those years, but they had a surplus from previous years or earned enough in subsequent years to pay their way through. Now, will the gentleman be satisfied? [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal statement to which I referred, and which explains the financial operations of the company, is herewith submitted under leave to print. The statement was prepared after careful research and investigation by Mr. Wilfred H. Schoff, secretary of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association. The information it contains was taken from official documents.

It is as follows:

CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL.

A statement from the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, Philadelphia, Pa., December 30, 1918.

"Pursuant to authority voted by Congress in the river and harbor act of 1917, the War Department has negotiated with the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. for the purchase of the existing Chesapeake & Delaware Canal at the price recommended by the Chief of Engineers, $2,514,289.70 (H. Doc. 391, 62d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 4 and 95, and H. Doc. 196, 63d Cong., 1st sess., p. 6). These reports confirm the recommendations made in 1907 by a commission appointed by the President of the United States (S. Doc. 215, 59th Cong., 2d sess.).

"The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal forms the connecting link between the Delaware River and Chesapeake Bay, and is an essential part of the Atlantic intracoastal waterway system as recommended by the War Department and in part adopted by Congress through the purchase and partial completion of the Chesapeake & Albemarle Canal, connecting Chesapeake Bay with the North Carolina Sound and the Atlantic Ocean below Cape Hatteras.

"The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, if Congress shall approve the recommendations of the War Department, will be converted into a tide-level canal of 12 feet depth and 90 feet bottom width, these being the standard dimensions adopted on the New York Barge Canal and for the modernized Federal waterways.

"The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal in recent years has passed traffic averaging close to 1,000,000 tons per year. In this respect, it has maintained its usefulness and activity better than others of the old small canals, its maximum tonnage in 1872 having been 1,818,772 tons. Army engineers and commercial experts, who have studied the prospects of future commerce on an improved canal, predict for it an annual traffic largely in excess of the present figures, more nearly approximating 5,000,000 tons per year.

"The main hindrance to increase of traffic on the existing canal is its inadequate size, barges being limited to the dimen-

sions of the locks, 24 feet by 220 feet by 10 feet. On the New York Barge Canal, where locks were unavoidable, the dimensions adopted were 310 feet by 45 feet by 12 feet. The larger size, under modern conditions of traffic, is found necessary, in order to produce the economy of transportation which the modern barge affords.

"In answer to the natural inquiry how the price of $2,514,289.70, recommended by the War Department, is arrived at, it may be stated that this represents the amount for which the canal property is mortgaged, $2,602,950, less certain securities and other property held by the company, amounting to $88,060.30, the difference being $2,514,889.70.

"The amount of the mortgage, according to the annual reports of the company, is considerably less than the actual cost of the canal, and very much less than the present cost of reproducing the canal property, even deducting the locks and other structures which the Government will not use in completing its tide-level waterway over this route.

"A brief account of the formation and history of the canal company may be opportune. In the early years of our Republic the improvement of the means of communication was recognized to be the most vital issue before the people. All our early statesmen gave serious consideration to this problem. The labors of De Witt Clinton toward bringing about the completion of the Erie Canal are well known, but Americans of our time are not all aware of the fact that the engineering experience and the political foresight of George Washington were applied with almost equal persistence to the formulation of plans and the organization of companies for construction of canals and improvement of waterways in other parts of the country.

"These were recognized to be matters of public importance, and although in each case corporations were organized to undertake the work, they were semipublic, officered as a rule by men in public life, and received public support. The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. was of this sort. The surveys and levels were first made in 1769 under the auspices of the American Philosophical Society. The years of the Revolution and of the formation of the Republic were not auspicious for undertaking large public works, but the influence of George Washington was extended in support of such work throughout his administration. For the purpose of creating the connection between Delaware River and Chesapeake Bay the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. was incorporated in three States—Maryland, 1799; Delaware, 1801; Pennsylvania, 1801. The company was authorized to issue capital stock in the amount of $2,500,000, in 12,500 shares, at $200 par value. Subscription books were opened at Philadelphia, Wilmington, Baltimore, and elsewhere, but the funds received were sufficient only for a beginning, and the trade embargoes which culminated in the War of 1812 put a stop to the work.

"The President of the United States, James Madison, in his message to the Fourteenth Congress, second session, December, 1816, called attention to the desirability of soon completing the contemplated canals, and a committee of Congress reported a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe for shares in the companies organized to construct the Chesapeake & Delaware and the Dismal Swamp Canals. The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Co. was then reorganized, its surveys revised, and books again opened to subscription.

"The State of Maryland (under act of December 18, 1812) had subscribed to 250 shares, $50,000.

"The State of Pennsylvania (under act of March 28, 1823) subscribed to 500 shares, $100,000.

"The State of Delaware (under act of February 5, 1823) subscribed to 100 shares, $20,000.

"The United States (under act of Congress, March 3, 1825) subscribed 1,500 shares, $300,000, and subsequently (act of Congress, March 2, 1829) 750 shares, $150,000, making a total of $450 000.

"The city of Philadelphia at about this time, though the ordinance has not been found, is believed to have subscribed 125 shares, $25,000.

"Private investors subscribed apparently 4,208 shares, of which 890 were subsequently forfeited for nonpayment of installments, and others carried as 'partly paid.'

"The condition of the stock issue, as inferred from the company's report for 1851, was as follows:

Private investors	$517, 038. 50
United States	450, 000. 00
State of Pennsylvania	100, 000. 00
State of Maryland	50, 000. 00
City of Philadelphia	25, 000. 00
State of Delaware	20, 000. 00
	1, 162, 038. 50

"The stock subscribed by the United States, the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware, and the city of Philadelphia was common stock, on the same terms as that subscribed by private investors, and the acts of Congress of 1825 and 1829 provided that 'the Secretary of the Treasury shall vote for president and directors of the said company, according to such number of shares, and shall receive upon the said stock the proportion of the tolls which shall from time to time be due to the United States for the shares aforesaid.'

"The revised surveys called for a canal 13½ miles long, 60 feet surface width, 36 feet bottom width, 8 feet depth, at a cost estimated by its engineers of $1,354,364.64, and although this was slightly in excess of the stock subscriptions, the company decided to proceed with the work. The canal was completed and opened to operation in 1829, and the company, in its 1830 report, stated that it had cost a much larger sum than had been anticipated, the actual cost having been $2,201,864.03.

"The company started business, therefore, with a deficit in construction account of $1,039,825.53 and without capital, so that in 1833 the company was forced to negotiate a loan for $400,000 at 6 per cent. Its construction costs were further increased by contractors' litigations for work performed under canceled contracts, under which judgments were entered in the Delaware courts for $229,820.

From this the original construction cost may be figured at	$2, 431, 684. 03
With a consequent deficit, due to the fact that the stock issue was less than half subscribed, of	1, 269, 649. 53
The floating indebtedness arising from this, arrearages of interest, and deficits in canal operations were merged in 1836 into a funded debt of	1, 593, 185. 01
And in 1847 into a further funded debt of	796, 592. 23
In 1853 it became necessary for the company to enlarge its locks, to provide for increasing traffic, and to meet this expense a temporary loan was issued, amounting to	410, 222. 76
After completion of the new locks the three funded debts of the company were merged in 1856 into a 30-year mortgage loan at 6 per cent, amounting to	2, 800,000. 00

which amount was slightly less than the apparent cost of construction to that date and indicated a greatly reduced value in the common stock.

"The two decades following enlargement of the canal were years of prosperous business on which relatively high tolls were collected. The stockholders received several cash dividends and their holdings were further increased by several stock dividends, so that the total issue was expanded from $1,162,038.50 to $1,903,238.50. In 1867, under legislation enacted for that purpose, the company converted its stock issue from a $200 to a $50 share basis, each holder of $200 in the old issue receiving four shares of $50 in the new.

"In 1914, at a hearing before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Coast and Insular Survey, the company reported its stock issue as follows:

	Shares.	Par.
Private investors	20, 804	$1, 057, 588. 50
United States	14, 625	731, 250. 00
State of Maryland	1, 625	81, 250. 00
City of Philadelphia	663	33, 150. 00
	37, 717	1, 903, 238. 50

The property as above stated was subject to a mortgage maturing in 1886 of $2,800,000	$2, 800, 000. 00
The directors endeavored to pay off this loan, and at various times up to 1872 set aside for that purpose, out of earnings of the company, sums totaling	806, 250. 00
supposing that they had reduced the loan to	1, 993, 750. 00
But a dishonest official reissued out of the above (converting the cash to his own use)	609, 200. 00
so that upon maturity in 1886 the loan was extended at 5 per cent for a further period of 30 years, for	2, 602, 950. 00
In 1893, owing to the depletion of the company's contingent fund, the loan holders consented to a reduction of the interest rate to 4 per cent in order to enable the company to accumulate a contingent fund of $100,000 to meet extraordinary expenses and deficits in operation as they might arise.	
In 1916 the loan was extended at 4 per cent for a further period of 10 years.	
The War Department has recommended acquisition of the canal property for the amount of the mortgage loan, less convertible securities, etc., in the treasury, amounting to	88, 060. 30
Making a net price of	2, 514, 289. 70

"The effect of the above-mentioned defalcation was to make it impossible for the stockholders to pay off the mortgage and acquire back their property. It, therefore, practically extinguished the value of the stock issue, amounting to $1,903.238.50. It took away nothing from the value of the canal property and it did not affect the mortgage loan of $2,602,950, on which interest has been punctually met.

"The United States, State of Maryland, and city of Philadelphia, together with numerous individuals and estates, principally descended from public-spirited citizens who subscribed to the original issue of common stock of 1823–1829, have a common

equity in the property, which is mortgaged for less than its cost, but on which, owing to reduced rate of tolls and increased expenses, they have been unable in recent years to earn a sufficient profit to pay off the mortgage.

"Of this issue the United States holds 14,625 shares, the State of Maryland 1,625, the city of Philadelphia 663 shares, and private individuals and estates 20,804 shares.

"The present recommendation of the War Department is in effect that the United States acquire possession of the property by paying off the mortgage.

"By so doing, the United States, a minority holder of 14,625 out of a total of 37,717 shares of the common stock, will become sole owner of the property, while the holders of the remaining 23,092 shares, including the State of Maryland and the city of Philadelphia, will receive nothing, and will sacrifice their equity as a contribution to a national welfare.

"It is obvious that such an arrangement is advantageous to the United States.

"The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal should be public property. It should be modernized and improved and made part of a comprehensive system of inland water transportation. Its corporate difficulties have arisen from insufficient initial financing, which has made it impossible at any time for the company to improve its property to keep pace with the increasing demands of traffic, and to the fact that as a local enterprise limited by its charter to the collection of tolls upon its canal, being, therefore, in the same status as a turnpike road, having no power to carry freight or passengers through its canal, it has never been in a position to develop business between distant points, and thus to utilize the undoubted advantages of its geographical position.

"The Chesapeake & Delaware Canal is needed also for purposes of even greater importance in interstate commerce. Before the United States entered the war, numerous boards of the Army and Navy reported upon the desirability of a series of safe inside passages between the great ports and the naval and military stations along the Atlantic seaboard, and the events of the war, when a few raiding submarines were able at different times to paralyze our coastwise traffic, afforded abundant proof of the need of these inside passages, if at any future time our Atlantic coast should be subjected to attack from a strong naval power.

"Government ownership and improvement of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal is, therefore, an essential item in our future national defense no less than our interstate commerce. The present question is whether acquisition of the existing property by paying off the mortgage is a fair basis of settlement. The United States should not be expected to pay more than the property is worth, neither should it expect to take it at a price unfair to the security holders. The original construction was undertaken in good faith, largely as the result of the urging of the Federal Government, and individual investors subscribed of their funds to contribute to the common welfare.

"For the financial difficulties in which the company became involved, the United States was responsible equally with the investors, for they arose altogether from a stock subscription insufficient to meet the construction cost. Although the common stock has now no more than a nominal value, the stockholders can not in honor, and probably could not in law, dispose of their property for less than the amount for which it is mortgaged, and this obligation rests equally upon all stockholders, the United States, the State of Maryland, the city of Philadelphia, and the individual subscribers. On the other hand, the property has cost considerably more than the amount for which it is mortgaged.

