The VICE PRESIDENT. On the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the committee, the yeas are 24 and the nays are 20. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is present and not voting. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Glass	McNary	Spencer
Ball	Harrison	Moses	Sterling
Brandegee	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sutherland
Capper	Kellogg	New	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Nugent	Thomas
Comer	Kenyon	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Keyes	Ransdell	Underwood
Dial	Kirby	Reed	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lenroot	Sheppard	Warren
France	McCumber	Simmons	Watson
Gerry	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The names of the absent Senators were called and Mr. KNOX answered to his name when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA, Mr. PAGE, and Mr. HARRIS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

On a division, the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. SMITH of Maryland entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair as on the last vote and vote "yea."

Mr. KIRBY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], which I transfer to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement of my pair and its transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I make the same announcement that I made a few moments ago with reference to the transfer of my pair and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). Announcing my pair as on the last vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BALL (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. STERLING. Making the same transfer of my pair as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS. I inquire if the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed he has not voted.

Mr. THOMAS. I withhold my vote, as I have a pair with that Senator. I desire, however, to be counted to make a quorum.

Mr. TRAMMELL (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to announce the same transfer of my pair as on the last vote and will allow my vote to stand.

The yeas and nays resulted as follows:

YEAS—25.

Ashurst	Kendrick	Ransdell	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kirby	Reed	Swanson
Comer	Knox	Sheppard	Trammell
Dial	McKellar	Simmons	Underwood
Glass	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	
Harris	Nugent	Smith, Md.	
Harrison	Overman	Spencer	

NAYS—21.

Ball	France	Keyes	Sutherland
Borah	Gerry	Lenroot	Wadsworth
Brandegee	Gronna	Moses	Warren
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	
Curtis	Kellogg	New	
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	

NOT VOTING—50.

Beckham	Hale	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Harding	Newberry	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Henderson	Norris	Smoot
Culberson	Hitchcock	Owen	Stanley
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Penrose	Thomas
Edge	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Townsend
Elkins	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	La Follette	Poindexter	Watson
Fletcher	Lodge	Pomerene	Williams
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Robinson	Wolcott
Gay	McCumber	Sherman	
Gore	McLean	Shields	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the amendment of the Senator from Missouri the yeas are 25, the nays are 21. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] are present, but have not voted. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Harrison	Nugent	Sterling
Ball	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sutherland
Brandegee	Kellogg	Page	Swanson
Capper	Kendrick	Ransdell	Thomas
Comer	Keyes	Reed	Trammell
Curtis	Knox	Sheppard	Underwood
Dial	Lenroot	Simmons	Wadsworth
Dillingham	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
Glass	McNary	Smith, Md.	Watson
Gronna	New	Spencer	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BORAH, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KENYON, Mr. MOSES, and Mr. NELSON answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, it seems to be impossible to get a quorum this afternoon. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 26, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *April 26, 1920.*

Rev. John Paul Tyler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, father of life and of mercies, giver of every good and perfect gift, command upon us, we beseech Thee, Thy blessing as we enter upon the activities of another day and another week. Bless us in all that we shall do or say. Enlighten our minds with Thy wisdom, that with unselfish devotion to Thy righteousness in the earth through our lives and labors Thy kingdom may come. Forgive us our blindness and our selfishness. Help us to see and to do Thy will.

Let Thy blessing rest upon our native land, we pray, upon the President of our United States, upon all the Members of this Congress, upon the loved ones in homes, wherever they are. Keep them, protect, shield, and direct them. Guide us by Thy counsel, and afterwards receive us into glory. For we ask it in the name of our Lord and Savior, who taught us when we pray to say:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, April 23, 1920, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

CALLING THE ROLL.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

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

Ball	Harris	McKellar	Simmons
Borah	Harrison	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Henderson	McNary	Smith, Md.
Capper	Hitchcock	Moses	Smoot
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Spencer
Comer	Jones, Wash.	New	Sutherland
Culberson	Kellogg	Nugent	Swanson
Curtis	Kendrick	Overman	Thomas
Dillingham	Keyes	Page	Townsend
Fernald	King	Phelan	Trammell
France	Knox	Phipps	Wadsworth
Gay	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Gerry	Lodge	Ransdell	
Glass	McCormick	Reed	
Gronna	McCumber	Sheppard	

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] is detained at a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are absent on official business.

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

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AS CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES (S. DOC. NO. 173, PT. 3).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to resolution of December 11, 1919, a statement showing the name, rank, and total compensation of all officers in the War Department who, at the time they were commissioned, were employed by the civil branch of the Government and the compensation such officers were receiving as civil employees at the time they were commissioned, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ARMY REORGANIZATION.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, during the debate upon the Army reorganization bill I made some remarks concerning the sending of untrained soldiers to the front. I have a letter from the Secretary of War in which he has taken exceptions to some of the statements that I made. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD this letter together with my reply to it.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 15, 1920.

Hon. IRVINE L. LENROOT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On pages 5537 and 5538 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1920, there appears the following extract from a speech delivered by you on that day:

"The murder of these boys—because it was murder—was not due to the failure to enact a policy of universal military training prior to our entry into the war. It was due wholly, as every officer who touched upon the subject has testified, to the fact that division commanders in the camps of this country, who had trained men in abundance, when they were called upon for replacements, instead of those commanders sending their trained men they sent from those camps men who had never received an hour's training, and kept their trained men in the camps in this country."

I realize that in the heat of debate upon the floor of the Senate there must inevitably occur statements which, in some cases, convey most undeserved censure of those who are unable to properly reply or defend themselves before the bar of public opinion. This realization is, I believe, shared by the public, as well as the Members of Congress, and for that reason no attempt is made in many cases to call attention to these unfair criticisms. The above remarks, however, reflect so seriously upon officers of high rank, who conscientiously did their best to forward the interests of the country at large, that I feel I should call the matter to your attention.

I do not question Col. Donovan's statement made before your committee, that at one time he unfortunately received a detachment of men who had not completed the prescribed course of training. In operations of the magnitude that we were conducting at that time, it is possible that through some miscarriage of plans such a situation might have arisen. This, however, I assure you, was not the case generally, and I feel certain that an occurrence of this nature was most rare.

As to how this particular situation arose, there seems to be no competent evidence. Col. Donovan himself, in explaining it, assumed a hypothetical reason which he thought might have existed, and clearly stated in this connection that he did not know this to be the case. In reality, this method of replacement was used at only one time, and involved but four divisions. The instructions governing this movement included the following:

"All men selected for Infantry, Field Artillery, and Cavalry will be men with the usual oversea qualifications, and, if possible, men who have had target practice and at least two months' training."

There is nothing in the records to indicate that these instructions were not carried out in the spirit in which they were issued. It would appear, therefore, that your general indictment of the division commanders of the camps in this country has not the foundation upon which such grave charges should have been based. I rely upon your sense of justice for a correction of the false impression, the perpetuation of which, I feel sure, you would not desire.

Cordially, yours, NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

—

APRIL 21, 1920.

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

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have yours of the 15th instant relative to remarks made by me in the Senate on April 12, 1920. In reply, I will say that in the language quoted by you I had no intention of charging that all division commanders adopted the practice of filling replacement quotas with untrained men, and I do not think the language would carry that idea. I, of course, had no intention of making any such sweeping charge. The fact remains, however, that there was testimony in abundance to the effect that untrained men were sent to the front, and this has been corroborated by many ex-service men in private conversation with me. I do not believe that all division commanders were guilty of this charge, but that some were guilty the testimony abundantly shows.

Permit me to say that in my opinion there was no time while we were engaged in war when there was the slightest excuse for sending any boy who had had no training whatever across the seas where he might be sent to the front to fight. The instructions quoted by you of themselves seem to leave some discretion in this regard with division commanders. You quote as follows:

"All men selected for Infantry, Field Artillery, and Cavalry will be men with the usual oversea qualifications and, if possible, men who have had target practice and at least two months' training."

I can not see why, so far as "two months' training" is concerned, there should have been any discretion whatever left with division commanders, but even with this discretion there could be no excuse for any division commander sending untrained men.

It seems to me a thorough investigation should be made by you of this matter; and if any division commander is found to have sent untrained men for replacement when he had trained men who might have been sent, he should be court-martialed.

I, of course, have no desire to cast any reflection upon division commanders who were not guilty of this practice, and I therefore shall be very glad to insert in the RECORD at the first opportunity your letter to me and this reply.

Very sincerely, yours, I. L. LENROOT.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a very brief letter and resolution from the Fargo (N. Dak.) Trades and Labor Assembly, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., *April 21, 1920.*

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The inclosed resolution was read and indorsed by the Fargo Trades and Labor Assembly at our meeting last Wednesday, and I am instructed to forward same to you and ask your support of the bills called for in the resolution.

Thanking you for past favors, and in the hope that your support will be forthcoming, we remain,

Sincerely,

FARGO TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY,
By W. G. BESSERER, *Secretary*.

—

Whereas the signing of the peace treaty finds in American civil and military prisons, or under bail pending trial or appeal, large numbers of men and women whose offense or alleged offense is of a political nature; and

Whereas the sole justification for such prosecution and imprisonment, that of war-time necessity, no longer exists; and

Whereas in all democratic countries of Europe which have been associated with us in the prosecution of the war full amnesty has been granted to all political, industrial, and religious war opponents: Be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of our organization that further prosecution and imprisonment in the United States of a body of political offenders is contrary to the democratic idealism and the traditions of freedom to which our country is committed; and be it further

Resolved, That we accordingly urge upon the United States Senators and Congressmen of our State to do all in their power to support Senator FRANCE's joint resolution, S. J. Res. 171, for amnesty, and S. 1833, to repeal the espionage law. With all earnestness at our command we urge the necessity of granting an immediate amnesty to all prisoners whose religious, political, or economic beliefs formed the basis of their prosecution, trial, and imprisonment.

FARGO TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Eureka, Kans., and a petition of sundry postal employees of Independence, Kans., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MOSES presented a memorial of the American Society of Landscape Architects, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation granting certain irrigation easements in the Yellowstone National Park, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Rosa, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a more simplified method of collecting taxes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of sundry citizens of Talbot County, Md., praying for the establishment of a Bureau of Education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a memorial of the Federation of Labor, of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the deportation of aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Fred W. Beaudry Post, No. 126, American Legion, Department of Michigan, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the purchase of artificial limbs from the nearest representative of the Public Health Service instead of through the authorities at the city of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Wyandotte; of the Association of Commerce of Wyandotte; and of Local Lodge No. 199, Boiler Makers, Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, of Wyandotte, all in the State of Michigan, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the parole of Federal prisoners, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Rotary Club of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation for nation-wide promotion of physical education in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of the Ernest Kern Co., of Detroit, Mich., and a memorial of the Seelye & Brown Co., of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed increase in the tax on all forms of advertising, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13138) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended May 15, 1916, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred bill (S. 4273) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1, chapter 209, of the United States Statutes at Large, volume 27, entitled 'An act providing when plaintiff may sue as a poor person and when counsel shall be assigned by the court,' and to provide for the prosecution of writs of error and appeals in forma pauperis, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat., p. 866), reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 546) thereon.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3251) granting longevity pay from and including August 5, 1917, to certain officers and enlisted men, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 547) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 4287) for the relief of James M. Kelly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4288) granting an increase of pension to Elevse Fightner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4289) granting a pension to Thomas George Maginnis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4290) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Burkhart (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4291) granting an increase of pension to Abram Robinson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 4292) granting a pension to Clint T. Littlefield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 4293) granting a pension to Margaret Howell Butler;

A bill (S. 4294) granting an increase of pension to Robert O. Dunn (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4295) granting an increase of pension to Delia B. Zell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

DUTIES ON IMPORTS.