"Among cash items in the company's reports appear the following:

Original construction 1829 (company's report for 1830, p. 16)	$2,201,864.03
Judgment under contract litigation, 1832	229,820.00
Reservoir, 1841	22,000.00
Completing same, 1844	7,300.00
Pumping engine and lifting wheel and dredge	38,200.00
Waterworks, 1853	6,900.99
Reconstruction of locks, 1855	375,177.02
Water wheel, 1857 (company's report for 1856)	6,090.00
Riparian rights purchased, 1872	7,790.50
Dredge, 1882	12,000.00
Telegraph line, 1861	1,385.00
Boilers and engines, 1865	17,866.75
Dredge, 1866	13,931.80
Telegraph line, 1872	1,725.16
Pump, 1873	1,500.00
Other items in sundry annual reports, 1851–1880, about	20,000.00
Making an apparent total of	2,963,551.25
To this should be added the steady enlargement of the canal prism by the company's dredges; a conservative estimate would be $10,000 per year, 1866 to 1918, 53 years	530,000.00
Or an apparent construction cost of	3,493,551.25

"The Agnus commission in 1907 reported the cost of production at that time as:

Dry excavation, 15,000,000 cubic yards, at $0.16	$2,400,000
Dredging 1,435,760 cubic yards at $0.14	200,000
80,000 linear feet bank revetment	70,000
44,000 perches masonry at $3	132,000
Lock at Delaware City	120,000
Lock at St. Georges	118,226
Lock at Chesapeake City	147,970
Acreage of land holdings, 8,000 acres at $50	400,000
Pumping plant at Chesapeake City	50,000
Auxiliary arrangements for summit level supply	5,000
Bridges	31,000
Houses, offices, etc	30,000
Tools, machinery, etc	1,000
Telephone line	2,000
	3,708,186

"But it is well known that the cost of both dry excavation and dredging has materially increased since 1907 and that the company's land holdings have likewise increased in value, so that a present cost of reproduction would be more than nearly $5,000,000.

"The provision in the pending river and harbor bill for the United States to acquire the property for the amount of the mortgage appears, therefore, to be fair in every respect. Although the United States as holder of a minority of stock interest is on no more than equal terms with the other stockholders, it will receive from them the free and patriotic contribution of their equity and will take over the property for an amount considerably less than the stockholders have expended upon it—very much less than the cost of reproduction at present prices, and will then be in a position to improve and develop it for the prosperity and security of the whole country."

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, it is particularly gratifying to me, having worked with these gentlemen for the purchase of this canal, to know that the House will act favorably upon this item. In reference to the canal not making more money, I merely want to cite one instance. When I was a member of the State senate the canal company came to Annapolis and asked that its tolls be increased. The State senate refused it, so that the canal has been held down to a certain revenue all the time upon the old toll basis, whereas the expenses of maintenance and all other charges have gradually increased.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman say that the canal company asked the State of Maryland to increase its tolls?

Mr. LINTHICUM. To allow them to increase the tolls.

Mr. MADDEN. Why, the tolls are the charges paid, the sums to be paid for the right to use the canal.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I term it tolls, or whatever you choose to call it.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought they wanted to increase the freight rates.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Well, freight rates or tolls, as you choose to term it.

Mr. MADDEN. There is a difference between tolls and freight rates.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The legislature absolutely refused it, and the canal, without any increase in its charges, has been able to pay expenses all these years and they have gone ahead until this time, keeping itself in proper shape. Now, I believe, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] says, that it is not a question for Baltimore, it is not a question for Philadelphia or any of these great cities, but it is a question for the entire Nation. It is a question of having the commerce of every port along the Atlantic seaboard transported without being subjected to the rigors and dangers of the sea to the various terminals along our coast. When Senator Burton was chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of this House he came to Baltimore, and he was taken down the river and shown the great port facilities. He was shown the magnificent business we were performing, and he said, "Gentlemen, I am not interested in what business you are doing; I am interested in the port facilities, because that is a benefit to the Central

West and to the entire country. I am interested in the country, and the better the harbor and the deeper the harbor you have here in Baltimore the better facilities will we have through the West." When we are enabled by deeper canals to bring this trade to Baltimore, Philadelphia, and the Atlantic seaboard, why, it is going to improve the entire transportation system of the country. I want at this time to express the deep appreciation that the country owes to the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association and to those splendid officials, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL]. They have worked in season and out of season for a proposition which they believe is to the interest of the entire land, and I believe when this work is finally completed if there be any of us left to look back upon this controversy we will say to ourselves and our friends, "How foolish we were absolutely to stand against a proposition of this mighty importance to the Nation." I do not want to take up any more of the time of the committee. I am not near so well informed upon this as these gentlemen are, but I do believe that when this item is adopted and this work is performed it will stand out as a monument to the Sixty-fifth Congress and to the gentlemen who have assisted us in the splendid undertaking. [Applause.]

Mr. CLEARY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLEARY. Is it not a fact that a waterway that barely pays when it is not fully developed will be much more profitable when fully developed?

Mr. LINTHICUM. That has been demonstrated in many instances, in railroads and everything else, that when you develop an increased traffic you make it more profitable.

Mr. CLEARY. And is not that one of the greatest arguments for the improvement of these waterways?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Absolutely. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask the same privilege of revising and extending my remarks in the RECORD, because it was refused when I made the request a while ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, again I am interested in the line of discussion of the two distinguished gentlemen who have just concluded, one from Philadelphia at one of the terminals and the other from Baltimore at the other terminal, gentlemen who approve of this canal. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, with all the eloquence of which he is capable, has talked about the attractive features of this canal for years. I am not going to question that. I do question the right or duty of this Government to buy it. The gentleman from Baltimore says that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is the president of the Inland Waterways Association, and the gentleman from North Carolina, who happens to be vice president of that association and the chairman of this committee, have worked in season and out of season, to use his own expression, to secure the adoption of this project. What chance does an ordinary man, even though he is a Member of Congress himself, have against the honorable president and vice president of this Inland Waterways Association, who are both strong Members of this body? Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania read a letter from a soldier in Germany, but he did not tell you, and he does not tell the House, that Germany controls the railroads of Germany. Ah, that is the point! He did not tell you that they owned the railroads. He did not tell you that France is going to acquire the possession of all of her railroads, and that is the reason these countries have made a success of it.

Mr. LOBECK rose.

Mr. FREAR. In just a moment. I did not interrupt these other gentlemen. Now, they have not touched the argument. The point is here that the Manchester Canal, as the gentleman from Illinois well said, was built by Manchester, not by England. This canal is not to be built by Philadelphia, it is not built by Baltimore. Oh, no. The very fact that the president and vice president of the Inland Waterways Association worked in season and out, according to the gentleman from Maryland, has had some impression, I take it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the proposition: The gentleman states in one breath that all the important governments of Europe practically, very nearly of the whole world, have taken over railroads, and that he is opposed to it, and yet the railroads destroy all the inland commerce that we know of on all the rivers and canals. And in these other governments, like in Germany, they compel the port or harbor to make its contribution. Nothing is contributed here from Philadelphia. All they have got to do is to work and work and work. And what was the expression of my good friend from Baltimore [Mr. LINTHICUM]? That they work in season and out and they finally get it. Now, I am not criticizing them. I know that these gentlemen are very distinguished gentlemen, and that they have worked hard for this project. But I say that this Government will never make a success of its inland waterways, and we all know it, if we stop to reason—and it is perfectly foolish to think otherwise—unless we control the railroad rates. On the Mississippi River, the Missouri, the Cumberland, the Tennessee, and all of those rivers you can not control your rates or control the freight rates and permit these places to live, as they do in Germany. For 7 out of 12 years this canal has failed to pay expenses. How was it paid? Out of the fund they had on hand, of course. That shows the commercial standing of the canal. The gentleman criticizes "the gentleman from Wisconsin" and says, "Why, he is not interested in waterways." Oh, yes, I am, but I am not interested in throwing this money into this canal, causing the people of this whole Government to be burdened with taxes on account of it, that are taken, to use the expression of the eloquent gentleman from Pennsylvania, from the blood that is being wrung out of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent in this connection to insert a short extract in regard to railroads.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the extract referred to:

PRIVATE OR GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF RAILWAYS AND WATERWAYS.

Our Government is the only Nation of importance that refuses to accept a businesslike financial budget, and in equally mysterious fashion it is practically the only Government in the world that tenaciously clings to private ownership of railways, notwithstanding that policy has resulted in the destruction of our inland waterway transportation. All important railway lines are State owned in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Russia, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Japan, South Africa, Australia, and other countries. Over one-half of the lines operated under the English flag, according to statistics, or about 53,400 miles against 33,292 miles, are State owned, and the remainder are rapidly being taken over by the Government. In France the Government operates only a limited number of its railways, but by operation of law all are to come into the possession of the Government in the course of time. This principle also is invoked by the South American and Central American Governments, according to authorities that have compiled statistics on the subject. Irrespective of merits or demerits of the railway problem, Congress continually is asked to give down liberally for impossible waterways without contributions from localities, giving to the community having the longest or most powerful reach, irrespective of comparative commercial necessity or possible utility, and we are continually asked to look to Germany and other foreign governments for justification of such course. Every student of the subject knows that local contributions are generally imposed in Europe with waterway improvements, and wherever appreciable waterway traffic exists in European countries it is generally due to exceptional conditions affecting coal or other low-grade freight that are easily distinguished from our own conditions and to a control of railway rates that is exercised abroad in favor of cheap traffic for the waterways.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rockhall, Queenstown, Claiborne, Tilghman Island, Cambridge, and Crisfield Harbors, Elk and Little Elk, Chester, Corsica, Choptank, Tuckahoe, Warwick, La Trappe, Tred Avon, Wicomico, Manokin, and Pocomoke Rivers, Slaughter, Tyaskin, and Broad Creeks, Twitch Cove and Big Thoroughfare River, and Lower Thoroughfare, Deal Island, Md.; Nanticoke River (including Northwest Fork), Del. and Md.; Broad Creek River, Del.; and Tangier Channel, Va.: Completing improvement of the North Fork of Tred Avon River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 27, Sixty-third Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, $19,600; completing improvement of Wicomico River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1509, Sixty-third Congress, third session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, $17,100; completing improvement of Tangier Channel in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 107, Sixty-third Congress, first session, $16,434; in all, $53,134. The unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made for Tilghman Island Harbor is hereby made available for improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 796, Sixty-third Congress, second session.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. I notice there is in this bill no mention of the Baltimore Harbor, either for maintenance or for continuing improvement. I would like to have information from the gentleman as to why this was left out.

Mr. SMALL. The reason for that lies in the fact that the balance available is sufficient for the needs of Baltimore Harbor for the next fiscal year. The amount on hand is $676,000, and the Chief of Engineers reports that that amount will be sufficient for all the needs of the harbor, both for maintenance and

such work of further improvement as may be necessary until the end of the next fiscal year.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am very glad to have the information from the gentleman.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, there are several new projects in this one paragraph. I am not going to discuss them all, because I am not here in the rôle of an obstructionist, as I have said. I am here to show the character of the bill as best I may, and to show the absolutely indefensible character of some of the items.

I take the first item there. I am perfectly willing to take the others, but I am going to take the first. It is for the North and South Forks of the Tred Avon River, $19,600. I will read from Document No. 7, Sixty-third Congress, first session, and page 3. It says:

The improvement desired is an extension of the channel up one of the forks so as to make additional terminal facilities possible. Under existing conditions the only wharf property available is controlled by one individual, and boats can not go above this property on account of lack of depth.

Think of it! One individual!

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman get the idea from the Report of the Engineers that this money is to be expended for making a channel?

Mr. FREAR. Possibly.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what it is for?

Mr. FREAR. I assume so; not for building wharves.

Mr. MADDEN. They are going to build a channel? There is no channel there now?

Mr. FREAR. Not at this farthest point.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is an outrage for the Government of the United States to spend money for any such purpose.

Mr. FREAR. Here is the absurdity of this item, which was in the 1914 bill and stricken out because the bill failed. I am reading on page 5 now. Here is a community that wants some money expended for its own individual use. If you go to California, Oregon, Washington, or the Hawaiian Islands, or elsewhere, you say, "Pay your share." Let us see what they do over in Maryland. Let us see the representation of the improvement. They do not give a nickel toward this. But it is for the benefit of these people. They say that this village has four banks, with aggregate deposits of $2,125,000; that the assessable value of property within the county is $13,000,000.

Then they go on and say down below—

The town is on two railroads, the Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic and the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington.

And with those conditions this town does not give a nickel. Yet why do you put the condition in as to all other places? What right have we—I am speaking now of the committee and of the Congress, of which I am a Member—to appropriate this money for a project of that kind? Who can defend it? I do not know. A man in that community may, because he may want it. But why not act fairly and squarely with the various communities in this country and say, "If we are going to require a contribution from one place, we will require it at others." They have several banks here, and yet they do not give 5 cents toward this project, and we stick it in the bill without any evidence that it is needed at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MADDEN. This paragraph deals with a number of projects, among them being Elk and Little Elk Creek. What these Elks are used for I do not know; whether they are intended to be used for supplying meat to the soldiers abroad or to those in American camps, no one has said; whether they are intended to divert the sportsmanlike spirit of the hunter, no one says. It is evident from reading the report that there is no need for any expenditure of money here, not even for the entertainment of the hunter.

Later on we have an improvement at Twitch Cove. Now, Twitch Cove, I assume, is one of those sleepy creeks within which the water sleeps in its own bed. [Laughter.] There is no chance whatever for the promotion of any commerce at Twitch Cove, as I understand it.

Then we have Slaughter Creek. Here is the Treasury of the United States slaughtered annually for an amount unjustified in order that the political welfare of those patriotic statesmen in the neighborhood of Baltimore may be advanced. That these appropriations are unjustified and unjustifiable everybody will agree except the gentleman from Baltimore [Mr. LINTHICUM], who just took his seat a moment ago.

Then we have this new project, provided for in House Document No. 27 of the Sixty-third Congress, first session, calling for an expenditure of $19,600 for the construction of a creek where now no navigation is possible, and where I understand from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] no navigation will be had, except that water will be carried to the dock of a single individual who is in business there. It seems to me that where somebody locates a business upon dry land it is not the business of the Government to build a waterway to his plant, and nobody but the men with such imaginations as those have who come from the State of Maryland would be able to induce the Engineers of the Army to recommend such an improvement.

We have an inland waterway to be provided for on the Delaware River and Chesapeake Bay, Md., for the improvement of which we are to be called upon later to expend the further sum of $17,100.

Tangier Channel is another case where, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 27, Sixty-third Congress, we are to appropriate $16,434, when it was rejected only a short time ago by the Army engineers. But the persuasive influence of the gentleman speaking for the Democratic Party of Maryland, who sits in this House with a certificate of election to Congress, was able to change the minds of the Army engineers, and now we are called upon to spend money for that improvement. Who says there is any navigation there to justify the appropriation? Does anyone claim it? I deny it. Who replies to the contrary? No one from Maryland.

Why not then cut out the appropriation? Why should we in other sections of the country be called upon to contribute to such improvements as these—rather not improvements, but such expenditures as these? The time has come, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, when Members must speak out, when the people of the Nation demand that appropriations shall be scrutinized. There is $18,000,000,000 of a deficit in the Treasury for obligations created by reason of the war, with new appropriations demanded every day, running into the billions. There is a $6,000,000,000 bond sale soon to begin. Taxes are levied in such enormous proportions on the backs of the American people as were never known before. Still the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, with its imagination, comes here and begs of you and recommends the appropriation of money to throw into these dry creeks, where no navigation has ever been dreamed of or ever will be.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I suppose we have been waiting as usual for the annual witty speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], which he always makes——

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know what the gentleman has been waiting for, but he may get more than he has waited for.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Well, possibly, that depends. I am willing to bandy words or anything else with the gentleman. I hope that is parliamentary. [Laughter.] When the gentleman so rudely interrupted me I was going to suggest that we had been waiting for his annual speech on rivers and harbors. Personally I am thankful that he has made it at this point, because I thought he was going to tell his old story about the water hyacinth.

Mr. MADDEN. No; I will reach that later.

Mr. DUPRÉ. And I will meet the gentleman later, as I have previously. The gentleman selects the Little Elk and the Big Elk, and he has made a tremendous impression on the House with his play on those words. So I think we might as well vote on the proposition which he has so earnestly urged be deleted from the bill.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire unduly to take the time of the House, but only to reply to the challenge which has been extended by the learned gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] who has just spoken. He referred to Tangier Channel as being in Maryland. It is not in Maryland. It is in Virginia. I desire that the credit for that shall go to Virginia.

Mr. MADDEN. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I am perfectly willing to accord it.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. That is only an evidence of the ignorance of the gentleman from Illinois about the bill, that he did not even know what State it was in.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. The gentleman stated that this was rejected by the Army engineers. I desire to call the attention of the House to the document in which this project has been distinctly approved, and it is the project that is in the bill.

The gentleman from Illinois has said that there is no commerce on this channel. I desire to refer to the document in which it is distinctly shown that there is an outgoing commerce of $200,000 and an incoming commerce of $121,400, or a total of $321,400, with a channel that, at the minimum, has a depth of only 2 feet. The former report, referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], was made in 1891. I have the report here. If anyone will take the time to read

that report, he will be convinced that the engineer had never examined the project. Again, we find that in 1900 the same engineer made the same report, and said that there was no commerce at Tangier Island. He said that they had a commerce only sufficient for the necessities of life. In reply to that I call attention to the report which was filed by the engineer 10 years later, showing that Tangier Island, in Chesapeake Bay, 15 miles from Crisfield, had at that time a commerce of fish, crabs, and oysters, dependent entirely upon its own boats, of $321,000. The population had increased 50 per cent, increasing from 800 people to 1,200 people, and its commerce had increased from the mere necessities of life to a total of $321,000, and that with a freight rate from Crisfield, Md., of 20 cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that round about the vicinity of Crisfield and these rivers that need improvement the city of New York, the city of Philadelphia, the city of Baltimore, and the city of Washington obtain a very large proportion of their food supplies?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Of course it is true. The gentleman from Illinois has talked about commerce. Gentlemen, we are dealing here with a commerce that means a reduction in the price of the necessities of life. These people are sending you fish, crabs, and oysters. They have nothing else to deal in. They have their boats drawing from 2 to 6 feet of water, and they practically can not navigate those channels with any cargo. It is in order that they may increase this interstate commerce with Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Crisfield in the necessities of life that this appropriation is put into this bill. I merely ask you, gentlemen, in justice to your own votes, to read the report, and it will be sufficient. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I just want to ask the gentleman if he thinks a channel with 2 feet of water in it is a thing that justifies the expenditure of public money for the creation of commerce?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I do, with the commerce that is there and the commerce that will come with the depth of 5 feet, which is asked for in this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that there are a number of rivers in this country where the project depth ultimately hoped to be attained is only 3 feet, upon which float many thousands of tons of interstate commerce. I recall one river with a depth of only 3 feet which a few years ago had a commerce of $13,000,000 of cotton floated in one year, in addition to other products in interstate commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

James, Nansemond, Pagan, and Appomattox Rivers, Va.: Completing improvement of Pagan River in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 591, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, $25,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of making an inquiry about an item which has been passed. If I am mistaken in the conclusions which I have drawn with regard to it, I should like to be corrected.

When the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] was discussing that item of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal I was anxious to know what the receipts were and the amount that was paid annually, and the gentleman said it was in the report. I do not find it in the report, but he has furnished me with a copy of the hearings, in which I find what seems to me to be a very extraordinary showing. According to this statement, on page 36 of the hearings, it will be seen that for 31 years there was part of the time a net return and part of the time there was a loss, and, if my figures are correct, the net profit for that time was approximately $120,000 and the net loss was $130,000.

I can well understand, therefore, why the cost of this canal, according to the statement on page 34—the original cost was $2,201,000 cash; received from stock subscriptions $1,162,000, and the balance by bond issue of $1,036,000. The amount subscribed for stock by the United States was $450,000. Now, this bonded indebtedness of the company has increased from $1,036,000 to over $2,500,000. They paid the dividends out of borrowed money, according to the report shown here. If you are going to pay interest at 4 per cent on $2,500,000, it will require an annual expenditure of $100,000. The showing here is that for 30 years the net loss is $10,000 over and above the receipts when it comes to deduct the operating expenses. So instead of paying the interest out of the operation it has been obliged to borrow $10,000 to operate the plant, and all of this interest must have been paid out of borrowed money. We might as well understand when we buy this plant that we are buying something that is hardly paying, has not paid for 30 years, a cent above the operating expenses, unless the figures that I have read are incorrect.

Mr. CLEARY. If the gentleman will yield, suppose a waterway 7 or 8 feet deep was not profitable to the owners, would they not immediately and naturally improve it; or, if new owners bought it, would they not improve it, expecting to make it profitable because of the improvement?

Mr. GOOD. That may be; it may be made a profitable thing. I am only talking about what has been done.

Mr. CLEARY. It is what will be done that we are interested in. We want to know if we can make it profitable. There may be a waterway only 6 or 7 feet deep which is unprofitable, but if made 10 or 12 feet deep may be of great profit.

Mr. GOOD. That may be true; I am only trying to find out if the figures are true that I quote from the hearings as to the actual conditions in regard to this canal.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do it for the purpose of asking the gentleman from North Carolina a question. We have now finished 8 or 9 pages of a bill of 31 pages. We commenced the session this morning at 11 o'clock, got to the bill about half-past 11, and now what is the gentleman's intention as to proceeding with the bill this afternoon?

Mr. SMALL. I will be frank with the gentleman. A request was submitted this morning by gentlemen on both sides that we make an effort to complete the bill to-day.

Mr. MANN. I understand, and I hoped that would be possible; but Members want to know how late they are going to be kept here.

Mr. SMALL. I would be glad to continue the consideration of the bill until after 6 o'clock, and yet I realize that we are dependent upon the will of the committee. The bill has been before the House, not under consideration, since January 2, and this is the first time we have been able to resume consideration. The amount of business before the House is so great that we deem it urgent that we complete the bill as soon as possible. I have difficulty in answering the gentleman except from my own viewpoint. I would be glad to sit until 8 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. I do not see any special object in continuing between 6 and 8 o'clock and then stopping, because it is quite certain that there would not be very many here between 6 and 8 o'clock. The gentleman would not be able, in my judgment, to continue unless he so announced now and have a quorum present.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion to the chairman of the committee? Would it not be well to sit until half-past 5 and then resume at 8 o'clock?

Mr. SMALL. That would be agreeable to the chairman, but my observation has been that once the Members of the House have dispersed for the evening they do not return.

Mr. MANN. It is not fair to have an evening session of the House without giving advance notice. Gentlemen have a right to make engagements for the evening, unless they have notice that Congress will be in session, and while they might break their engagement it is hardly fair to them.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Would the gentleman consider a suggestion to sit until 6 o'clock and then adjourn until morning?

Mr. MANN. We might meet at 11 o'clock. I would be willing to meet at half-past 10.

Mr. SMALL. What would the gentleman from Illinois suggest?

Mr. MANN. I think it would be desirable to adjourn at 6 o'clock and to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. I had hoped that we could get through with the bill to-day. We have no desire on this side of the House to delay the consideration of these bills.

Mr. SMALL. I am sure the gentleman is acting in good faith. I think, under all conditions, Mr. Chairman, it would be advisable to announce now that I will move at 6 o'clock that the committee rise, and then I will ask unanimous consent that the House meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow, and I hope no one will make an objection.