Mr. DILLINGHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10918) to provide revenue and encourage domestic industries by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

HEIRS OF JOSHUA NICHOLLS.

Mr. DIAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 190) for the relief of Elizabeth R. Nicholls and Joanna L. Nicholls, heirs of Joshua Nicholls, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.). The morning business is closed, and the calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11892) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the committee amendment. It will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, line 3, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$27,000,000," so as to read:

That the sum of $27,000,000 be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated—

And so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the amendment of the committee.

The Reading Clerk called the roll.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], which I transfer to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. KENDRICK. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], which I transfer to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and vote "nay."

Mr. BALL. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I understand he has not voted, so I withhold my vote.

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. That Senator being absent, I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. TOWNSEND (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], which I transfer to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] are absent on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]; and

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY].

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.
Comer	Kendrick	Overman	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Knox	Pittman	Spencer
Gay	McCormick	Ransdell	Swanson
Glass	McKellar	Reed	Trammell
Harris	McNary	Sheppard	
Harrison	Myers	Simmons	

NAYS—28.

Borah	Gerry	Lodge	Phipps
Calder	Gronna	McCumber	Smoot
Capper	Jones, Wash.	McLean	Sutherland
Curtis	Kellogg	Moses	Townsend
Dillingham	Keyes	Nelson	Wadsworth
Fernald	King	New	Warren
France	Lenroot	Page	Watson

NOT VOTING—42.

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	Newberry	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Gore	Norris	Stanley
Beckham	Hale	Owen	Sterling
Brandegee	Harding	Penrose	Thomas
Colt	Henderson	Phelan	Underwood
Cummins	Hitchcock	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Johnson, Calif.	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Johnson, S. Dak.	Robinson	Williams
Elkins	Kenyon	Sherman	Wolcott
Fall	Kirby	Shields	
Fletcher	La Follette	Smith, Ga.	

So Mr. REED's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, on page 1, line 3, I move to amend the amendment reported by the committee by striking out "$20,000,000" and inserting "$24,000,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1, line 3, it is moved to strike out "$20,000,000," the sum which it is proposed to increase the appropriation by the Committee on Commerce, and to insert in lieu thereof "$24,000,000."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I have offered this amendment, in the first place, because the amount proposed is needed to carry on river and harbor improvements; and, in the second place, the Engineers' Department of the Government in their recommendations have stated that they can not with a less sum than that properly take care of the rivers and harbors of the country. I quote from the report of the Senate committee as follows:

> The Engineers were told to go over the revised list of projects very carefully with a view to giving us the very lowest sum that they could get along with without detriment to existing commercial needs—

This was after their first estimate of $43,000,000—

> They went over the projects carefully and insisted that $24,000,000 ($5,000,000 for maintenance and $19,000,000 for improvement) was the lowest sum they felt they could get along with.

In view of that recommendation of the Board of Army Engineers I can not understand how anyone who believes that the rivers and harbors of the country should be taken care of can vote against the amendment which I have proposed. In my opinion, the pending river and harbor bill is not only an indictment of the majority of the Senate and of the other House, but it is a confession of their incompetence and inability adequately to provide for the domestic needs of the country.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], in his speech on Saturday last, among other things, stated:

> The fact is that this $20,000,000, with the amount that is now on hand, will permit for the coming year twice the amount of the average expenditures for the past five years.

That statement is misleading. It is not a fact that the $20,000,000 proposed to be appropriated, together with the amount which will be available on July 1, will equal the average of river and harbor expenditures for the last five years. As shown by the report of the Senate Committee on Commerce, the amounts that have been expended for the past five years on river and harbor improvements are as follows: In 1915, $36,682,913.27; in 1916, $28,779,995.40; in 1917, $23,829,265.46; in 1918, $20,613,905.46; and in 1919, $21,245,177.

Senators know that during the war we economized on the river and harbor bill and cut it to the bone more than any other appropriation bill passed by Congress. For the years immediately preceding the war the appropriations for river and harbor improvements were as follows: In 1914 we appropriated $51,000,000; in 1913, $41,000,000; in 1912, $30,883,000; in 1911, $49,000,000; and in 1908, $43,000,000.

It is stated by those who oppose adequate appropriations for rivers and harbors that $12,000,000 will be carried over as a surplus on the 30th of June of this year. I am told—and the chairman of the Committee on Commerce states it is a fact—that that is no more than the amount that has been carried over from prior river and harbor bills. I am told this morning by Col. Taylor, of the Engineer Corps, that it is probably less than the amount that was carried over during the five years immediately preceding the war. So those who oppose the increase of the appropriation in the river and harbor bill must oppose it because of the reasons advanced by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee. Here is the excuse that the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House has given to the country for appropriating merely $12,000,000 this year. They say in their report:

> The plan adopted in this bill will allow the Secretary of War to allot funds to the different works when and as the maintenance work is needed, and it is expected that the annual amount appropriated under this plan in the future will be considerably below former appropriations in amount and that a sufficient unallotted fund will be available from this appropriation at all times to prosecute emergency work at any locality when it becomes necessary.

That was evidently why the House of Representatives supported the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House in only providing an appropriation of $12,000,000 for river and harbor improvements. They arrived at that figure not on the theory that it would take care of the rivers and harbors of the country, that it would provide sufficient funds to dig out the channels so that commerce might flow into and depart from our ports at all times, but they based their action on the theory that it would be sufficient "at all times to prosecute emergency work at any locality when it becomes necessary."

When has it become necessary for Congress merely to appropriate a sufficient sum of money for rivers and harbors to take care of emergency work when the necessity arises? Our policy has been for years to appropriate a sufficient amount of money to take care of the needs of trade and commerce by the improvement of our rivers and harbors not in emergency times but at all times during the year.

Following the action of the House, the Senate Commerce Committee recommended an appropriation of only $20,000,000. They were not following the expert advice of the Board of Army Engineers; but they appropriated $20,000,000 simply because they did not think they would be able to get more money than

that. That is the reason for their recommendation. Those in the Senate Commerce Committee who opposed increasing the appropriation beyond $20,000,000 knew that more money was needed to take care of the rivers and harbors, but they were afraid they would never be able to compromise with the House, and that it might become necessary to agree to the House appropriation of $12,000,000 even if every river and every harbor in this country should suffer during the coming year as they have suffered during the past five years.

Some days ago the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] stated the question correctly when he said that a dollar to-day on river and harbor work will accomplish about 40 per cent of what a dollar would accomplish five years ago; in other words, the $20,000,000 appropriated by this bill will go no further than $8,000,000 would have gone five years ago. Taking those figures, if we should agree to the House appropriation of $12,000,000, in actual results accomplished it would be equal only to an appropriation of about $5,000,000 five years ago. I can not believe that the Senate of the United States desires to cripple the rivers and harbors of this country in any such fashion as that.

We have not economized on other bills. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], in his speech on Saturday, told us how we had cut down appropriations for this and that. The Senator forgot that the last year preceding the war, before we got into the war, for Army purposes we appropriated approximately only $100,000,000, and that for the Navy we appropriated approximately $150,000,000.

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

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator was comparing the appropriations for last year with the appropriations for this year, and the Senator stated that this was the only appropriation bill that was increased so far as he was advised.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, yes; if the Senator wants to take as a comparison what we did during the war, when everyone knows and will concede that abnormal appropriations were made to take care of abnormal conditions; but I understood the Senator to say—and I am glad to receive the correction—that before the war we reduced the appropriations; that that was one of the achievements of the Republican Party; that it had reduced all appropriations for other purposes; and that this was only in line with that.

While we appropriated $101,000,000 for the Army before the war—in 1915, I believe—the Army bill this year will carry approximately $350,000,000; perhaps more, but certainly no less than that. I understand that the Naval Affairs Committee will bring in, or has brought in, a bill that will carry approximately $550,000,000 for the Navy. Before the war we had never appropriated over $160,000,000 at any time for the Navy; and so this species of Republican economy is the kind that increases the Army appropriations threefold, that increases the Navy appropriations fourfold, and reduces appropriations for the rivers and harbors of the country over one-half.

That is false economy. You are only trying to fool the American people about it; but I am wondering what the citizens of New York, who are interested in the commerce that flows from their harbor, think about it. I am wondering what the people in Connecticut, who are interested in their rivers and in their harbors, are thinking about it. I am wondering what the people in New Jersey, who ship and export millions of dollars' worth of products from their harbors, are going to think about the votes of their Senators in a measly appropriation that would destroy river and harbor improvement. I am wondering what the people in Michigan are going to think of the votes of their Senators when they see they are voting for $20,000,000, as against an increase to $27,000,000 or $24,000,000, when, as stated by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], a dollar to-day will go no further than $2.50 would have gone practically five years ago. The Senator shakes his head, but I understood the Senator to say that $20,000,000 to-day for river and harbor improvement would go about as far as $8,000,000 would have gone five years ago.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator stated it the wrong way a moment ago; that is all.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, the Senator understands what I am getting at.

Mr. CALDER. Perfectly. The Senator is perfectly right in his last statement.

Mr. HARRISON. Absolutely. So, when the Rivers and Harbors Committee come in with an estimate of $43,000,000 for the rivers and harbors of the country and state that they have cut the amount to the bone, even then, I say, Senators who know that that amount will take care of only 40 per cent of what it would have taken care of five years ago vote to reduce it to $20,000,000.

So I am of the opinion that the people back home who are interested in their river improvement, who are interested in their harbors being improved, who for four or five years during the war have seen their dredge boats lying idle and rusting, who have seen expenditures of money made when no work was being done, because of the inadequate appropriations, are going to ask the reason why their particular Senator or Representative did not vote with us to appropriate a sufficient amount of money to do their work, so that the trade and commerce of the country might continue to grow.

The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] in his very able and aggressive speech on last Saturday told the Senate how last month our exports had gone forward at a greater increase than ever before in the history of the country. If that is true—and it is true—and we want to see our exports continue to grow larger, we ought to make reasonable appropriations to take care of the harbors through which and in which the ships for which we have appropriated such large sums may come. I was looking at the appropriations for our merchant marine and I see that the startling figure of $3,000,000,000 was appropriated to obtain a merchant marine. Is it statesmanship, is it good common sense to spend $3,000,000,000 of the people's money in providing for a merchant marine and then refuse to appropriate a sufficient amount of money to dredge our harbors in order that these ships may come and go? That is a short-sighted policy, Senators, and yet that is what we have done in the past few years.