I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] further to make the announcement that we shall endeavor to complete the consideration of this bill to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to the sounds of North Carolina: For maintenance, $250,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, in line with what has been said, let me assure the House that I have no intention to delay

the passage of the bill, but this is the first day we have had for discussion, and when we are charged, those of us who are opposed to certain kinds of legislation, with intellectual dishonesty, when the public-building bill is set aside, which is a bill of the same general character, because the members of that committee realize that at this time of all times it is unwise to force such a bill upon the attention of the House, then it occurs to me that it is right to oppose a bill of this kind, and I owe no apology to anyone, and when the gentleman charges us with intellectual dishonesty I assure him that so far as I am able I want to point out some of the defects, and among other items there is the one before us. This is an item for the expenditure of $250,000 for a canal that runs down to the sounds of North Carolina. Not one dollar was recommended by the Army engineers to the committee for this item. About $250,000 has been expended thus far, with a balance on hand. The Army engineers reported on page 569 in regard to this canal running down into North Carolina no estimate for additional funds, and that as the maintenance of this waterway at the present time is not considered of sufficient importance to justify the expenditure of any funds in addition to the balance available on July 1, 1918, they do not request anything, not one dollar. Think of it; no estimate for additional funds has been made; it is not considered of sufficient importance to justify the expenditure of any funds in addition to the balance available; and yet this committee adds $250,000, a quarter of a million dollars. Intellectual dishonesty! Who selected the items? Who added the money to the bill for a canal that lost 40 per cent of its commerce in two years? You will find that on page 569 of the report. No estimate for an additional amount is demanded, and here the committee gives practically the same amount that has been expended upon this canal during the last 25 years. The public-building bill was set aside because of its unsavory record. Can you think of anything worse than that item—a quarter of a million dollars—when the engineers say they do not need it? Who put it in? Let us find out about this question of intellectual dishonesty. Some one put it in. Over half the insignificant commerce on this waterway is logs and lumber that float on that small stream. The engineers say in the 1918 report they do not need the money, and do not want it, and you put in a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I regret the necessity for making a brief comment. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] states with reference to this item that no recommendation was made in the report of the Chief of Engineers. The next paragraph in the bill is as follows:

Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, $750,000.

The gentleman may make the same criticism as to this latter item.

Answering his criticism, I submit this comment: Before the committee entered upon the consideration of this bill I made a statement of some length to the committee, and it was discussed before the committee. Presumably the gentleman heard it. The Chief of Engineers made the estimates, which are contained in annual report, during the summer. Those estimates were made after conferences with the Secretary of War and with a number of the members of the committee, including the chairman of the committee. At that time it was agreed that all estimates for maintenance and further improvement should be, to use a familiar expression, "cut to the bone," and the estimates in the annual report of the Chief of Engineers were made during the summer, when the war was still in progress. When we began the consideration of this bill, at the convening of this session, on the 2d of December, as everyone knows, the armistice had been signed on November 11 and peace had come.

There have been many conferences held with the Secretary of War, with the Chief of Engineers, and between Members of the House as to the policy that should be pursued in this bill, and it was agreed that we should have a bill framed along lines appropriate to normal or peace conditions. Therefore the Chief of Engineers increased the estimates in some instances and submitted estimates in other instances where no estimates had been originally submitted. There was originally an estimate for $500,000 for the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the sea. That was increased to two and a half million dollars. There was an estimate of $400,000 for the Schuylkill River, which was increased to $1,000,000. There was an estimate made during the summer of $3,000,000 for the East River, and that was increased to $4,000,000. I might recite further instances where estimates for maintenance and further improvements were increased when we entered upon the consideration of this bill on December 2 last.

Does the gentleman from Wisconsin know that? As a member of the committee should he know it? He, of course, says that these two items happen to be in North Carolina and would have the Committee of the Whole draw the inference that for some reason, improper or otherwise, the chairman of the committee was influential in having the Chief of Engineers make an estimate which was unnecessary and not in the public interest. I do not expect to detain the committee at length in replying to that inference, but I merely wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, in response to several statements which have been made in debate about the amount of the estimates contained in the annual report of the Chief of Engineers and the amounts appropriated in this bill, that increases were made, with the full knowledge and consent of the committee, upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and, as we all believe, in the public interest.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I note in the report, page 3, a statement that after the armistice was signed there was a conference of the President, the Secretary of War, and the Chief of Engineers, and certain appropriations for maintenance were increased. I assume that is what the gentleman referred to in part?

Mr. SMALL. Yes. As a result the Chief of Engineers increased the estimates on certain of these items.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I note further down in the list of these increases $250,000 for the waterway from Norfolk, Va., to the sounds of North Carolina. Do I understand the gentleman that the engineers in this supplemental estimate specifically mentioned this item?

Mr. SMALL. They did.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman defer it until the next item is read?

Mr. FREAR. I do not expect to take two minutes in response. I do not want to have the House misled, and I do not propose to mislead if I can help it. On page 569 of the Engineer's Report—and I read it for the third time—the Chief of Engineers and the Board of Engineers—and this is not Gen. Taylor who made the change, but this is what the Chief of Engineers said. Listen:

No estimate for additional funds is made, as the maintenance of this waterway, this canal, at the present time is not considered of sufficient importance to justify the expenditure of any funds in addition to the balance available on July 1, 1918—

Now, how much?—

Nine hundred and twenty-nine dollars—

On hand.

That is on page 569. The waterway is not considered of sufficient importance in time of war or peace, and yet $250,000 has been added. Who added it? Who brought in the report of these 70 projects? There has been added $250,000, a quarter of a million, almost as much as has been expended on this one item in the last 25 years. Why? Is it the fact that the distinguished gentleman who charges us with intellectual dishonesty will not be the chairman of the committee next time and will not have the selection of all these items? May that possibly influence his opinion at this time? I wonder! Mr. Chairman, until the insinuations, the unfair and unjust insinuations, were thrown out I had no idea of going into these items, but I propose to do it in order that the House may know who is improperly influenced in this discussion and who desires to present the matter frankly. Do you suppose if you had gone to the Chief of Engineers you could have gotten $250,000 added to your project, I ask the different members of this committee, to an item of little benefit and aid to commerce? Do you think you could? Just take it to yourselves. Why, of course not; of course not. It takes a friend in court to get such a remarkable concession as large as this when the Engineer's Report says it is not important, that no importance is attached to it in time of war or in time of peace or any other time. Yet here is $250,000 added to the whole project.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield? I am not particularly enthusiastic about this project, but I think we ought to be fair to the gentleman from North Carolina. The gentleman from Wisconsin asked who put this in, and apparently the President and the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers put it in.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized to oppose the pending amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems rather strange that where the Chief of Engineers says that he is unwilling to recommend the expenditure of $929 for a further improvement of a channel the Committee on Rivers and Harbors are proposing to expend $250,000 on it.

I read from page 569 of the report, which says:

Proposed operations: With the funds available, necessary examinations will be made and, if required, shoals and snags will be removed.

Shoals and snags! That is quite a navigable stream, I judge, where you have to remove the shoals and the snags in order to get water through a channel, to say nothing at all about getting boats through it. He says further:

No estimate for additional funds is made, as the maintenance of this waterway at the present time is not considered of sufficient importance to justify the expenditure of any funds in addition to the balance available on July 1, 1918.

Now, there was nine hundred and some odd dollars available July 1, 1918. The Chief of Engineers says that the channel is not considered of sufficient importance to justify the expenditure of more money than is available. And yet we find in this bill an item of $250,000 to remove the snags and the shoals. Why do we want to remove the snags? Is it to provide for navigation? Why do we want to remove the shoals? Is it that we may be able to float boats or that the water may be allowed to run through the channel without overflowing the banks? Is it because we have land to protect on the sides of this channel, or is it because we want navigation? Is there any justification, in the face of the statement by the Chief of Engineers that the $929 available is all the money that ought to be expended under any circumstances, in appropriating $250,000? Is it possible that under the present state of the Government finances, where everybody is being taxed to the limit, that we are willing to display our extravagance by reporting in favor of an appropriation of $250,000, where the responsible executive official of the Government, the Chief of Engineers, says there is no justification whatever for the expenditure of more than $929?

I think the House, under all the circumstances, ought to vote to strike this item out. There can be no justification for doing anything else. Are we to go before the people with the declaration that we are willing to spend $250,000 under the present conditions, where the Chief of Engineers says we ought not to even spend $929? Has the Committee on Rivers and Harbors so far forgotten its obligations to the people of America that it is willing to stand sponsor here for the appropriation of a quarter of a million dollars under such circumstances? Has the Committee on Rivers and Harbors the courage to come before the House and say to the Members that they are willing to stand for such a recommendation in the face of the adverse report of the Chief of Engineers? Are we to understand that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has no consideration whatever for the state of the country's finances? Are we to understand that they pay no attention whatever to the already great load that is being carried on the backs of the American people? Are we to understand that in the face of idleness everywhere, of the returning soldiers without jobs, of the returning soldiers unable to get their pay, that, notwithstanding all this, we are asked to expend $250,000 of the people's money when there is no justification whatever for any expenditure at all? Has the River and Harbor Committee so far forgotten the sense of propriety that it will come before the Congress and recommend the expenditure of this vast sum in the face of the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers that there is no justification for it? Does the River and Harbor Committee expect to command the respect and the confidence of their associates on this floor with such a recommendation in the face of all the facts?

I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors should himself move to strike this item from the bill, for no man, knowing all the facts in the case, can justify it, and no person knows the facts better than the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. And I am unwilling, as one Member of this House, to go before the American people and say that I will vote for the expenditure of $250,000 of their money for an improvement that does not under any circumstances even encourage the development of navigation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. SMALL. Pardon me, in order to make a request. How much time does the gentleman require?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Five minutes, or I will restrict it to three minutes if the gentleman desires.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I will have to object to that, because I expect to move to strike out the item, and I want to debate that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to call to the attention of the House the iniquity of the item.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman may prefer that I should say what I have to say on the next item. If so, very well.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the item out, and on that motion I desire to say a few words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MADDEN moves to strike out the paragraph, page 8, lines 23 and 24.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to make any point of order, but I think the gentleman must realize that there ought to be an end to the debate. The gentleman has already discussed this.

Mr. MADDEN. I have not discussed this motion.

Mr. SMALL. But the gentleman's discussion is entirely pertinent.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will submit a point of order to the Chair, I will abide by that, whether I speak or not.

Mr. SMALL. I will not make a point of order, even if there is delay.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the present state of the Government's finances, with $18,000,000,000 of obligations standing against the United States, having expended $25,000,000,000 to conduct the war so far, having appropriated $36,000,000,000 with which to conduct the war, having gone to the American people to ask them to buy bonds in unlimited quantities in order to conduct the war, having shown beyond any controversy the injustice of the item proposed for the expenditure of $250,000 where the Chief of Engineers says we ought not to spend any money at all, I submit to the membership of the House that this item ought not to remain in the bill.

I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, if he himself does not believe that under all the circumstances this item should be stricken from the bill? I ask the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, if anybody in the War Department recommended the appropriation of $250,000 in the face of the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers to the effect that we ought not to expend any money on this project? I ask the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, whether or not there is any commerce that justifies the expenditure of $250,000 as provided in this item of the bill? I ask the gentleman from North Carolina to say to the House on his honor as a man that this $250,000 proposed appropriation is justified in any sense for navigation. I ask the gentleman from North Carolina to say to the House, upon his honor as a man and as chairman of this great committee, whether the removal of the sand bars, if I may so speak, and the removal of the snags from this creek or this channel is of sufficient importance to the navigation of the country to justify the further obligation of $250,000 against the Treasury of the United States? I feel justified in saying that the gentleman from North Carolina is sufficiently honorable, sufficiently honest, sufficiently interested in the integrity of the bill, sufficiently interested in the preservation of the integrity of the Treasury that when put upon his honor he will say that this item should be stricken from the bill; and I ask every man here who believes in maintaining the integrity and the honor and the dignity of the House of Representatives to vote to strike the item from the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have not always been in accord with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Very often, in fact, I have differed from them; but I want always to treat the committee fairly, and I do not want any statements to be put into the RECORD here, to be read by the public at large, that will indicate that committee is not dealing fairly with the House.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has stated over and over again that the Chief of Engineers did not recommend this item. Let me read from the hearings just a brief statement with reference to what the Chief of Engineers says with reference to this project if the appropriation were given:

The section of the inland waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort in North Carolina, which is known as the North Carolina cut, and which gives a thoroughly protected channel, is going to take some time to complete—several years to complete. If an appropriation were given for this project—for the waterway from Norfolk, Va., to the sounds of North Carolina—of $250,000, and for the inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, of $750,000, I think that within the next year or a year and a half we could have a 12-foot channel through from Norfolk to Beaufort, and I would recommend that those appropriations be made.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman inform the House from whose testimony he is reading?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. From that of Gen. Taylor.