I saw the Senate pass a railroad bill. I voted against it. I am glad I voted against it. I am prouder now than ever before of the fact that I voted against it, because I saw in the consideration of that bill where the Treasury of the United States was being drained, millions and hundreds of millions of dollars handed over to the railroads, the people taxed proportionately, and then I saw the authority granted in that bill that the railroads might be guaranteed a certain percentage on their investment, and the power there granted that the people might be taxed in order that those railroads might obtain that particular percentage. I saw you take care of the railroads by burdening the tax bearers of this country in making possible higher freight rates. I see you now withholding this appropriation that will help the rivers and the harbors that they may compete with the same railroads that you befriended.

If you want to help the people, give them cheap transportation. You can not do it by allowing the rivers to fill up, by not having the harbors dredged, and at the same time giving subsidies to the railroads of the country.

This Congress has been liberal with the railroads. It has been liberal in providing money for the highways of the country. We appropriated, I think, $75,000,000 to be used in cooperation with the States for that purpose, but when it comes to following the suggestion of the Army Board of Engineers to improve the rivers and the harbors of the country—the natural highways—that boats may ply to and fro on them, that people may obtain cheaper freight rates, that competition may ensue between them and the railroads, then I see the Republican majority suddenly become very economical, very stingy, and try to follow the House majority in appropriating a measly $20,000,000 for this work.

Why, you do not believe that you will be able to get even that much in conference with the House, do you? You are figuring on cutting even that amount. That should be no concern of ours. Let the Representatives in the other body answer to their constituents for the inadequate appropriation of $12,000,000 that they made, but let us answer to our constituents. Let us try to take care of the needs of this country. Let us look at this new day in the proper light. Let us take advantage of the great opportunities that are now being offered to us. As we have been niggardly for the past five years in withholding adequate appropriations for our harbors and for our rivers, let us at least now, in this dawn of an industrial awakening, appropriate at least a reasonable amount in order that these harbors that have suffered so long may be adequately taken care of.

No one can charge you with extravagance when you vote for this amendment to raise the amount from $20,000,000 to $24,000,000, because the Board of Engineers say that they can not get along with less than that. They estimated for $43,000,000, and I can not understand the reasoning of the Committee on Commerce, in view of the recommendation of the Board of Army Engineers, in cutting the amount from $24,000,000 to $20,000,000.

It has been charged that this is a "pork-barrel" bill. I have heard that assertion ever since I came to Congress, and long before; but I lay it down as an indisputable proposition that no bill that passes Congress is subjected to such close scrutiny and given such consideration as are the river and harbor appropria-

tions. We come in with our bill for naval appropriations. Those appropriations are sometimes inserted in the bill at the instance of some individual member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate. They come in with estimates at other times of the Secretary of the Navy; but there is no board, such as the Board of Army Engineers, composed of experts, studying nothing but that kind of work, a board which passes on it and must give their O. K. for it.

You pass your Army appropriation bill on estimates prepared by some man in the War Department. Often amendments or provisions are inserted at the instance of some Senator or Representative. They do not receive the same close scrutiny and careful consideration that is given to the provisions incorporated in the river and harbor appropriation bill.

No appropriation bills go through the same careful consideration and investigation which river and harbor appropriations receive. Not only do we rely on the work of the committee which drafts the bill, but we rely also on the O. K. of the Board of Army Engineers; aye, we go further than that, because before they put their O. K. on it each provision is O. K'd by the local engineer officer, by the district engineer officer, and while in the past there may have been some little project that would subject itself to criticism and should not have been incorporated in the bill, in the great majority of cases, the overwhelming majority of cases, have been those which showed wisdom upon the part of Congress in making the appropriation.

So, I submit that at this time, when the war is over and we are starting out in trying to obtain for this country our part of the trade and commerce of the world, when we have a merchant marine we are all proud of, let us not stint ourselves. Let us not play politics because some may live away back in a place where there is no river and no harbor, aye, not even a creek, and we can go back to that particular constituency and say that we cut down the river and harbor bill to $20,000,000.

I suggest to those Senators who come from localities where river and harbor improvement is needed and where it has been withheld throughout the war, to help us in securing the adoption of this amendment, which will insure us at least $24,000,000 for this year.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words in support of the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and am very sorry that it did not pass.

I wish to call the attention of Senators to the report of the very able and fair-minded chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. JONES of Washington]. I am sure he has done everything a chairman in his very difficult position could do. I would like to have Senators look at the first page of his report. He shows, in the first place, that the estimates made for river and harbor improvements by the engineers amounted to $42,000,000. Who are these engineers, Senators? Are they interested parties? By no means. They were the honor men at West Point, the men who reached the highest position in their respective classes at West Point. They are high officers of the Army; men entitled to retire with good pay at the age of 64; men sent from one place in the country to another, rarely ever kept more than three years in one place, entirely free from entanglements and local interests of any kind. If there be a disinterested, able body of men in the public service, it is in the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, who are charged, among other duties, with making recommendations for expenditures on works of river and harbor improvement and with using the money given to them.

That is the class of men who made the original estimate of $42,000,000 for carrying on, in a fairly reasonable manner, all the work on the rivers and harbors of the country, including Porto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii. It is a small sum when one considers the vast interests involved. We understand that they were requested by the House of Representatives to cut their estimate to the bone, to cut it down to the irreducible minimum, the very last dollar with which they could get along; and, as shown by the report of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, page 1, the department was asked to reduce its estimates as much as possible. It submitted a revised estimate calling for about $22,000,000 for improvement and five million for maintenance; $27,000,000 in all; which they thought was the last dollar they could get along with, and that was the sum which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] sought to have adopted by his amendment to raise the amount carried in the Senate committee's bill from $20,000,000 to $27,000,000.

That amendment was voted down by a majority of two. The present amendment proposes to give $24,000,000 for all these rivers and harbors, increasing the sum suggested by the Senate committee from $20,000,000 to $24,000,000, an addition of $4,000,000.

What does the chairman of the committee say about that? His report reads:

> Your committee hoped that it might feel justified in approving the amount as it came from the House. We are in hearty accord with the desire to meet the need for economy. The Engineers—

What engineers? The United States Army Engineers, not the local engineers at New York City, or Boston, or Philadelphia, or Norfolk, or New Orleans, or San Francisco, or Seattle, no men with local interests to subserve, but great Engineers of the Army, who are not tied to any locality, are not dependent for their living upon whether the amount appropriated is $20,000,000 or $24,000,000, who receive their salaries entirely regardless of what Congress does in the matter, and who are perfectly disinterested men.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator about what proportion of the money appropriated in the bill goes to harbors as contradistinguished from river improvement?

Mr. RANSDELL. In answer to the Senator's question, I will state that the bill as framed does not provide how the money shall be expended. It is a lump-sum appropriation of $20,000,000, to be used by the engineers in whatever manner they deem best for promoting the commerce of the entire Nation on waterway projects which have already been formally adopted and approved by Congress, the work on which is now under way.

On page 2 of the report of the committee will be found a list of the active projects, with the estimates originally made by the engineers, aggregating $42,000,000, and then a revised estimate. I have gone over the latter, and, as well as I can estimate, would say that about three-fourths of the money which the engineers propose to expend out of whatever sum is given them will be used on the harbors of the country. Something like one-fourth will be used in improving the rivers. Far the greater portion will go on the harbors, and those harbors are in every part of the country.

Those harbors, Mr. President, are absolutely needed to develop the wonderful foreign and domestic commerce of the Nation, through the aid of the great merchant marine just alluded to by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], on which we have appropriated about $3,000,000,000. It is absolutely necessary to improve those harbors and do so promptly.

Recently on the South Atlantic coast lines of ships have been started by the Shipping Board, sailing out of several harbors, and they are doing satisfactory business. At many harbors on the Great Lakes, at many harbors on the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific there is a rapidly growing commerce, and nearly all of them need improvement. If we do not give the engineers the $24,000,000, the irreducible minimum which they have asked, in my judgment they will be bound to neglect work on a great many of the big harbors.

Let me allude to one with which I am quite familiar—the Southwest Pass of the Mississippi River, in my own State. Making up estimates for the bill as the engineers do ordinarily, suggesting what they thought should be expended, they proposed in the original estimate that Congress should give $2,191,000 for carrying on the work at Southwest Pass. When they were told to cut the estimate down to the very last dollar, they suggested for the Southwest Pass $1,600,000. If you are going to further cut the total appropriation from $24,000,000 to $20,000,000, and then if the conferees, as I fear, are going to further yield to the House and make the appropriation $15,000,000 or $18,000,000, how is the Southwest Pass going to fare? It is not possible to give Southwest Pass $1,600,000 out of $20,000,000 unless a number of other projects are eliminated.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

Mr. RANSDELL. In one moment I will yield. The engineers may possibly do it, but, if so, they will have to completely eliminate several other important projects. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. Has the Senator observed that in the letter from Col. Taylor, under date of April 5, upon a basis of $18,000,000—not $20,000,000—they propose to give to Southwest Pass the full amount of $1,600,000?

Mr. RANSDELL. I read that letter, and I believe I know something about human nature. As able as these engineers are, as sincere as they are, I believe I know what they are going to do when we give them $20,000,000 or $18,000,000 and tell them that out of that sum they must take care of every waterway in America, and the Senator from Wisconsin, the Senator from Missouri, and Senators from other States press before them in the strongest manner, insisting that they do something for the

projects in their respective States. It will be almost impossible to resist such appeals. Congress does not command them to spend $1,600,000 of this $20,000,000 on Southwest Pass. Congress, if the bill is passed as now before us, says, "Do the best you can with the total appropriation." They say, of course, that they would endeavor to expend $1,600,000 on Southwest Pass if they get but $18,000,000. It is one of the most important projects. But can I, as a Senator from the State of Louisiana, stand here asking for appropriations for the great harbor of my State and consent, even if it gets what it is entitled to, that the others shall be cut out? No; that will never be my position. I am willing to stand or fall with the other meritorious waterways, rivers, and harbors of the country. If the others which are included in this estimate, and the others which go to make up the irreducible minimum of the $27,000,000, can not receive what they are entitled to, then I am willing that my harbor shall not receive what it is entitled to.

There is nothing in that thought that is improper. Mind you, we are not approving any new projects in the bill. We are not saying that so much shall be expended in one place and so much in another. We are giving a lump sum to the engineers and telling them to do the very best they can with it. They tell us that they can not get along in anything like a reasonable manner with less than $27,000,000. Yet the House comes in first and says, "You know a great deal more about it than we do. We practically know nothing. You are the doctors, you are the men whose duty it is to give us the information. Yet after you prescribe at our request we are not going to give even one-half of the minimum that you need," because the $12,000,000 which the House gave is not one-half of $27,000,000.