Mr. FREAR. He is not the Chief of Engineers. Here is the report of the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Who was Gen. Taylor acting for if not for the Chief of Engineers?

Mr. FREAR. He is one of the engineers of the War Department?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman from Wisconsin refers to Gen. Harry Taylor as not being the Chief of Engineers. Everyone connected with the committee knows that Gen. Harry Taylor is assistant to the Chief of Engineers, having charge of rivers and harbors, and in every recommendation that he makes he represents the Chief of Engineers, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] knows that.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Just a moment. I will take only five minutes. Of course, it would be idle folly to expend $250,000 to clear a channel of snags and sand bars and have then only 2 or 3 feet of water, and no man in this House would be justified in voting for such a project. But it is altogether a different question as to whether a man would be justified in voting for a 12-foot channel from Norfolk, Va., down to Beaufort, N. C., as is proposed here. The whole proposition is a part of the great intercoastal canal which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] eloquently described to the committee a little while ago, and at that time the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] did not see fit to move to strike out the other items connected with it.

This is part and parcel of that project. Ordinarily I do not think that money should be expended on such projects, but in the face of the railroad rates that we now have, that tend to hamper business and destroy trade, and in consideration of the further fact that it is proposed to employ the returning soldiers upon great public enterprises, I think that this project can well have much argument in its support, and it ought not to be stigmatized as one that nobody can justify in conscience and reason here upon the floor. If a waterway can be constructed with 12 feet of depth from Norfolk to Beaufort, there is no question on earth but that thousands of tons of commerce will float upon it every year, and I think it would be of great benefit in many directions.

Mr. FREAR. This is a project which amounts to about $5,000,000. I think the gentleman must have misunderstood or misread the report of the engineers giving a 12-foot canal.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is talking about the whole project in stating the cost. I have read what the engineer, Gen. Taylor, said, and I assume that he knows his business. I have read it just as it is stated here. This is a great enterprise, one of the greatest enterprises ever undertaken in the history of this country. Along the Atlantic coast there float millions of tons of shipping exposed to the storm of the seas and to destruction. Can we afford to spend this money? I have some doubt about it, I will admit, at this particular time; yet the canal would be of great advantage.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman know of any mariner who has asked for protection for navigation in an inland canal for his ship, who desires to keep away from the deep-sea navigation?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman can answer that for himself. I am not interested in the question, though I know Cape Hatteras is called the "graveyard of the Atlantic."

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has offered himself as an authority on this question and I thought he had some evidence.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is immaterial what the deep-sea sailor wants. A barge canal of 12 feet would do an enormous business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I would not consume any time except from a query put to me by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. At this particular time I am not willing to go into this subject fully. I will say, however, that in my opinion this appropriation is entirely in the public interest and will subserve a most useful public purpose in the interest of navigation and commerce.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 7, noes 40.

Mr. MADDEN made the point of order that no quorum was present, and subsequently withdrew it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, $750,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. SMALL. Before the gentleman proceeds, I wish to ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. FREAR. This is a three-quarter of a million dollar project. Will the gentleman make it 15 minutes?

Mr. SMALL. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. FREAR. I would like about three minutes to close and five minutes to open.

Mr. SMALL. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I object; I do not think it is fair to ask to close debate before debate is begun. As a matter of fact, the gentleman can not close debate before debate has commenced.

Mr. SMALL. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order that the request is out of order before the debate begins.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the gentleman can make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I object.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, these two canals run near each other. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] a little while ago read from Gen. Taylor's report that he made before the committee. I do not want gentlemen to forget that we are paying nearly 100 per cent more for dredging than we paid two years before. The Chief of Engineers said that no estimate for additional funds is made for that canal and that it is not considered at the present time of sufficient importance to justify the expenditure of $250,000.

What would you give for that kind of testimony? Why was not he confronted with this record? Who put the item into this bill? Now, look at this statement here. On page 574 we find $640,725 balance on this insignificant waterway now under discussion, and yet the committee has inserted without request of engineers $750,000. The canal has 148,000 tons of commerce, and over half of that is logs, timber, and sand.

We have spent on this project something like $3,744,000, and all the commerce does not reach one-tenth part of little harbors that we have up in my country. Still you propose, after the engineers submitted nothing, because they had a large amount on hand—the engineers' report shows $649,000, according to this book, and yet the committee add three-quarters of a million dollars more. What did the engineers say about it? Did they ask for it? Oh, not one, except Gen. Taylor, who is a willing witness. It is all on one side, and it makes no difference, for he does not pay the bill, he does not pay the taxes. On page 573, after considering this matter carefully, they have sufficient funds, the engineers say, due to war conditions.

You have got back to war conditions in this item:

No estimate is submitted for beginning constructive operations on the part of the waterway between Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds.

I take it that that is not the project that they have in mind here, but they do not ask for anything. Nothing was asked in this report for proposed operations. They had a sufficient amount. It says:

The river and harbor act approved July 18, 1918, appropriated $500,000 for this work, making a total of $649,725.37 available for expenditure upon the improvement.

And he tells how that money is to be expended. He does not ask for anything more. But the gentleman who charges the House with intellectual dishonesty, the vice president of the Inland Waterway Association, who makes his accusations against Members of Congress, has an item of $750,000 added to this in addition to the $250,000 for the other canal in North Carolina, his State.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The chairman of the committee never charged the House with intellectual dishonesty. He only charged one member of it.

Mr. FREAR. And the gentleman from Louisiana, with five projects in the bill, representing, as he does, the president of the National River and Harbor Congress, who is running over here and there, is equally interested in this bill.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I hope that I may——

Mr. FREAR. I object to the gentleman talking in my time. The gentleman can get his own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that anyone talking here against these items has to meet every man who has a project of importance in the bill, for Members feel that that is the most interesting thing in their minds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ].

Mr. FREAR. I have three minutes in which to reply.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I would rather listen to the gentleman.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman from Louisiana has not the privilege of determining that.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, the only trouble with the gentleman from Wisconsin is that he is unfamiliar with the project that he is talking about. He continually harps with regard to some five projects which I have, that are yet to come. As a matter of fact, as I have previously suggested to my friend from Illinois, I wish I had 10 projects, but they will be discussed in their own proper time. The matters to be discussed now are those before the committee for consideration.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has been speaking about "Mr. Taylor." I do not know whether he is talking about Col. TAYLOR, of Arkansas, or whom, but I imagine he has been talking about Brig. Gen. Taylor, who is the Assistant Chief of Engineers, and who knows something more about rivers and harbors than the gentleman from Wisconsin does.

The section of the inland waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort in North Carolina—

Says Gen. Taylor—I am reading from page 39 of the hearings—

is going to take several years to complete.

I tried to get the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] to admit that the report of the Chief of Engineers was made on the basis of July 1. The gentleman from Illinois would not admit that. I hope somebody will pin down the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] and make him say so. I doubt if they can pin him down even to so patent a fact as that the report of the Chief of Engineers was made on the basis of July 1, and under the law, as I understand it, that report had to be in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury by October 15. On July 1, in spite of the gallant efforts of our boys from Wisconsin and other States, our country was very much concerned in the conflict which was being waged. Subsequently, when the matter came to the attention of the committee, the armistice had been signed, and the representative of the Chief of Engineers, without any invitation or solicitation, of his own accord made many suggestions, as I have already told the House, with regard to amending the report which the Chief of Engineers had previously made.

Among them was an increased amount for this inland waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort, to be found in a document which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] hates to read, but which is available to all other Members, namely, the hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which the gentleman is an honored and loquacious member. So I appeal from this obsolete document from which he has been quoting to the hearings before the committee, and particularly to the report and statement of Gen. Taylor, the accredited representative of the War Department upon that occasion. It is useless to call it to the attention of the gentleman, because he does not want to know, but it may be well to tell the other Members of the House that whenever the gentleman from Wisconsin is talking about something it might be well to inquire whether he is reading from the hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, where Gen. Taylor, the Assistant Chief of Engineers, presented revised estimates, or from these very parsimonious estimates made last July, when we thought that things might happen to this country which, thank God, have not happened.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to call attention to this proposal to appropriate $750,000 for the waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C. Reading from the report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, June 30, 1918, I find the following:

At the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, there was an available balance, exclusive of outstanding liabilities and contract obligations, of $149,725.37 for expenditure under this project. The river and harbor act approved July 18, 1918, appropriated $500,000 for this work, making a total of $649,725.37 available for expenditure upon the improvement. It is intended to expend the money available for completion of the part of the inland waterway which lies between Norfolk, Va., and Albemarle Sound, N. C., and for making surveys, etc., as follows:

Operations under contract:		
To complete dredging in the North Landing River, Va.	$15,948.69	
To complete dredging in the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River, Va.	237,780.00	
Total		253,728.69
Work with United States plant:		
To complete dredging of Virginia Cut, including cost of removal of logs, etc.	$41,800.00	
To complete dredging in North Landing River, Va., including cost of removal of logs, etc.	211,000.00	
To remove old lock, west end of Virginia Cut	40,000.00	
To complete survey and secure options on land between Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds	11,000.00	
Acquirement of land required for improvement of South Branch of Elizabeth River	15,000.00	
		$318,800.00
Engineering, supervision, and contingencies		77,196.68
Total		649,725.37

It is proposed to commence the work to be done under contract, provided the necessary arrangements can be made for doing the work, about November 1, 1918, to prosecute it at an average rate of expenditure of about $25,000 per month, and to complete it in about 10 months. This is a very rough estimate of the time of beginning and rate of progress, due to the prevailing conditions in the matters of labor and material, and available plant, resulting from the war. If arrangements can not be made for doing this work by contract, it is proposed to perform the necessary dredging and work incidental thereto by the use of Government plant and hired labor.

It is proposed to prosecute the work to be done by Government plant and hired labor according to the following schedule:

Operation of U. S. dredge *Currituck*, 20 months, at $12,000 per month	$240,000
Operation of U. S. snag boat *Roanoke*, 10 months, at $1,280 per month	12,800
Survey, 5 months, at $2,200 per month	11,000
Removal of lock, 4 months, at $10,000 per month	40,000

And below I find the following:

Due to war conditions, no estimate is submitted for beginning constructive operations on the part of the waterway between Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds, N. C.

Mr. FREAR. Six hundred and forty-nine thousand dollars was the balance on hand.

Mr. MADDEN. They had $649,000 on hand. They say they can expend only $303,000 in the next 20 months. Yet in addition to the $649,000, out of which $303,000 can be expended in 20 months, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors brings in a proposal to appropriate $750,000 more. According to the statement made by the Chief of Engineers, there would be $384,000 left at the end of 20 months from the 1st of November, 1918; and so, with $750,000 more proposed, we have $1,349,000 to begin a work of which only $303,000 can be expended in 20 months. Why do we need the $750,000? If no part of the $750,000 can be used at all until after the expenditure of the $649,000, and only $300,000 of the $649,000 can be used within 20 months from the 1st of November, 1918, what is the sense in appropriating $750,000 now? I suppose it is useless to appeal to the good sense or judgment of gentlemen who have projects in the bill, but there is no harm in stating the facts and putting them into the RECORD, so that the public may understand that, notwithstanding the fact that there is no need whatever for the money, that it can not be used, yet the River and Harbor Committee insists upon appropriating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Members may see the commercial economy and advantage of shortening the distance between Philadelphia and Baltimore, instead of having the commerce that arises in those respective cities go around the Delaware Capes and up the Chesapeake and vice versa to the respective terminals through the Government acquiring the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, having a length, I believe, of 13 miles; but when you come before the Congress in these times with a project that is now under consideration seeking to create an inland waterway 12 feet in depth paralleling the entire coast from New England down to Florida and from Florida around to the Gulf, when the ocean is open at all times, in all kinds of weather for all kinds of navigation, I can not understand the justification of sinking $5,000,000, which this one project involves, from Norfolk to Beaufort Inlet. I have been on the coast on occasions, and I have seen little dories out in the ocean less than 25 feet in length going through tempestuous seas, and yet you wish here to establish a route for pleasure boats, to avoid perhaps the high seas, by establishing a canal uniform in depth to 12 feet. What we do find are the terminal facilities along this canal in these several hundred miles from Norfolk to Beaufort Inlet, which the engineer's estimate for the project to cost more than $5,000,000, of which $750,000 is voted in this bill. There is no objection on the part of Members who are interested in worthy river improvements in these times when it is necessary to employ labor to have the Government expend funds, but there is righteous indignation on the part of Members of this House in sinking money on pleasure canal routes. I read from the report of the Chief of Engineers, page 572, as to what are the terminal

facilities in this stretch of territory from Norfolk to Beaufort Inlet.

The north end of this waterway is in Norfolk Harbor, the terminal facilities of which are described under this heading in the report on that improvement. Following is a list of the other wharves on the waterway: At Great Bridge, Va., at the northern end of the Virginia Cut, 1 wharf and warehouse; on the Virginia Cut, 2 wharves with warehouses; at Munden, Va., 1 wharf and warehouse; on Currituck Sound, 1 wharf and warehouse; on the Carolina Cut, 2 wharves with warehouses; and on North River, 3 small wharves. All of the above wharves and warehouses are privately owned. The wharves are of the bulkhead and open power work type and the warehouses are simple wooden structures. All are understood to be open to general public use upon the payment of wharfage. Physical connection with railroads exists only at Munden, Va., the terminus of the Currituck branch of the Norfolk-Southern Railroad. No highways lead to the different parts of the waterway, except where public roads touch the stream. The facilities are considered adequate for existing commerce.

Mark you this as to whether there is warrant for any traffic development on this inland waterway when the ocean is open within a few miles for all character of vessels.

No highways lead to the different parts of the waterway, except where public roads touch the stream. The facilities are considered adequate for existing commerce.

All facilities are considered adequate for existing commerce. That is the supreme and final judgment of the Chief of Engineers, and yet the committee comes in here with an appropriation of three-quarters of a million dollars and asks, because there is need to employ labor, to sink it in this canal paralleling the coast. It will require wild imagination indeed for anyone to imagine that there will be any commerce for years and years on a project that the report shows will total more than $5,000,000 in expenditure and where there are no developing aids to commerce except one railroad. How can you justify such an extravagant expenditure when you are calling upon the people to raise billions of dollars by loans to carry on the Government for the next fiscal year?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will my friend yield for a moment? I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin, the other gentleman from Wisconsin, to page 39 here, where Gen. Taylor, the representative of the Chief of Engineers, urged this appropriation. Probably there is no use to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin to anything except the Engineer's Report, which was made last July.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is the solemn pronouncement of the Chief of Engineers, who says in the last line:

The facilities are considered adequate for existing commerce.

There is nothing that goes beyond——

Mr. DUPRÉ. There is the report of the Chief of Engineers through his representative, Gen. Taylor, who says an absolutely different thing.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman pardon me to make a request?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; not to be taken out of my time.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, after the gentleman from New York concludes, who, as I understand, desires five minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin desires three minutes——

Mr. FREAR. Make it five; I may not take more than two or three——

Mr. SMALL. Then I would like a brief time, and I ask that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, who was last heard, has misconstrued entirely a single sentence in the Engineer's Report, and upon that he bases a very specious and very illogical argument. He says there is a sentence, in effect, that the existing facilities are deemed adequate for the existing commerce. Now, to what does that refer? The gentleman takes that in its broadest sense, separates it from the context, treats it as though it were a single sentence with no connection whatever with what precedes it, and yet it is limited entirely to that which preceded it; and it says this only and means this only: That the existing facilities, so far as wharves are concerned, so far as highways are concerned, are adequate to accommodate the existing commerce, and that is all that it says.

It has no such reference at all as the gentleman supposes, and if he had read the report carefully he would have seen that it had no reference at all to the question of the stream itself, the waterway, being adequate for the commerce which can be transported upon it, and which is the question at issue. And that is about the way the gentlemen who are criticizing this bill get their material. They think that the Chief of Engineers is an editor and a writer instead of being, as he is, a scientific man who deals with these matters as an engineer, and they find some one sentence of this kind and upon that they build a fairy tale which has absolutely no possible connection with the facts which are involved.

Now, let us see what is involved here. The fact is that this project has been in existence for a considerable length of time. It is a 12-foot project and the work at the northerly end is well under way. It is a project which is 190—practically 200—miles long. It is a project which in its incomplete condition attracts about 700,000 to 800,000 tons of freight per year, and has attracted that amount of tonnage all through until war time was reached, and even in war time it has attracted about 400,000 tons. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] says that this is a pleasure way; that he has seen yachts which dared the tempests of the ocean. Of course he has. But the barges which carry freight do not dare the ocean. They take even on this inadequate canal to the amount——

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have not the time.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think you have time for facts.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They take it to the amount of hundreds of thousands of tons, and have taken it ever since the project was commenced. That is the situation. And these gentlemen go back to the time previous to the war and say, "You can not use $750,000." Of course, you could not at the time the engineer made the printed report. But war conditions have ceased. The conditions are totally changed. The Engineer Department can to-day obtain dredges. They are ready to do this work. And they make their recommendations not as of six months or eight months ago, but they make their recommendations as to the conditions prevailing to-day. And with those conditions before them they say the amount recommended can be used.

Now, let us just take for a moment the tone of this criticism. I believe gentlemen can discuss these matters and not become personal. And I believe that gentlemen can discuss these matters and refer solely to facts. I believe that gentlemen can discuss these matters and be fair to their associates. I believe that gentlemen can discuss these matters and not indulge in personalities. I say that this project comes before the committee with the indorsement of the Chief of Engineers. And it comes before the committee also justified by the amount of commerce, justified by the changed conditions, and the amount which is asked can be used.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have five minutes in conclusion. Would the gentleman from New York like to have two of those minutes?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; I have finished.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was it the arrangement that the gentleman from Wisconsin should close?

The CHAIRMAN. The arrangement was for 15 minutes, and the Chair understood it would be divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. SMALL. Would the gentleman like to get some of my time?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A minute or two.

Mr. SMALL. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to make this further parliamentary inquiry. Has not the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] already spoken on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. I understand; but the Chair also understands it was the unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] was to have five minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], who always gets the bouquets thrown at him, also gets four millions in this bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Because the project merits it. That is the reason.

Mr. FREAR. I can not question the gentleman's argument on that, and I do not pretend to do that. When the gentleman speaks about personalities being injected into this discussion, let me say they first came from the gentleman from North Carolina, whose project this is, because he was the first one who had the temerity to charge men with intellectual dishonesty on this floor because they disagreed with him on his bill. Let me say a word to the gentleman from New York. What does he know about it? Practically not anything. He mistakes the commerce. He does not have it correctly. The commerce in 1914 was a little over 200,000 tons. Last year it was only 148,000 tons, and over half of that was timber and logs.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That was by the Government canal only. That was—oh, I was talking about the commerce.

Mr. FREAR. I object, Mr. Chairman. I have only a little time, and I want to go into this thing. I have given the official commerce figures for this project, and those are the figures in the Engineer's Report that we were entitled to rely upon. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] challenges my judgment of this item. I will say that I used to live on that waterway. The gentleman does not know the waterway. I know it; at least portions of it. Only 148,000 tons of commerce were borne on that waterway last year, and this bill carries over $750,000 for it, with over $600,000 in balances on hand. Think of it! What an absurdity! But the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], chairman of the committee, wants the project and he gets it, just as he got the other $250,000 project for North Carolina.

The suggestion is made that a remark made by Gen. Taylor as an afterthought—just a remark in answer to a question—the suggestion is made that Gen. Taylor's remark should set aside the results of the investigation and determination of the engineers, whose official reports are before us. Why, Mr. Chairman, what chance does an Army officer have between us when he gets down with the committee and every member is anxious about his projects, when the chairman of the committee, with the interest that he naturally feels in a project of this kind, is interested? The engineers did not ask for a dollar in their report, neither for the first canal nor for the second, and the committee has added $1,000,000 in these two items.

Now I want to discuss one more item.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. FREAR. In a moment, and then I will get through. The suggestion has been made here that these improvements will furnish employment to men. Mr. Chairman, I make this statement—I have made it before; I have asked for investigating committees, and they have not been granted—I make the statement that the Dredgers' Association under a gentlemen's agreement practically controls all the dredging on the coast to-day. Under a gentlemen's agreement they divide up the territory and work. They estimate the cost and then they usually double, adding about 100 per cent. I am satisfied that those are the correct figures, because they come to me from a source that I deem unquestionable. Here is the evidence of how this dredging has jumped: In 1916 Bowers & Co. were charging us for North Landing 5.9 cents a yard. Last year, 1918, at North Landing it had increased to 22 cents, as compared with 5.9 cents, or about 6 cents. At the same place the dredgers have jumped it three times and more in their estimates. Take the Virginia cut, which in 1915 was 14 cents for dredging. In 1918 the Virginia cut is given at 22 cents, an increase of 50 per cent. As I say, when you have that situation the men who run the dredges will get that Government money. It is not the soldiers who want employment who will get it. The dredgers charge 100 per cent over the cost. That is the statement that comes to us.

Now, from the evidence that we have the Treasury is in worse shape than it was when these estimates were first made. We have a $6,000,000,000 revenue bill confronting us. The Army engineers said they did not need any money for either of these projects before and did not want it; and yet Gen. Taylor gets into the record and says one-quarter of a million could be spent for one of these projects and three-quarters of a million for another. I leave that statement speak for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from North Carolina how much time I may have?

Mr. SMALL. Three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have received this letter from one of the large fertilizer establishments of Philadelphia:

PHILADELPHIA, *December 14, 1918.*

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have been advised that the United States Shipping Board have advanced freight rates on phosphate rock from Florida eastern ports to Philadelphia and other tidewater ports 90 cents per ton. This seriously affects our fertilizer business and costs to the farmer, since Florida phosphate rock plays an essential part in the fertilizer industry; in fact, the material is indispensable. This cost must necessarily be reflected in the selling price of the manufactured product, and it is unfortunate that this is asked at this time, because it will tend to increase the cost of producing crops, whereas the feeling now seems to be that the cost of living should recede.

The present vessel rate of freight from Florida to Philadelphia is $6.50 per ton, and vessel pays for loading and discharging. The new rate will work out $7 per ton, free loading and discharging, which really amounts to an increase of about $1 per ton.

When we tell you that this new rate is three and one-half times the normal rate before the war, we think you will agree with us that this seems out of proportion for a comparatively short-haul coastwise ocean trip. This new rate becomes effective on December 15, and we earnestly beg your support to our protest, and ask if you will take this up for us and for the fertilizer industry in general, since the entire industry is affected.

Anything that you can do which will help out on this vital matter that affects the cost of food production will be greatly appreciated by us and be of service to the country at large.

Very truly, yours,

BAUGH & SONS CO.,
E. BUTLER, Jr.,
Treasurer.

The present vessel rate referred to in this letter is for that outside ocean voyage that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] thinks we should resort to.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In a moment. Both gentlemen from Wisconsin have been arguing for an outside route. One of them said he has seen "a little dory"—that, I am frank to say, might send him to oblivion in some of these inland waters about which he complains—riding gaily out on the ocean "in a tempestuous sea." I have never in my experience, except down in the West Indies, seen any "little dory" riding on "a tempestuous sea" out in the ocean. And I question from what I did see whether the gentleman from Wisconsin would care to be in one under the circumstances. But I read recently of dozens of American vessels going to the bottom on the Atlantic coast in peaceful seas because we did not have these inland waterways open. The German submarines were out there on the open sea and the American ships that might have used an inside passage in times of war, but which had not been prepared for them, were sent to the bottom. It was "too expensive" to build these inside waterways. The gentleman has forgotten that the ocean has not been free, is not free now, to American shipping along the Atlantic seaboard. The gentleman has forgotten that the German submarines were here and that American vessels were sunk and American coastwise shipping stopped because American torpedo-boat destroyers were loaned to our allies to protect their shipping and ours on the other side of the water. The gentleman has temerity to stand here and say that we shall not improve our inland waterways, but shall continue to take all the risks of the outside sea, upon which he once saw a little dory riding in a tempestuous storm.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] have so completely answered any objection to the appropriation for this waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort that I would not consume the time of the committee except for the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. I have such great respect for him that I am constrained to say he would not have made the argument he did if he had been well informed. It is impossible for a man within 5 minutes or 10 minutes to glance over a report and reach a satisfactory conclusion on a subject upon which boards of engineers have been engaged in investigation for months and upon which at least some members of the committee have read hundreds of pages of evidence and upon which at least some Members of the House have endeavored to give intelligent study. So, while the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] was not creditable to him, it is due to the fact that he had not given sufficient time to study the reports and inform himself.