Then the Senate comes along and, with the same information which the House had, raises the amount to $20,000,000. Why did we not raise it to $27,000,000, or at least to $24,000,000, because Col. Taylor in some testimony did indicate that possibly if the maintenance item and the prosecution of the work item were included in one lump sum, not dividing them as the House had done, he might be able to save between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000, and in that way it was finally gotten down to $24,000,000?

Why should we, Senators, cut down on such an important matter as that in a Congress which will appropriate, before we get through, between $3,500,000,000 and $4,000,000,000? We are doing this for transportation. We paid out of the Nation's money for railroad transportation, to help them along, and did it with my hearty approval, nearly a billion dollars. We are giving the railroads several hundred million dollars right now to help them along and I am willing to vote it. I am willing to vote every dollar which our Committees on Commerce and Interstate Commerce say is necessary to keep the transportation agencies of the country moving.

We do not stop at a paltry $20,000,000 or $24,000,000 to keep the railroads moving. The waterways are another branch of our mighty transportation system. We must do what is necessary to keep them in proper condition to do business. Do we want some of our great ports to be blockaded because the engineers have not the money to dredge out the channels? It seems to me it would be horrible if the splendid ships that have been built at such enormous cost should fail to enter any of our ports because the channels had filled up. We must keep everything going on in a reasonable and proper way.

I was one of those who were anxious to see a liberal river and harbor bill passed at this time. I was anxious to see some new projects taken on, put under way, and prosecuted vigorously, but I realize the needs of the Treasury. I do not wish to see one single dollar appropriated unless it is absolutely necessary. I do not ask you to take my judgment or the judgment of any Member of the Senate; I simply ask you to take the judgment of the Corps of Engineers, who for over 100 years have been in charge of all these works and who have told us as disinterested experts that the very least they can get along with is $24,000,000.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President——

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

Mr. KELLOGG. Will the Senator tell the Senate, even with the present taxes, where the Government is going to get the money to pay the estimated expenses for the next fiscal year?

Mr. RANSDELL. I will say to the Senator that I am not an expert on finances. That duty devolves, I take it, upon the Finance Committee of the Senate. But I will say to the Senator, as I have already said, that this Congress is appropriating well on to $4,000,000,000 for carrying on the affairs of the greatest Nation on earth. I will say further to the Senator that the appropriation carried in the bill is to make our colossal foreign commerce available—to make it successful.

What would happen to the Mississippi Valley, for instance—not only to the State of Louisiana but to the whole Mississippi Valley—if because of a failure to improve the mouth of the Mississippi River ships were unable to enter the port at New Orleans, a port which now, in the volume and the value of its exports and imports, is second only to New York? That would be a very serious calamity to the Nation—not to Louisiana alone—and it might readily happen. One ordinary-size ship sinking in South Pass would so block the channel that it would be months, probably, before ships could come in if the other entrance—the Southwest Pass—is not open. The work on Southwest Pass is being prosecuted. The engineers desire $2,192,000 to prosecute the work on Southwest Pass. They say they can get along somehow with $1,600,000. Suppose you give them but a million dollars for this purpose—suppose the bill is finally cut down to $15,000,000 or $16,000,000 and they can not possibly get more than $1,000,000 for Southwest Pass—what, then, is going to happen to the commerce of our Nation?

It would be a very serious matter, it seems to me, for the commercial interests of that great section of the upper Mississippi Valley which the Senator from Minnesota represents so ably if they are unable to ship their commerce, their manufactured articles of every kind and sort, through the port of New Orleans, thence through the Panama Canal to the Orient, and the western coast of South America, and the east and west coasts of North America, and to Central America, and the West Indies. It would be a very great calamity, I repeat, to the entire Mississippi Valley.

In a Congress, Mr. President, which is appropriating well on to $4,000,000,000, if not quite $4,000,000,000, I say that the item of $24,000,000 for improving the transportation facilities of the country is a mere bagatelle. I say it is unwise, unbusinesslike, to quibble on the small sum of $4,000,000, only one-tenth of 1 per cent of the appropriations of this Congress. That is all the amendment asks. I sincerely hope, sir, that the Senate will vote in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I am in favor of river and harbor appropriations to take care of the necessary commerce of the country. I voted with the committee because it seemed to me from the presentation made by the committee that the country would get along very well this year with $20,000,000. I shall not vote, of course, to reduce that sum. I believe the sum appropriated by the House was too small.

I realize the great importance of the waterways of the country reaching to the great interior fertile valley, but when I hear Senators appealing to the Senate to increase appropriations, as did the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], I think we would better pause and consider what is confronting the country. The Senator says we will appropriate $4,000,000,000 this year. Why, Mr. President, the entire income of the Government, under the present rate of taxation, is $6,000,000,000. The estimates of the departments for the operating expenses of the Government for the year 1921, from July 1, are about the same sum, $6,000,000,000; and the deficit from last year is $3,000,000,000. In addition to that, there are certain losses which have been reported by the Director General of the Railroad Administration, amounting to something like $400,000,000 or $500,000,000; and there are other items which I will not stop to designate, due to increase of salaries, wages, and so forth. The estimates will bring the Government expenditures for next year to $10,000,000,000.

The Senator talks about liberal appropriations to the railroads. They have been liberal to pay the losses of the last two years, which now the Director General admits are $1,000,000,000, and which I will assure the Senate will amount to $1,200,000,000 before the bills are paid.

We talk about losses, of course, due to the enormous expenses of the Shipping Corporation. Why charge a Republican Congress with them, as does the Senator from Mississippi? Who made the appropriations and who spent the money? Is it fair to say that a Republican Congress did it? Not at all.

The Senator speaks about the expenditures for the Army. The Secretary of War called upon the Congress with an estimate of $1,100,000,000 for the Army. I am informed that the Army bill as it passed the House and the Senate will carry an appropriation of about $375,000,000 to $425,000,000. I assure Senators that if they would stop and consider this subject, they are going to see that it is necessary to cut the expenditures of the Government somewhere, everywhere that it can be done.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

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

Mr. REED. The Senator from Minnesota voted for the Army bill, I think.

Mr. KELLOGG. I did vote for the Army bill.

Mr. REED. And the Senator knows the estimates contained in that bill were about $600,000,000. Does not the Senator think that we had better take a little off the Army to carry on the internal commerce of the country?

Mr. KELLOGG. Possibly that might be done; but I voted for the Army bill because I believed that at this time it was not wise to reduce the Army below the estimate of the committee, which, I think, was for an Army of 280,000.

Mr. REED. I desire to ask the Senator another question, if he will permit me. Because of the congested condition at our eastern ports during the war, we had to, or, at least, whether we had to or not, we did, stop the operation of all factories east of the Ohio River for 14 days. The economic loss resulting from that action is estimated by some as high as $6,000,000,000. Does the Senator think that, if we are preparing for future possible war conditions, it would be well to have some additional means of transportation developed and some ports opened up to relieve conditions in this country in case of such a catastrophe as another war?

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I certainly wish to be liberal in the matter of river and harbor improvements. I will say, however, to the Senator that the stopping of the factories in this country, in my judgment, was the greatest piece of folly that ever a meddling fuel director or any other kind of a director perpetrated upon a country. It was in line with trying to run all the business with a director general in Washington, which can not be done. I think the Senator will agree with me as to that.

I read this morning in the newspapers a statement of Mr. McAdoo calling on Congress to reduce taxes. That is a very easy statement to make in a newspaper when one is a candidate for President and not responsible for the voting of the money which is necessary to pay the expenses of the Government; but most of the losses of the railroads were due to Mr. McAdoo and his system of administration, concentrated in Washington.

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator bear in mind the fact that Mr. McAdoo's letter was addressed to the farmers, and that he particularly proposed to reduce taxes to them and to put the burden on somebody else? Does not the Senator also know that political exigencies account for many curiosities in the way of ideas?

Mr. KELLOGG. I am quite aware of that, I will say to the Senator from Missouri, but such statements are not statesmanlike; they are political.

I wish to see the tax system changed and the taxes reduced as fast as possible; but, Mr. President, before taxes are reduced we have got to reduce expenditures; and the country should realize that fact. Taxes can not be reduced, as Mr. McAdoo the other day recommended, by borrowing money and continuing to sell bonds. We already have a bonded debt of $25,000,000,000, and Government bonds can not be sold to-day on a basis of less than 5 per cent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think that we can reduce taxes by instituting in this country a military system three times as expensive as German militarism ever was?

Mr. KELLOGG. No; I do not think anything of the kind, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to know it.

Mr. KELLOGG. I am anxious, of course, that the great commerce of the country shall be taken care of; I believe that the continuance of our export business, which last year amounted to more than $6,000,000,000, is necessary to the prosperity of this country, which is a large surplus-producing Nation; but, Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce has stated in its report that $20,000,000 will fairly take care of the rivers and harbors for the next year. In view of that fact, I voted with the committee, because I realize the absolute necessity for retrenchment in all branches of the Government.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not go out of the Chamber for a minute. I want to talk about a matter in which I think he is particularly interested.

The commerce on the upper Mississippi River, by which I mean that stretch of the river from St. Louis to Minneapolis, has practically ceased to exist. It has ceased to exist chiefly because the railroads made the same kind of war upon boats on the river that they made on each other. It was a common thing for railroads in the old days—and I am not saying this to drag up old and unpleasant memories, but simply because it is a fact of history—it was a common thing for railroads in the old days to undertake to destroy each other. The Senator from Minnesota knows that, because he has had a wide experience in investigating some of those questions. Rates would be reduced for no other purpose than to destroy a weak rival, the stronger roads being able to stand a reduction and the weaker not, with the result that the weaker road would find its stocks and securities depreciated; it would be thrown into bankruptcy, and would be absorbed or controlled.

The same kind of war, as the Senator knows, was made upon river traffic. The result was that boat lines being owned by small companies could be easily crushed. A single season deprived of profitable business, and those boats were ready to be tied up to the wharves and sold or sent into other waters. In some instances the railroads even purchased the boats, so that river transportation was destroyed. The railroads would reduce rates during the summer months, for instance, when the boats were active, and then raise the rates during the winter months and make the loss back when the boats could not operate. That was a system which went or for many years. Finally the wharves were allowed to decay, the boats were gone, and the railroads had the field to themselves.

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

Mr. REED. Yes; although I am leading up to a matter to which I desire to call the Senator's attention.

Mr. KELLOGG. I merely wish to make the suggestion to the Senator that those conditions were taken into consideration in connection with the railroad bill recently enacted, and the Interstate Commerce Commission was given jurisdiction so that it may protect the water lines.

Mr. REED. Exactly; the Senator has anticipated what I was about to say.

We kept on with the foolish policy of permitting the railroads to operate in the manner of which I have spoken, killing off water transportation and then killing off their own rivals. The wharves disappeared; the facilities by which goods could be taken from a river, even if transported on a boat, ceased to exist; and if any boat happening to survive this warfare hauled goods no railroad would interchange rates with it or interchange freight with it. It was a condition where a part of the public transportation service of the country was destroying another part of the public transportation service of the country. That, everybody will agree, was unwise, improvident, and wasteful.