The gentleman talks about the necessity of this interior waterway when we have the Atlantic Ocean. Does the gentleman know that this waterway lies behind Cape Hatteras and Cape Lookout, which, along with Cape Cod, are the most dangerous points along the Atlantic seaboard and in the whole world? Does the gentleman know that this waterway leading down from Norfolk traverses the sounds of eastern North Carolina to Beaufort, and that for that entire distance there is not a single navigable outlet to the ocean, so that the only way those people in eastern North Carolina can reach Norfolk, Baltimore, and Philadelphia by water is through this inside route? Does the gentleman know further that prior to this war we were building up quite a substantial through commerce between Charleston and Savannah and other southern ports with Norfolk, Baltimore, and Philadelphia? This traffic was by barges, which navigated the ocean south of Beaufort Inlet.

Beaufort Inlet lies south of both Cape Hatteras and Cape Lookout, from which point coastwise navigation south to Jacksonville is comparatively safe. There is not a more meritorious project in all the country than this Norfolk-Beaufort waterway. The gentleman simply did not know. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Blackwater River, Va.; Meherrin and Roanoke Rivers, and Newbegun Creek, N. C.: Completing improvement of Newbegun Creek in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 24, Sixty-third Congress, first session, $5,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire before I conclude these remarks to discuss Newbegun Creek. I am interested, and I think the House ought to be interested, in the unprejudiced judgment passed upon this inland waterway by the president of the Inland Waterways Association, assisted by the vice president of the Inland Waterways Association.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I have only five minutes, and I want to discuss Newbegun Creek.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is so personal——

Mr. FREAR. I will say this, that the gentleman is one of the most courteous and one of the most able gentlemen on the floor of the House; but when this question is raised by these two gentlemen here, of course they have this deep interest in it, it is very dear to their hearts, and they have urged it constantly. I am not speaking now of the vast amount of money in this bill in which the gentleman's community is interested, as well as the large amount going to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], but I do say that they are not entirely unprejudiced, and I do not assume that I am. I try to be, however.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman makes this personal reference on every paragraph of the bill. Surely there must be some reason for it.

Mr. FREAR. No; this last item is an inland waterway, where a million dollars has been put in.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. No, I can not; this next item is the Newbegun Creek, a very important proposition. It was stricken out in the 1914 bill. I read from the Engineer's Report:

A gasoline boat 57 feet long, with 4½ feet maximum draft, runs between the landings on this creek and Elizabeth City, making daily round trips during most of the year, though occasionally the schedule is reduced to three round trips per week. This boat makes connection at Elizabeth City with the Norfolk Southern Railroad. There are a number of other boats used on this stream, but they do not appear to run on a regular schedule.

It has not been possible to obtain complete statistics as to the annual commerce of the stream, owing to the partial destruction by fire of the records of the gasoline boat, but from the data that could be obtained it is estimated that the annual commerce amounts to about 5,000 tons, valued at $300,000.

This is the first examination of this creek that has been directed by Congress, and no work has ever been done upon it by the United States, but about 30 years ago an attempt to improve the bar was made by a local steamboat company, which excavated the southern channel now used.

That item is shoved in here when we are paying more taxes and more taxes and more funds are asked with which to buy liberty bonds.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman state when this Newbegun Creek was begun?

Mr. FREAR. It does not say when it was begun. Probably just begun. It is a tributary of the Albemarle Sound, but it says that the stream varies in depth after a rainfall, and that with unfavorable wind the variation may be 2 feet.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the wind blow the water out of the channel?

Mr. FREAR. To the extent of 2 feet.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I will yield for a question but not for a statement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has never been upon the water——

Mr. DUPRÉ. Does not the gentleman think it would be advisable to investigate the Deep Waterway League, the same as they are investigating the National Security League?

Mr. FREAR. No; because the gentleman was in favor of investigating the National Security League, and he is not in favor of an investigation of the Waterway League. I accept his judgment in this case.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman know that the action of the wind influences the tide?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; it states here to the extent of 2 feet.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that the wind frequently holds the water down so that vessels have to wait until the wind subsides?

Mr. FREAR. That is so in the Newbegun Creek to the extent of 2 feet. The gasoline boat can not get up the creek when the wind blows.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is there any gentleman except he who comes from the mountain top that would laugh at that proposition?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, we have the second largest harbor in the country in my own State and plenty of good waterway projects.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, the gentleman runs like a March hare.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; and so does the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has interrupted me. I can not yield to discussion further on this line.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the gentleman from Wisconsin think of the suggestion that a bulkhead be built on one side of the channel to stop the wind from blowing the water out of the channel?

Mr. FREAR. I think it would be better to place the gasoline boat on stilts, or use some other means for floating it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Manteo Bay, Scuppernong, Pamlico, Tar, South, Bay, Neuse, and Trent Rivers, Fishing, Contentnea, Swift, and Smith Creeks, and waterway connecting Swan Quarter Bay with Deep Bay, N. C.: For maintenance, $7,500; completing improvement of Scuppernong River in accordance with the report submitted in House document No. 1196, Sixty-second Congress, third session, $31,800; in all, $39,300.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to express my commendation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in trying to get lower freight rates on phosphate rock. The gentleman has been so uniformly criticizing the southern producer in all things that we grow——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I never unfavorably criticized the southern producer, but always sought to encourage him and have him do his best.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I have heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania stand on the floor and criticize the southern cotton planter for not being patriotic because he would not grow more linters, when the gentleman knows, as a matter of fact, that there is no such thing as the growing of linters. The gentleman has learned that none of these items enters into the cost of production, including that of cotton, because his manufacturers have it brought home to them that the gentleman is willing to do something for the southern cotton planters. I am glad to find him on that side, even if he has been moved by the interests of the northern manufacturer.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I see that the gentleman is good-natured about this, and I shall not pursue the controversy. I think we are pretty nearly alike on the proposition.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to the Scuppernong River, if I may; that is, Scuppernong Creek, which is the project, one of the six new projects that go into the bill.

Mr. MANN. What is the meaning of the word "scuppernong?"

Mr. FREAR. Scuppernong is a grape, and a very delicious one. I have lived down there, and I know. In 1913 the commerce of this remarkable creek amounted to 30,000 tons, but in 1917 it had dwindled down to 9,000 tons. You may be sure that the engineer who made the estimates down there, when he gave a loss of 70 per cent, did not misrepresent it. The average haul is 4 miles. No boat lines have been established. The improvement has had the effect of reducing the freight rates, it says. All of the wharves are privately owned. Mr. Chairman, nearly one-half of the speech of the chairman of the committee was in regard to having publicly owned wharves on waterways, and here down in his own State we find that they are privately owned. Why select Ohio for public wharves instead of having the wharves down in North Carolina public? I have before me Document No. 1196 of the Sixty-second Congress, second session, which contains a report way back in 1912, and in this time, when we are taking the blood out of the people, to use the splendid expression of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], to pay bills, you are asking us to put the Scuppernong Creek and Newbegun Creek in this bill. Let us see what the report says. Reading from page 5 we find that the first report was unfavorable to any improvements, because of the small commerce and the sparse population, for they were amply served as it was at that time, and now the commerce has dwindled to 9,000 tons. The report of 1902 covered some proposed improve-

ments at the bar and was a favorable one and resulted in adoption.

Mr. MADDEN. Have they got bars down there?

Mr. FREAR. They have bars there. It is said in the report that the improvements made have resulted in placing the commerce on a substantial basis, excepting for a severe blow that was received in 1908. What was that severe blow? "Prior to that time there were no railroads in that section, and all the transportation of products was dependent upon the water, but during 1908 a branch of the Norfolk & Southern Railroad was extended to Creswell," and that was the unfortunate occurrence which took away from the water traffic. It is said that that, combined with the financial panic of that year, resulted in a large decrease in the river tonnage. The report says that at that time it was 68,000 tons, and now it is only 9,000 tons. Think of it. Here is a loss of about 85 per cent in that time, and this bill proposes to give this creek as much more as it has had in all of the years of the past. Think of the waste in this project! Generally speaking, it is said the depth of water appears to be ample for the one steamer and 25 schooners that navigate the river, except above Cross Landing, and then it is rendered difficult on account of the bends and obstructions. Yet with that statement of facts, with that situation presented by the engineers in the report of 1912, the people of the country in this year, with a deficit of eighteen billions before the country, with people being urged to buy liberty bonds, are to be taxed $1,000,000 for two little waterways down there, together with the Newbegun and the Scuppernong Creeks. Think of the absurdity of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beaufort and Morehead City Harbors, Beaufort Inlet, waterway from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Inlet, waterway connecting Core Sound and Beaufort Harbor, channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay and Cedar Bay, and inland waterway Beaufort to Jacksonville, N. C.: For maintenance, $24,500; completing improvement of Beaufort Harbor in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1108, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $15,900; completing improvement of channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay and Cedar Bay, N. C., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1125, Sixty-third Congress, second session, $5,200; in all, $45,600.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. MADDEN. This item has not been passed.

Mr. SMALL. No; it is open for discussion. I desire to announce now that we shall try to complete the bill to-morrow. 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. BYRNS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the River and Harbor appropriation bill and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if we are to have notice now that we are to stay in session to-morrow night until this bill is passed, I think I shall have to object to meeting at 11 o'clock. I have other things to do.

Mr. SMALL. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to object.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman was present when we had the colloquy here.

Mr. MADDEN. I know I was present.

Mr. SMALL. And when it was announced——

Mr. MADDEN. But there was not any such statement made as that we are going to stay in session until late to-morrow night.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman may not have heard it.

Mr. MADDEN. I was here, and there was no statement of that sort made. Anyhow, if there is such a statement made now, I am going to object. I am willing to meet at 11 o'clock, but I am not willing to stay until 9 o'clock to-morrow night.

The SPEAKER. That is no part of the gentleman's request.

Mr. MADDEN. I know.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows, but that was not part of the gentleman's request.

Mr. MADDEN. And unless the gentleman says he does not intend to do that——

Mr. SMALL. Of course, the completion of the bill is in the control of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow?

Mr. MADDEN. I think I shall have to object, unless we have an understanding that we quit at a reasonable time to-morrow night.

Mr. SMALL. I hope the gentleman will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

THE LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL. (H. REPT. NO. 910).

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I present a bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves all points of order on the bill, and the bill is ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REREFERENCE OF A BILL.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, on December 30 I introduced a bill (H. R. 13565) affecting the mining of rare minerals, which was erroneously referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which it belongs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think when a gentleman makes a request we should hear what it is. We could not hear what the gentleman was asking, and the Speaker did not state the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it over again so that all gentlemen can hear it.

Mr. WELLING. I ask unanimous consent that a bill I introduced on December 30, which was erroneously referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, and that request has the indorsement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MANN and Mr. ROBBINS. What is the bill?

The SPEAKER. It is in reference to the mining of rare minerals.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the mistake was made by marking it "M. & M."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House that on Monday, after the reading of the Journal, I have 20 minutes to speak upon the question of the League to Enforce Peace.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] asks unanimous consent that next Monday, after the reading of the Journal, on the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table, that he shall be permitted to address the House for not to exceed 20 minutes on the League to Enforce Peace.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will say that I am extremely sorry to have to object to any request made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], but some time ago I gave notice that during the short session, when I was present, objection would be made to making a speech after the reading of the Journal. It would have to come up in general debate on some bill. The reason for it is, of course, that it might interfere with the transaction of important business.