At last we arrived at a condition where public warfare on the railroads, conducted, I think, frequently without proper judgment, resulted in the railroads ceasing to improve themselves. Public warfare, plus financial buccaneering, plus bad railroad management, and plus all of the conditions to which I have referred, brought about a condition where it was stated by Mr. Hill, the great railroad builder, and by other eminent railroad authorities that the railroads were 10 years or more behind the necessities of the country. So when we entered the recent war we found that transportation, the most vital thing during a war except the mere matter of men at the front, was in a desperate condition. Without going into details, we know that the harbors of the East were congested, that the railroads were incapable of carrying the business of the country, and that the economic loss to the country was incalculable. A small percentage of that economic loss would have made every important stream in the United States navigable; it would have rebuilt the wharves in all the principal cities; it would have opened the ports of the South and have expanded the ports of the East and of the West. Capitalized, it would maintain those ports and rivers forever. On top of that, we have annually or semiannually flood losses, nearly any one of which far exceeds the total appropriation for rivers carried by this bill.

With these conditions confronting us during the war the Government undertook to put lines of boats upon the Mississippi River and upon the Warrior River. It also undertook to organize certain lines of transportation and to place boats upon certain canals. When it began that project the Government found itself confronted with the same shortage of materials that the business of the country had to contend with, so that while it started in with the expectation of having these boats completed within a few months, the Government was unable to accomplish the task. Nevertheless orders for boats of a character and of a power heretofore unprecedented were given. On the upper Mississippi River a line of boats was projected to carry freight from Minneapolis to St. Louis and from St. Louis on to the Gulf, where the freight that went as far as the Gulf could, if destined to the ports of the world, be loaded upon ocean-going craft.

The line of boats which was ordered for service upon the upper Mississippi directly concerns the great State of Minnesota; it is vital to the development of the two wonderful cities of the

Senator's State, a State that he loves and that he wants to see developed. I think I have here in a condensed statement the facts concerning that projected line of boats. Contracts were entered into for the construction of 19 steel barges and 4 steel-hull towboats for the upper Mississippi.

On April 1, 1920, 14 of these barges had been launched, 4 were under construction on the ways, and the material for the remaining 1 was being collected.

The average completion of all the barges was 88.64 per cent. While they had been launched, they had not been completed.

The barges will cost approximately $110,000 each, and will carry, fully loaded, on a draft of 7 feet, 2,000 tons each.

One of the barges constructed by the Marietta Manufacturing Co. and one by the Dubuque Boat & Boiler Works were delivered in the fall of 1919, and towed by a self-propelled river dredge from St. Paul to St. Louis, each loaded with 650 tons of ore. The boats on this trip drew approximately 4 feet of water and the towboat 4½ feet. The trip was made without special difficulty or incident.

I am reading from a report made to me by the War Department.

These are the barges, but they had not yet one of their towboats.

The towboats are being constructed under a joint contract entered into by the Marietta Manufacturing Co., the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., and the St. Louis Boat & Engineering Co. The cost of these towboats, including the contract work, designs, drawings, and so forth, to be furnished by the United States, will be approximately $375,000 each. These boats have approximately 1,800 horsepower, and will draw 4½ feet of water when in service.

On April 1 the work on these boats was approximately 15 per cent completed. The contract calls for the delivery of the first boat April 27, 1920; the second June 6, 1920; the third July 16, 1920; and the fourth August 25, 1920. On account of the delays which have been experienced by severe winter conditions, inability to obtain materials, and difficulties with labor the contract work on these boats has been greatly delayed, and they will not be completed until nearly the end of the season of 1920, if, indeed, they are completed at all during the present season; but undoubtedly the entire fleet of 4 towboats and 19 barges will be available for service in the spring of 1921.

The towboats are modern, up-to-date boats of unusual power, and the barges have been especially designed for easy towing and handling in shallow channels; and the one experiment which has been made with the barges indicated that they were correctly designed to accomplish the purpose intended.

I am reading from Mr. Taylor's statement.

Here are the boats actually in process of construction to connect the Senator's great State, with its immense tonnage, with the lower Mississippi, to afford a cheap means of hauling the ores to steel factories located in the Mississippi Valley, to afford direct transportation for the wheat and flour and other products of the great State of Minnesota to southern ports, where they can be reshipped for European and other ports, especially for the oriental countries. I want to say to the Senator that I have examined this bill with the greatest care, and I give it to him as my deliberate judgment that if this bill is passed at less than $27,000,000 not one dollar of the money in addition to that which has been previously absolutely appropriated will be spent upon the upper Mississippi River.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President——

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

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. KELLOGG. I understood from the chairman of the committee—it was publicly stated here—that with the $20,000,000 of appropriation there would be available for the upper Mississippi $1,200,000, for the lower Mississippi $500,000, and for the Missouri River $600,000, and that this would fairly take care of what it was necessary to do during the coming year.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have heard those figures, but I can not understand where the chairman of the committee gets them. The Board of Engineers made their estimate. They put in items for these rivers, and they made an aggregate estimate of $27,000,000 as the last reduction they could make.

Then the chairman of the committee wrote to the Chief of Engineers a letter, which the Senator from Minnesota will find on page 4 of the report, in which he asked him if they could not omit certain items. Among these items to be omitted or reduced was the Mississippi River and the Missouri River to St. Paul, reduced to $600,000.

I do not know what that means. There is some mistake in that term, "Mississippi River and Missouri River to St. Paul," for, of course, the Missouri River does not run to St. Paul.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I see the engineers describe it that way in their estimate. It means, of course, the stretch of the Mississippi from St. Louis to St. Paul. I do not know myself why they include the word "Missouri" in it, but they do.

Mr. KELLOGG. It evidently means "Mississippi, Missouri River to St. Paul."

Mr. REED. It means, I think, the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Missouri to St. Paul, $600,000.

Mr. KELLOGG. It reads "$1,200,000."

Mr. REED. But I am reading from the Senator's letter.

Mr. KELLOGG. Oh!

Mr. REED. The Chief of Engineers reported back that certain of these items could not be cut at all, and that certain items could be cut a certain amount if they had to do it. The item of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Mississippi to St. Paul is not in the items to which I have just referred, but must be covered by paragraph 14 of the letter, which reads:

> The omission of the remaining items will delay the prosecution of important and worthy improvements, but will not have the serious consequences incident to the omission of the items on which the above statements have been made.

So the best I can get out of the situation is that the engineers may hope to use $600,000 on the upper stretch of the Mississippi River.

I had a talk with Col. Taylor, who said to me that the increased cost of work, of labor, and of everything had made such a condition that he could not say that these projects could be carried on with the $20,000,000 that is proposed here; that, of course, the Board of Engineers would do the very best they could. So, as I look at it, these projects which the Board of Engineers have certified as the more important, as the imperative projects, will be taken care of. The projects which are covered by paragraph 14 of the answer to the letter of the chairman of the committee will be the ones to suffer. That means the Mississippi River, among others. It is against that that I protest, and I hope the Senator can be induced to join in the protest, and therefore I address him.

The Senator has said that the Interstate Commerce Commission is now empowered to protect river transportation. I hope it will exercise that power.

Recently those who were in charge of river transportation, either present or potential, have succeeded in getting joint water and rail rates established, and that was done at many points during governmental control. Wharves are being built all along this river by the cities which are located on the river. With the joint rates, with modern wharves being constructed, with a boat line in process of construction, we are now engaged in passing a bill which in all human probability will result in nothing of importance being done upon the Mississippi River. That work must and will languish.

I appreciate the Senator's argument in favor of economy. I am as much in favor of economy as others. But let us look at this question of economy. An army eats every day, and it produces nothing. It is necessary; it is not to be condemned; it is not to be starved; but it is that character of expense which when the money is once employed it is gone forever. The spending of money to open the Mississippi River probably means a benefit to the Senator's own State and to his own city in one year more than the entire cost of improving that stream. Yet we propose to throttle these improvements which, in their blessings to the people, bring back tenfold every dollar expended and at the same time, without a blush, we vote an army of 300,000 men, to cost $600,000,000.

You had better cut a regiment or two off that Army and fix up the highways of this country, even if you are dealing with the proposition as a war proposition, for if we ever engage in another war the fact that we have the great inland waterways of this country open to transportation is of more value than 100,000 men armed and ready for conflict, for you can not keep an army at the front unless you can feed them, and you can not feed an army unless you have transportation.

I wanted to offer those observations to the Senator from Minnesota. While we see men whose States border upon these great inland streams throwing dollars out with a scoop shovel for armies and navies and the payment of bonuses; when we decide that we can pay a thousand millions of dollars to the railroads, and, as the Senator states, $500,000,000 on top of that, that we can carry these enormous burdens, the water pouring out of the funnel, I find some modern economists busy holding their fingers on the spigot. It is not wise. Twice on Saturday my amendment

raising the amount of the bill to $27,000,000 received a majority vote, but was defeated because of the lack of a quorum.

Mr. President, there is not any use in my carrying on this discussion in the absence of Senators. I am not particularly anxious to have anybody hear me, but there are only four Senators present, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Harris	Moses	Smith, Md.
Calder	Harrison	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Henderson	New	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sterling
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Sutherland
Dial	Kellogg	Pittman	Thomas
Dillingham	Kendrick	Ransdell	Trammell
France	Keyes	Reed	Warren.
Gay	King	Sheppard	
Gronna	Lenroot	Simmons	
Hale	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The names of the absent Senators will be called.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. PAGE, and Mr. WADSWORTH entered the Chamber and answered to their names when called.

Mr. KNOX, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. GLASS, Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. BORAH, Mr. LODGE, Mr. McLEAN, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. CULBERSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senators from Kansas, from Iowa, from Minnesota, and other States of the interior of the country that under former rulings of the Interstate Commerce Commission potential water competition was used in the matter of rate making. The result was that the Missouri River was a basing point where the rates were made on the same basis as though there were actual water competition on that river and on the Mississippi River. The new railroad act, I understand, changes that rule, and the basing of rates now is upon actual water transportation. I would like to have the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], for I want to know that he understands this point. Of course, when he has heard it stated he will form his own conclusion.

If I am correct in my construction of the new railroad act, and boats are not put on those rivers, the basing point for rates, with water transportation considered as an element, will no longer obtain at the Missouri River and the Mississippi River points, and the basing point will be at Chicago. If that is done, every farmer in Kansas will pay for it, every business man in Kansas will pay for it, and every laborer in Kansas will pay for it. What is true of Kansas will be true of Iowa and will be true of the Dakotas, and will be true of the vast country drained by the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers. This is the year when river transportation will be saved or killed.

These boats, as I have shown, are in process of construction. When we come to another river and barbor bill, if transportation on the river has not been successful, it will be stated as conclusive evidence that river transportation is a failure. The question will never be asked, or if asked will be without effect, Why was the failure? Was it because there were bars across the streams or was it because they are really unnavigable? We will be met by the same old argument that we have confronted here for years, that there is no great amount of business done upon these waters, although every man who will stop to think knows that there can not be business done upon a water highway or a railway until the waterway has been so improved that boats can travel or the railroad has been so built that cars can run over it.

Now, at the very crucial time it is proposed to cut this appropriation bill to a point where it is perfectly certain that these rivers will receive no benefits, no improvement of consequence, and the boats which we are about to build and which have cost over $7,000,000 will be obliged to run over sand bars and through snags and over rapids and other obstructions to commerce. We sit here in the great interior of this country twiddling our thumbs and counting dollars on this proposition as though they were millions of dollars, and then shoveling out millions of dollars for a vast army that will cost $600,000,000 if it costs a cent, voting away money here for a civil pension list that will run into hundreds of millions or thousands of millions of dollars before we are through with it, and voting away money to the railroads.

Let me say there is not a railroad influence in the United States that is not being exerted now to kill off water transportation, and it is just as active to-day as it has ever been.

If Senators, with these facts before them, see fit to destroy the chance of their own section of the country—and I am referring to that vast section drained by the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers—let them do so, but let them do so with their eyes open and with full knowledge of the facts. The bill was designed in the House to be the end of river improvements of this land.

I see the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] standing here. I observe a clause in one of the reports, or in a letter which I have from the Engineering Department, that the engineers desired to make improvements so as to open certain waters in Texas, but that they do not get it, and can not get it, under this bill.

I say this final word to the Senators from the great central parts of the country, the most fertile domain there is in all the world of arable lands, a domain cut off from the sea and dependent upon railroads alone, unless these rivers are improved. You never had as good an opportunity to serve your country and your people as you have by seeing to it that these great rivers which the Lord created in our country are again made the carriers of mighty commerce.

Some gentlemen somewhere—of course, not here, for we never have any politics here; we are entirely above that—may think it is good politics. They may think they can go out into their States and say, "The Democrats appropriated $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 for the rivers and harbors of this country and, behold, we appropriated only $12,000,000." They may think that that will gain some votes in this campaign. I say to you that the issue will be so infinitesimal in this campaign, and the saving will be so small, compared with the vast aggregate of the appropriations, that your argument will have no more effect than a fly speck on the Pennsylvania Railroad track has upon the fast express that pushes on over it and does not know it is there.

But your people will awaken ultimately to the fact that they do not have water transportation. Your people will awaken ultimately to the fact that somebody sat down here in Congress and made it impossible to put boats on those streams, and that every farmer who ships grain or produce of any kind, everyone who is engaged in merchandising, the vast consuming public, has paid the freight and that the aggregate of that freight is a burden many times more than the taxes would have been.

Sooner or later in this country, instead of thinking of foreign lands and sending our dollars six or seven thousand miles from here to be expended by peoples centuries older than we are, yet slothful and retrograding and inefficient, incapable either of caring for themselves or caring for anybody else, the day will come when a policy will be inaugurated in this country to develop the country for the benefit of this people.

I showed the other day, from the figures of a great engineer—and they are backed by the Army engineers—that in the Mississippi Valley alone there are 20,000,000 acres of the most wonderful land ever created, subject to overflow, perpetually kept in a condition of swamp, and that all this land can be reclaimed.

We are talking about homes for soldiers. Where will we put them? Where will those homes be acquired? An empire of waste land or partially waste land is at our door; an empire, according to the estimates of great experts, that is capable of supporting a population five times as great as that which was supported in the Valley of the Nile in the days of the Pharaohs, and we allow this waste to go on, and call it economy to let it go on.

The day is coming in this country when political parties are going to be proud to carry out the pledges of the past, and both political parties are pledged to this policy. In platform after platform they have solemnly asserted to the public that they will carry out these improvements. I have the platforms here. Of course, they may not be binding upon anybody. I know the day has come when political platforms are treated as scraps of paper, but here is the Republican platform of 1912:

> The Mississippi River is the Nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from 31 States, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many millions of acres of the richest land in the Union, stopping mails, impeding commerce, and causing great loss of life and property. These floods are national in scope and the disasters they produce affect the general welfare. The States unaided can not cope with this giant problem, hence we believe the Federal Government should assume a fair proportion of the burden of its control, so as to prevent the disasters from recurring floods.

The Progressive platform of 1912—I suppose that party does not exist to-day, but at least many of its adherents exist—declares:

It is a national obligation to develop our rivers, and especially the Mississippi, without delay under a comprehensive general plan. Under such a plan the destructive floods of the Mississippi would be controlled and land sufficient to support millions of people will be reclaimed.

What said the Democratic platform of 1912?

We hold the control of the Mississippi River is a national problem; the building of the levees to prevent overflow of the land and its consequent devastation resulting in the interruption of interstate commerce, the disorganization of the mail service, and the enormous loss of life and property impose an obligation which alone can be discharged by the General Government.

President Wilson said:

In the case of the Mississippi River, it is plain that the Federal Government must build and maintain the levees.

Ex-President Taft said—I quote from him for what it is worth:

I am strongly in favor of expending the whole $50,000,000 to save that part of the country from floods in a reasonable time and to provide a proper levee system.

Ex-President Roosevelt said:

The Nation must build the levees and build them better and more scientifically than ever before.

I could quote other great authorities by the hour to the same effect; but here we are with the war closed; with Europe pressing in every direction for trade and commerce and business; with the United States willing, it seems, to forego the interest on its money, and in some instances it has been suggested to forgive the principal of the bonds; and while we are doing that we are starving our internal improvements to death; while we are doing that, European countries are keeping their money and using it for the purpose of internal improvements and external expansion.

I am informed that when we requested $5,000,000,000 that was due us from the Argentine Republic that Government went to Great Britain and Great Britain promptly loaned her the money, at the same time being in default to us for her debt to us, with the result that a movement is on in Argentine to transfer her trade and commerce to Great Britain. What has that to do with this case? Just this much: It illustrates the fact that the other countries of the world are awake to improvement; they are awake to every question of commerce, while we sit here like sluggards sleeping in the sun, and all about us other nations are surging forward. They are not neglecting their streams; they are not neglecting their rivers; they are not neglecting their opportunities; we sit here and count dollars for improvements that will bring back the money and will develop our country and make it great, splendid, and prosperous. We are not even collecting the interest that is due us, with a very small portion of which we could make every improvement we desire.

Mr. President, ours is the shortest-sighted policy ever pursued by a great nation. What we need in this Nation, and what we will ultimately have, is some man great enough to turn his back to the ocean and his eyes to the country; to cease troubling himself about the intellectual, physical, and moral degenerates of other lands and begin to vision an empire of America for Americans; an empire in which every acre of land shall be employed; where the swamp will give way to the home and the croak of the frog will be drowned in the hum of industry; where every river will bear upon its bosom the commerce of mighty States and of princely cities; where we shall have created a system of transportation so that if our country is ever attacked we can mass our men and mass our materials in a day's time where now it takes weeks of time.

What other country has pursued such a policy as ours? Shall we turn to Germany? The German armies could not have moved and been provisioned in the late war save for the canals and rivers of Germany. In addition to that, the Germans had built their railroads for strategic purposes. We talk about providing for a great Army, but I say that if war were to occur 10 years from now I would rather have a great system of perfected transportation in this country than a hundred thousand, aye, 200,000 men or 500,000 men; for with water and rail transportation perfected we could mobilize our resources and we could be prepared to place along the borders of this country the mightiest army ever assembled, and do it in the shortest conceivable time, and feed them and keep the commerce and the business of the country moving while the war is carried on.

Only $5,000,000 stand between keeping these improvements moving and killing them, but yet before this Congress adjourns we shall vote away fifty millions or one hundred million dollars to some wildcat and chimerical enterprise that promises us nothing. The price of one battleship will equal the entire amount of money appropriated in this bill for all the rivers and harbors of our land, and yet in the event of war a single rock left in one of the harbors of our country might lose us a naval battle and send to their deaths thousands of gallant men.

It is as insane a policy as it would be for a farmer in the interest of economy to refuse to buy the necessary plows to turn over the sod of his fields and to allow them to remain waste lands; it is as foolish a policy as it would be to leave a hole in the roof of a building which was filled with valuable goods and say that you are economizing by not sending for a tinner; it is as foolish a policy as it would be to take a herd of young cattle and starve them through the winter instead of feeding them, and say that you have saved so much on hay when you have lost ten times as much on beef.

Mr. President, I have wearied the Senate talking of this matter and have said all I can say. I call for the yeas and nays on the question.

Mr. LENROOT rose.

Mr. REED. Of course, if any other Senator wishes to speak, I do not desire to shut him off.

Mr. LENROOT. I have no objection to the yeas and nays being ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has made a very adroit appeal to the Senators from Minnesota and to those of us who represent States upon the Mississippi River. The State of Wisconsin borders the Mississippi River for more than 200 miles; but the mere fact that some money is proposed to be expended in his vicinity ought not to appeal to a Senator upon that ground alone.

Now, what is the situation with reference to the Mississippi River? I sincerely hope that the Mississippi River can be improved so that it will float a very great commerce, but the Senator from Missouri knows as well as I do that that is an experiment, an experiment which we hope will be successful; but we have no assurance of its success.

We now have a substantially completed project between St. Louis and New Orleans, and yet there is practically no commerce floating upon it to-day commensurate with the cost of the improvement.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator is wrong about that. We do not have a completed project; that is the entire trouble. The lower Mississippi has sand bars across it——

Mr. LENROOT. What portion of it is not completed, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. REED. The portion below Cairo. As I was saying, there are sand bars across it that have made it impossible for any boat of any size to proceed up and down that river with safety. Everybody knows that the project is not completed, but we are trying to get it completed.

Mr. LENROOT. The project itself, as I recollect, is completed, and, if the enormous sums that we are expending annually for maintenance on the Mississippi River are not sufficient to prevent bars forming and to enable boats to pass up and down the river, we have a most hopeless outlook, indeed, for the future of that river.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator ought not to say that. Here is a project two-thirds completed. The Senator knows that a boat can not run over a sand bar and that if you have a project two-thirds completed and then sand bars form in the middle of it you might as well have none of it completed.

Mr. LENROOT. I wish to ask the Senator what portion of the project from St. Louis to Cairo is not completed? There is a uniform depth of 8 feet for the entire distance, as I understand.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. LENROOT. If I am mistaken it is because of the fact which I have stated, that although, as I recollect, we are spending nearly half a million dollars for maintenance, that sum is not sufficient for maintenance. That can be the only answer.

Mr. REED. Oh, the answer is that, of course, you have got to maintain a river. You have got to maintain a railroad, too——

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. REED. You have got to maintain a horse and a wagon; anything you have you have got to maintain. But if you have a

river improvement that is not completed at all so that commerce can utilize the river you might as well have no river at all.