Mr. MANN. We will probably be on the legislative appropriation bill in general debate on Monday. I have no doubt that my colleague could secure time on that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I will renew the request that when we adjourn to-day we adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. If we can have some assurance that we will adjourn not later than 6 o'clock to-morrow, I will not object. I am as anxious to get through as anybody else is.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think we will finish the bill, but I could not give the assurance.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 11, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a proposed draft of a bill providing for readjustment of the rates of pay of chief pay clerks and chief pharmacists of the Navy (H. Doc. No. 1669); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the assistant chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Harry R. Hurlbut, Sherman R. Hurlbut, Elizabeth J. Hurlbut, and Horace A. Hurlbut, heirs of Frederick J. Hurlbut, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1670); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the War Department for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1671); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Public Printer, submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1672); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Geological Survey for topographic surveys in the United States, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1673); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the president of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required for current expenses of the institution during the remainder of the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1674); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Agriculture for assistance in supplying and conserving farm labor through cooperation with State, county, and local agencies, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1675); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting a substitute estimate of appropriation required by the Department of Agriculture for farmers' cooperative demonstration work, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1676); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17) to include certain lands in the counties of Modoc and Siskiyou, Cal., in the Modoc National Forest, California, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 909), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. WELLING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2885) for the relief of Moses M. Bane, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 905), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5495) for the relief of Joseph A. Prat, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 906), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4923) to relieve the estate of Thomas H. Hall, deceased, late postmaster at Panacea, Fla., and the bondsmen of said Thomas H. Hall of the payment of money alleged to have been misappropriated by a clerk in said office, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 907), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WELLING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9045) for the relief of certain pay officers of the United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 908), 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. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 13945) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Armstrong, State of Pennsylvania, two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13946) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Punxsutawney, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13947) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Clarion, State of Pennsylvania, two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13948) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of New Bethlehem, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13949) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jefferson, State of Pennsylvania, two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13950) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ford City, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13951) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Indiana, State of Pennsylvania, two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13952) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Blairsville, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13953) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Brookville Park Association, Brookville, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 13954) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Central High School, St. Joseph, Mo.; the State Normal School, Maryville, Mo.; the Tarkio College, Tarkio, Mo.; and the county of Andrew, Mo., one each a German brass cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13955) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sycamore, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13956) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mendota, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13957) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Peru, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13958) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morris, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13959) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of DeKalb, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13960) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ottawa, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13961) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of La Salle, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 13962) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Columbia, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 13963) to increase the salary of the United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 13964) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the cities of Crowley, Oberlin, De Rider, Lake Charles, Cameron, Ville Platte, Opelousas, and Jennings, La., each two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 13965) to expel and exclude from the United States certain undesirable aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 13966) to prevent the sale of firearms to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 13967) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto approved October 6, 1917; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 13968) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Spring Green, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13969) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Thorp, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13970) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Lisbon, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13971) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Owen, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13972) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Merrillan, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13973) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Prairie du Sac, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13974) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sauk City, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 13975) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Geneseo, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13976) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Canton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13977) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Quincy, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13978) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rushville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13979) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lewistown, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13980) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Galesburg, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13981) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cambridge, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 13982) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eastport, Me., two bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 13983) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of New Kensington, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13984) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Jeannette, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13985) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Slippery Rock, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13986) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Harmony, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13987) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Zelienople, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13988) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Irwin, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13989) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Vandergrift, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13990) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Mount Pleasant, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13991) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Scottdale, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13992) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Monessen, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13993) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Latrobe, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13994) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Butler, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13995) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Greensburg, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 13996) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Borough of Laporte, county of Sullivan, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece captured from the enemy during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13997) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Sunbury, county of Northumberland, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece captured from the enemy during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13998) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Danville, county of Montour, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece captured from the enemy during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13999) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Bloomsburg, county of Columbia, State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece captured from the enemy during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 14000) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lexington, Ky., three German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 14001) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Gregory, S. Dak., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRODBECK: A bill (H. R. 14002) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Hanover, York County, Pa., four cannon or fieldpieces, with carriages, with suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14003) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Gettysburg, Adams County, Pa.,

20 German cannon or fieldpieces, with carriages, with suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14004) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of York, York County, Pa., four cannon or fieldpieces, with carriages, with suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 14005) to incorporate the Order of the Gold Star; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 14006) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Malone, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14007) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Port Henry, for use at old Fort St. Frederick, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14008) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Kingston, Caldwell County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14009) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gallatin, Daviess County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14010) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Liberty, Clay County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14011) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Richmond, Ray County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14012) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Plattsburg, Clinton County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14013) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Maysville, Dekalb County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14014) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14015) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Albany, Gentry County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14016) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Princeton, Mercer County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14017) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grant City, Worth County, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 14018) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Falmouth, Ky., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14019) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Williamstown, Ky., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14020) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Warsaw, Ky., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14021) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bedford, Ky., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14022) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Carrollton, Ky., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14023) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newport, Ky., four German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14024) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Covington, Ky., four German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14025) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Burlington, Ky., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 14026) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Boulder, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14027) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Yuma, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14028) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Washington, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14029) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Weld, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14030) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Sedgwick, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14031) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Morgan, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14032) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Kit Carson, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14033) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of El Paso, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14034) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Elbert, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14035) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Logan, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14036) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Lincoln, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14037) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Phillips, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14038) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Larimer, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14039) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Arapahoe, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14040) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Douglas, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14041) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Cheyenne, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14042) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county of Adams, State of Colorado, for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14043) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the public park at Eaton, Weld County, Colo., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14044) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the town of Limon for the city park of Limon, Colo., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14045) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the park board of Longmont Park, Longmont, Colo., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 14046) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Defiance, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14047) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Paulding, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14048) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Napoleon, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14049) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Van Wert, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14050) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ottawa, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14051) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bryan, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14052) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wauseon, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 14053) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Paterson, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14054) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Passaic, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 14055) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Laporte City, Black Hawk County, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14056) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dubuque, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14057) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eagle Grove, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed on the lawn of public library at said place; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14058) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eldora, Hardin County, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14059) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eagle Grove, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece, to be placed in the city park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 14060) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to cities and towns in Louisiana German cannon, fieldpieces, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 14061) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14062) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hamilton, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece or piece of artillery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 14063) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate captured German cannon to the city of Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 14064) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Crawford, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Van Buren, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14065) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Pike, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the town of Murfreesboro, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14066) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Greenwood district, county of Sebastian, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the town of Greenwood, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14067) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the southern district of the county of Logan, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the town of Booneville, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14068) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the northern district of the county of Logan, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the town of Paris, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14069) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Fort Smith district of the county of Sebastian, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Fort Smith, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14070) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Polk, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Mena, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14071) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Sevier, Ark., to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of De Queen, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14072) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Scott, Ark., to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the town of Waldron, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14073) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Montgomery, Ark., to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the town of Mount Ida, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14074) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Miller, Ark., to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Texarkana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14075) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Howard, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Nashville, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14076) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Little River, State of Arkansas, to be placed in the courthouse grounds in the city of Ashdown, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 14077) to create a commission to be known as the Federal motion-picture commission, and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Resolution (H. Res. 500) directing the Secretary of War to furnish information in reference to foreign military officers now in the United States to the Clerk of the House of Representatives; 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. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 14079) granting an increase of pension to James T. Kent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 14080) granting a pension to Floyd B. Daugherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 14081) granting a pension to John M. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 14082) granting a pension to Florence G. Tuttle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 14083) granting a pension to William Dugent alias William Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14084) granting a pension to Belle Harbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH (for Mr. HEINTZ): A bill (H. R. 14085) granting a pension to Robert Goodman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 14086) granting a pension to George McFoster; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14087) granting an increase of pension to Henson Lanter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 14088) for the relief of William H. Stone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 14089) granting a pension to Jesse Courtney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 14090) granting a pension to Mary J. Doyle; 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: Resolutions adopted at mass meeting of American friends of Irish independence, held at New York, demanding withdrawal of armies from Ireland and Russia so that Irish people and the Russian people may be left free to work out their own destiny; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of members of the Chicago war-service committee of the national war-service committee of the dry goods and department stores in Chicago and Illinois, protesting against the proposed tax on certain articles of wearing apparel, etc., costing above a fixed amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, the Motor and Accessory Manufacturers' Association, the Automobile Equipment Association, and the National Automobile Dealers' Association, protesting against sales taxes on automobiles, tires, parts, and accessories as proposed in the pending war-revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Florsheim Shoe Co., opposing the proposed tax on shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Attleboro (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce and of Emil Brande & Bro., of Chicago, protesting against the proposed tax on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, for the enactment of the Smith rehabilitation bill, Senate bill 4922; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of the pupils of the public schools of Porto Rico, that a battleship of the United States be named Porto Rico; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Powell (Wyo.) Chamber of Commerce for the completion of the Shoshone irrigation project; to Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 401, of Peru, Ill., of the Iron Molders' Union of North America, favoring the enactment of the McKellar-Keating retirement bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Leon F. Mass, favoring the construction of a system of Government owned, controlled, and maintained paved trunk-line highways across the United States, from ocean to ocean and from north to south, with necessary and convenient intersecting lines; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petition of J. W. Shorthill, secretary of the National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Associations, favoring the control of railroads to be returned to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of H. H. Gross, president of the Universal Military Training League, for universal military training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George H. Higgins, factory manager Burd High Compression Ring Co., of Rockford, Ill., protesting against the enactment of the bill placing wireless telegraphy under the sole control of the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of W. B. Shafer, jr., of Norfolk, Va., advocating 12 months' extra pay for all who served in the Army or Navy during the late war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Haddorff Piano Co., of Rockford, Ill., favoring repeal of the increased postage rate on first-class matter and opposing repeal of the zone plan for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rockford (Ill.) Association of Credit Men, for equality in the levying of taxes under the pending revenue bill and for speedy enactment of the measure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions by the Republican Club of New York, against the provisions of the revenue bill providing rates of taxation beyond the current year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the New Korea Association, for self-determination of the people of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Petition of E. F. Achard, of the Federal Plate Glass Co. of Illinois, opposing an excess or war profits tax in excess of 50 per cent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of district board, Division No. 4, of Boston, Mass., and local board, Division No. 1, Rockford, Ill., favoring a brevet commission and medal for members of the district and local selective-service boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of representatives of Minneapolis Jewish workers' organizations in convention assembled, indorsing the Lundeen resolutions for the recall of American troops from Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of Walter F. Naylor and others, of Wheeling, W. Va., urging Government operation of railroads in the United States for five years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lodge 326, Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron-Ship Builders, and Helpers, of Grafton, W. Va., urging Government operation of railroads in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Resolution of Portland (Me.) Council, United Commercial Travelers of America, favoring the return of railroads to private ownership and operation under Government regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting of the Lithuanians of Lewiston, Me., and vicinity, favoring the national independence of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *January 11, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for that desire which Thou hast implanted in the heart of man, which is ever moving him upward and onward toward a betterment of his condition, physically, mentally, morally, spiritually; for every honest, patriotic, philanthropic measure in the home, the State, the Nation, looking to that end; and we most fervently pray that it may possess our hearts until we all come unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; and Thine be the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of the bill H. R. 13026, with the report.

The SPEAKER. What is the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It is a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to provide a hospital and sanitarium facilities for discharged and sick soldiers and sailors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent for a reprint of a thousand copies of the bill named, with the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 79. An act for the sale of isolated tracts of the public domain in Minnesota;

H. R. 1423. An act for the relief of Alexander F. McCollam;

H. R. 9865. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to school district No. 28, of Missoula County, Mont.;

H. R. 8444. An act for the relief of Ira G. Kilpatrick and Guy D. Dill; and

H. R. 12194. An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of Members of the House to a matter that seems to me to be of considerable importance and that should receive early consideration. Much has been said about the alleged inefficiency of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. I think there will be less cause for complaint under the management of the newly appointed director, who seems to take hold with a will to accomplish results. However, there is a new branch of work upon which the bureau is only just about to commence. That is the branch concerning compensation for death or disability incurred in the service. I have introduced a bill to have that business transferred from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to the Bureau of Pensions, where it properly belongs and where all the facilities, machinery, and organization for that kind of work already exist. Whether you call it compensation or pensions it amounts precisely to the same thing. The same procedure and the same proofs are necessary as in the establishment of a right to pension under the general law for disability or death incurred in the service. It would take years and cost millions of dollars before the Bureau of War Risk Insurance could be as well organized and as well equipped