Mr. LENROOT. But it is completed, I beg to say to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Well, the Senator is gravely mistaken about it; that is all.

Mr. LENROOT. However that may be, Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that if the improvement is not completed to St. Louis it ought to be completed at the very earliest possible moment.

Mr. REED. Yes; that is why I want some money appropriated by this bill.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator is getting it. Mr. President, if commerce can not be developed from St. Louis to New Orleans upon a completed project, it is idle to talk about any considerable commerce being developed from St. Paul and Minneapolis to New Orleans, because there is the great Southwest Territory that is naturally tributary to St. Louis that would furnish the commerce if, as an economic proposition, it could be advantageously carried by water.

I believe that the commerce can be developed upon the Mississippi River, but not any such commerce as the Senator from Missouri evidently has in mind. These are not like the old days, Mr. President, when the Mississippi River was the only means of communication for a great section of country.

The Senator says that the railroads, through low rates, have destroyed commerce upon the Mississippi River. I think that is true in part, but only in part. The fact is that commerce can not be developed upon any stream where the haul by water is only a portion, and a short portion, of the total haul; in other words, commerce can not be developed where it is necessary, in the first instance, to transport by rail to a river point, then ship by water a short distance to another point down the river, and then transfer to rail for shipment to the interior. It can not be done. It is not a matter of unreasonable rates at all; but it is not an economical proposition because of the terminal charges and the cost of loading and reloading. However, I do believe it is possible to establish a through commerce upon the Mississippi River to New Orleans and from New Orleans to foreign ports. I want to see that experiment tried; but, as I said a moment ago, unless such a commerce can be successfully developed from St. Louis to New Orleans it can not be expected that it will be developed further up the river.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. KING. I ask purely for information. Many years ago, as we read, there was a considerable commerce carried upon the waters of the Mississippi River. Those who have had the pleasure of reading Mark Twain remember the boats which he describes that plied between various parts of the States and the mouth of the Mississippi River. What is the reason that there is so little commerce now? What is the reason that upon the waters of the Missouri River there is so little commerce now, measured by what was carried many, many years ago?

Mr. LENROOT. I am very glad to give the Senator my judgment as to the reason. I think, as the Senator from Missouri has said, that in part it is due to the unreasonably low rates made by railroads to destroy water competition, but that is only a part of it. As to the greater part of the commerce which no longer exists upon the river, it goes by rail because it is cheaper to transport it by rail at fair rates than it is by water, for the reason that I stated a moment ago. Commerce does not originate to any great extent upon a river point. It must come from the interior. It must come by rail to be unloaded at the initial point, then loaded on to boats, shipped a few hundred miles by water, unloaded there, reloaded on cars, and then shipped into the interior. Now, so far as that character of commerce is concerned, it would be cheaper to carry it at a very high rate by rail than to transport it by water, and we never can hope to restore upon the Mississippi River that character of commerce.

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

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not upon the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, as well as upon many other streams upon which we are now spending millions of dollars, there are not adequate railroad facilities for the purpose of meeting all of the demands of commerce?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I would not say that. I doubt that very much.

Mr. KING. Is there any complaint now about there being an inadequate system of transportation to carry to the Gulf the commerce that could find an outlet there?

Mr. LENROOT. I think the shortage of cars upon the railroads is general, and affects all parts of our country. That is my judgment about it.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator contend that we ought to encourage the development of our rivers and harbors merely for the purpose of cheapening railroad transportation?

Mr. LENROOT. Not at all. I never have been in favor of that theory. We have control over rates, and if the railroads have been imposing a higher rate than is reasonable, it is not necessary to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to bring down rates, when we have an Interstate Commerce Commission here in Washington whose duty it is to see that only a reasonable rate is imposed.

Mr. KING. Then the Senator, as I understand, agrees with the soundness of the policy which was recommended by the Waterways Commission in their final report, wherein they discuss that feature, and state that—

> The United States must also adopt a definite policy regarding the relations between railways and waterways before any marked improvement in river transportation can be looked for. Such a policy must be based upon the idea that the purpose of improving waterways is to secure additional means of transportation and not to reduce or regulate railway rates. Experience has demonstrated that waterways can not be relied upon as the great cheapeners and regulators of railway rates which they once were supposed to be.

Mr. LENROOT. I am entirely in harmony with that view, but I do believe that there are possibilities of establishing on the Mississippi River through commerce, from South to North, and North to South, and thence to foreign ports. Whether it can be done or not, we do not know; but I want to see the experiment fully carried out. If it shall be successful from St. Louis to New Orleans, we can expect it to be successful from St. Paul and Minneapolis to New Orleans. If it shall be successful from St. Louis to New Orleans, we can expect that the improvement of the Missouri River from Kansas City to the mouth would be equally successful; but I do think that so long as it is an experiment, it is the height of folly to be conducting several experiments at one time, when one experiment will demonstrate the success or the failure of the project.

Now, Mr. President, with reference to the appropriations in this bill, the pending amendment is for $24,000,000; and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], and other Senators who have spoken upon the bill go upon the theory that if we should spend more than is provided for by the committee we would have an immediate resulting benefit to commerce. That is not the fact at all, under the report of the engineers themselves. If we spend the four million additional dollars that this amendment provides for, it will not carry an additional pound of commerce upon any of the projects upon which it will be spent; and remember that wherever we spend money upon a project that will not result in an immediate improvement to commerce, we are thereby increasing the cost of living to the people of this country instead of reducing it.

Mr. REED rose.

Mr. LENROOT. I will not yield for just a moment. I want to develop this.

Mr. President, why is that? Take this New York project; take the Delaware River project; take the Ohio River project—and that is where most of this additional four millions would be spent, under the estimates of the Board of Engineers. If you spend that four millions there, you will not add a ton of commerce by reason of the expenditure of those four millions, but you will have done this: Every man employed upon a project where there is no immediate benefit to commerce is taking just that much out of production of the necessaries which the country so sadly needs to-day. Every bag of cement that is used upon a project that will not result in immediate benefit to commerce will increase the cost of buildling operations everywhere in this country. So that where our trouble to-day is in the shortage of production, by increasing these appropriations for purposes that will not result in immediate benefit to commerce we will bring about just that much greater shortage of production next year.

Now I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, what does the Senator mean by saying that these improvements will not be of immediate benefit to commerce?

Mr. LENROOT. Exactly what I said. I will proceed to demonstrate it, if the Senator would like to have me.

Mr. REED. I should be very glad if the Senator would demonstrate it.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well.

Mr. REED. If any of them has to be absolutely completed before we can get commerce through, then, unless the work is begun, the benefit never will come.

Mr. LENROOT. I said "resulting in immediate benefit to commerce."

Mr. REED. Oh, well, of course, throwing the rocks out of Hell Gate will not result in an immediate benefit, but there will be an immediate benefit as soon as the rocks are out.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; when the project is completed, I agree.

Mr. REED. Exactly; and if it is necessary to do it, we ought to start to get them out; ought we not?

Mr. LENROOT. Not under these conditions; no. That is just the point I am making. Where there is no immediate benefit to commerce, in view of the necessity of men and in view of the necessity of supplies, where we need to have every ounce of our power directed to increase production, we ought not to take men and materials out of productive lines and put them into non-productive lines.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator know of a single one of these projects that will not relieve commerce to some extent if there is money employed on it this year, although it is not completed this year?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. REED. I should like to have the Senator name them.

Mr. LENROOT. All right; I will start in with the East River. The testimony shows there will be no immediate resulting benefit to commerce, yet for that an estimate is made of $2,100,000, where they had on November 1, unexpended, $4,784,000.

Mr. REED. What is the Senator reading from?

Mr. LENROOT. The East River, from the report of the committee on page 2, where the average expenditure for the last five years was $234,000, and the expenditure last year was $566,000.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator read the clause which states that there will be no benefit to commerce?

Mr. LENROOT. That was in the testimony. It was not in the report.

Mr. REED. Who testified to that?

Mr. LENROOT. Well, it is there; and that is bound to be true, because this will not complete the project.

Now, we will go on to the next one, the Delaware River, where an estimate is made of $2,000,000. That is not going to be of any immediate benefit to commerce, because this improvement is for a 35-foot channel, and this will not complete it, and it is of no benefit to commerce to have a 35-foot channel half the way and a 30-foot channel the other half of the way. No greater draft of boats can move up the Delaware River after the expenditure of this $2,000,000 than moved up before the expenditure.

Mr. REED. Did the Senator vote for any money to go to the Delaware River?

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, yes.

Mr. REED. Why did he vote for it when it was not going to be of immediate benefit?

Mr. LENROOT. Because Col. Taylor stated that they had a plant there, and that great loss would result to the Government from the idleness of the plant unless they could move along at a certain rate.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. LENROOT. And I did it for the purpose of going on with that improvement, so that there would not be a loss to the Government, but not because there would be any immediate resulting benefit to commerce.

Then we come, next, to the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, where the estimate is for a million dollars. Does the Senator from Missouri say that there will be any immediate benefit to commerce with the expenditure of that million dollars? I greatly question whether there will ever be any benefit to commerce commensurate with the cost of that commerce.

And so I could go on here, and it will more than cover the $4,000,000 for which the Senator from Missouri so eloquently pleads. There will be no immediate resulting benefit to commerce, but it will result in taking men out of production, where they are sorely needed, and taking building material where it is so sorely needed. What kind of business sense is it for Senators to think of making appropriations under those conditions, with this shortage in the Treasury, and with the shortage of production that exists to-day?

Mr. President, taking these items, they say that we are niggardly; that we should make larger appropriations. I observe on the other side of the aisle, in the roll calls that have been made, that it is very clear that the Democratic side of the Senate feel that they have no responsibility now for the expenditures of this Government.

Of course when they get upon the stump they will talk about the appropriations made by this Republican Congress and criticize us, when, as I recollect it, every Senator upon the other side of the aisle, with two or three exceptions, has voted for the $27,000,000 amendment increasing the appropriation in this bill.

Take the East River. The estimate is $2,100,000, and they had on hand November 1, $4,786,000, and expended last year the sum of only $506,000. Without this $2,000,000 at all it will permit an expenditure of eight times the amount which was expended upon that river last year.

On the Delaware River they expended last year $822,000, and they had on hand November 1, $1,136,000, and with the additional million it is proposed to give them instead of the two million they would have more than $2,000,000 to spend this year upon the Delaware River, a greater sum than has ever been expended upon the Delaware River in any single year.

I have spoken already of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal. Does the Senator from Missouri defend that expenditure with the condition of the Treasury as it is to-day? If he does, I would begin to think that, contrary to the Senator's usual policy, he has forgotten the condition of the Treasury or the interests of the taxpayer.

Galveston Channel is to receive $600,000, according to the revised estimate. There was on hand November 1 the sum of $599,000, and last year there was expended only $190,000, and the average for five years was only $141,000.

For the Ohio River there was a balance unexpended on January 1, 1920, of $9,478,000, including contracts which had been made, and included in that sum of unallotted funds on November 1 there was unexpended $4,597,000. Is not that liberal to the Ohio River? When, in the history of the Congress, have we been more liberal or have there been greater expenditures upon the Ohio River than will be made under this bill, not with the $27,000,000, not with the $24,000,000, but with the $20,000,000 provided for by the committee?

No, Mr. President, they can not make out a case that we are not taking care of the rivers and harbors of this country as fully as the present condition of the Treasury warrants.

But more than that, Mr. President, I want to say to the proponents of these amendments, where they seek to secure greater sums than recommended by the committee, they are defeating their own ends in doing it, and I think I know whereof I speak. It may be that if we can hold this down to $20,000,000 a compromise may be made in conference on a sum somewhere between fifteen and eighteen million dollars, but if you had adopted the amendment making the appropriation $27,000,000, or if you shall adopt this amendment making it $24,000,000, it is my judgment that the conferees on the part of the House would give no consideration whatever to the judgment of the Senate in raising these sums, but if we hold it to the committee recommendation a fair case can be made.

In my judgment this bill when finally agreed upon by the conference committee, especially if this amendment is adopted, will not carry to exceed $15,000,000. When you are trying to get a larger sum than that you are running the danger not of $15,000,000 but of no bill at all.

So, in the interest of liberal expenditures properly made, in the interest of getting as much as possible in the river and harbor bill at this session, every friend of rivers and harbors ought to vote to hold this appropriation down to the amount recommended by the committee, namely, $20,000,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, here is a strange argument, that we should make no improvement unless immediately a benefit will result to commerce; that is to say, unless there is enough money appropriated now so that a project can be absolutely completed we should appropriate no money now to carry on the work.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the Senator does not mean to inaccurately quote me. I made no such statement. There are many projects which can result in immediate benefit to commerce without full completion of the project.

Mr. REED. I will state it the Senator's way, that no money ought to be appropriated to a project unless an immediate benefit to commerce would come; that is to say, if it is going to take this appropriation, plus one to be made next year, to complete a project, we should not begin it this year. That is to say, you should not lay the foundation for a house because the next morning you can not move in your kitchen furniture. Consequently, you would never have any house. Yet the Senator has sat here and voted for a bill the numerous items of which he himself says embraced projects which can not be completed this year, and which will not, therefore, result in any benefit to commerce this year.

The Senator cited two instances. Against the Senator's expert opinion as to the Delaware River I put the opinion of the Army engineers. His argument is that there should be nothing spent on that river because we can not get a benefit this year. We are so nearsighted we can not see three months ahead, or

six months ahead, or a year ahead. The engineers said as to the Delaware River:

The appropriation recommended in Col. Taylor's memorandum is $2,000,000. The reduction proposed is $1,000,000.

I will not read, but I will put in the RECORD the rest of the comment of the Chief of Engineers, which is found in paragraphs 3 and 4 of his letter, and is an absolute condemnation of all the Senator has said:

3. The project for the improvement of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the sea provides for a channel 35 feet in depth at mean low water. The present controlling depth is 30 feet. The commerce of this port is approximately 25,000,000 tons per year, valued at over $2,000,000,000. An important navy yard is located near the head of the channel. The earliest possible completion of this project is regarded as of utmost importance to the great commerce. With a view to pressing the completion, a large amount of plant, including the dredge *Corozal* acquired from the Panama Canal, has recently been secured. To utilize this plant it will be necessary to purchase certain additional accessories, including a rehandling dredge for disposing of the material dredged by the *Corozal*. The cost of maintaining the plant in idleness would be a large sum.

4. The condition of the appropriations is now such that the department is seriously considering the rejection of a most advantageous bid for the execution of a large amount of necessary new work in Philadelphia Harbor. With the amount of $1,000,000 only, in addition to the amount which could be allotted from a lump-sum appropriation of $5,000,000 for the maintenance of all the harbors in the United States, it would be necessary to seriously curtail operations during the coming summer. The United States would suffer a considerable financial loss in the expenditures necessary for the care of idle plant, and the development of the commerce of the port would suffer great injury. The reduction proposed is considered most undesirable.

The Senator referred to the Ohio River project and told us how much money is on hand. He knows that nearly all of that money is contracted for or expended, and he knows that Col. Taylor reported in paragraphs 11 and 12 of his letter:

The project for the improvement of the Ohio River * * * is the largest comprehensive project of river and harbor improvement in this country.

Without reading, I ask leave to print the balance of the engineer's comment on that. He condemned the idea of cutting down that appropriation to the point named.

12. The project for the improvement of the Ohio River, to afford a navigable depth of 9 feet, is the largest comprehensive project of river and harbor improvement in this country. The work is now being actively prosecuted at 15 locks and dams, in part by contract and in part by United States plant and hired labor. The present appropriations have been reduced to such a low ebb that the reallotment of funds between the various works has been necessary to permit essential work to continue. The cessation of appropriations would disorganize the work and would be most disadvantageous to the United States. It is intended to apply a considerable portion of the sum recommended to the completion of the Emsworth Dam, which will replace the first two dams below Pittsburgh. The present structures, built many years ago, are in extremely bad repair and may break at any moment. The sum recommended is regarded as the minimum necessary for the economical prosecution of this project.

13. Commerce is endeavoring to utilize the Ohio River as rapidly as the work of the Government in building locks and dams will permit, and it is believed that this most important project, on which so many business interests of the central part of the country depend, should be pushed at as rapid a rate of progress as is possible. The million dollars requested in this bill is sufficient to keep the work of construction progressing at a proper rate, but if omitted would cause a cessation of work which would be not only most expensive to the United States on account of disorganization of forces and care of plant, but would also greatly interfere with important and large business interests which are making all preparations to utilize the improvement as it progresses. It is believed that this item should be retained, whatever else may be omitted.

Mr. President, there is just one remark of the Senator, aside from that, to which I want to reply. He tells us that river transportation can not succeed where there have to be shipments into the country. I have already explained that the railroads, under their old system, refused to interchange freight or to make joint rates. Joint rates are now being established and have been established at many points. Joint rates will be established at many other points if the Interstate Commerce Commission does its duty. Let me give just one illustration from the facts to show how badly the Senator is mistaken. Last fall, with an inefficient equipment, one boat carried 79,600 bags of sugar from New Orleans to St. Louis. Only 16,000 of those bags were used in St. Louis. The rest of them were shipped to interior points, far from the river, and that was done at a splendid saving in the matter of freight. That is just one example which shows how our theories can be erroneous.

That is all I desire to say, Mr. President, and I will ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment to the amendment.

PROPOSED WAR DEBT POOL.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to take a few minutes to call attention to another matter which I think it will be well for the Senate to bear in mind and which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD.

During the meetings of the peace conference in Paris I heard from one of the delegates there that there was great pressure to get an arrangement or an agreement in the treaty or the league by which all the loans of the different countries could be merged and then all the countries engaged in war were to become jointly liable; it was to be a joint bond. Of course, that meant making the United States and Great Britain alone the guarantors, for most of the other guarantors would not have been of very great value for the debts of the world.

Now, that has been renewed. I read a dispatch yesterday, under the heading "League fight over finances coming in May." I do not want to take the time of the Senate in reading it all, but I should like to have it all printed:

Trouble is already foreseen in the renewed agitation by countries like France in favor of the old scheme for pooling war debts or for endowing the financial section of the league with power to negotiate an international bond issue of some kind. This suggestion, which was made repeatedly during the peace conference, always encountered disapproval by Americans, notable among whom were Thomas W. Lamont, Bernard M. Baruch, and Henry P. Davison, who regarded it as uneconomic and without a chance of obtaining American cooperation.

I did not know whether those gentlemen were opposing it at the time, but our delegation there certainly opposed it, and were a good deal disturbed about it at the time.

Now, some French publicists—

I am reading again—

Now, some French publicists are urging France to adopt this plan for her offensive at the Brussels meeting as against the idea advanced by J. M. Keynes, the British financial expert, author of The Economic Consequences of the Peace. The French fear the latter plan—

Which, I think, put the whole expense of rehabilitating Germany upon us, and the consequence is that—

The French fear the latter plan will have the support of the league body delegates.

Mr. President, that is coming up again, and either by giving power to the league by necessary amendment or as a separate proposition we shall be brought face to face with it. Of course, not being in the league, we shall not be rendered liable unless we voluntarily join in a treaty to pool all the debts. It is to my mind a very great danger, not that I think we are going to accede to it, but that if we should be drawn into such a treaty it would become a very serious danger to the whole American people, and would mean a burden of taxation which it would be difficult to estimate.

I call attention to it, and ask to have the whole article printed, of which I have read only a few paragraphs, because I think it is worth considering.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator state what the article is? I did not understand.

Mr. LODGE. It is a press dispatch from Paris.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Whose proposal does it purport to contain?

Mr. LODGE. It is a matter to be brought before the meeting of the league.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Who says so?

Mr. LODGE. The French say so. The Senator is always desirous to have authority. It states that M. Poincare, former President of the French Republic, chairman of the reparation commission, in an article in the Revue des Deux Mondes, said:

It can scarcely be concealed that if at the Brussels session, at which there will be present not only Government representatives but a large number of bankers and financiers, a program is not clearly defined and the discussion strictly limited in advance, we will wake up some fine day before the ruins of the peace treaty.

He thinks it is serious.

An article by Jacques Bardoux, in L'Opinion, insists that the French cabinet must be prepared for a fight in Brussels.

"Neutrals and allies will come to Brussels with a program which is already known," he says. "Keynes has drawn it up, Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Asquith have adopted it, and now Premier Nitti has made it his own. This program aims at restoring German production at the expense of Franco-Belgian credit.

"OFFENSIVE ADVISED FOR FRANCE.

"Our defensive will be efficacious only in the measure wherein it becomes a concerted offensive which will have for its object the creation of an international organization to coordinate the liquidation of our war debt."

I think M. Poincare and these other writers of importance know what is coming. France desires a general pooling of the war debts. Mr. Keynes's plan or remedy was, as I understood it in his last chapter, that we should furnish all the money necessary to rehabilitate Germany, because his whole argument, as the Senator probably knows, is the necessity of rehabilitating Germany. His plan or remedy is very simple. It was that we should bear the expense. That is the difference between the two plans. That those plans are coming up there can not be any doubt.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood the Senator to say something about a meeting of the League of Nations——

Mr. LODGE. That is precisely when it is coming up.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As though the League of Nations, which is composed of 30 or 40 nations that had no part in the war, would have anything to say concerning the distribution or funding of the debt.

Mr. LODGE. M. Bardoux says:

Neutrals and allies will come to Brussels with a program which is already known. Keynes has drawn it up.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator, of course, does not credit any report that the League of Nations would have anything whatever to do with the distribution of the debts incurred as a result of the war?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know whether they have that power under the present draft or not. I think it is doubtful. My own belief is that what they intend is to amend the league. The French plan is evidently the one that was proposed and urged during the peace negotiations, which was that all the nations engaged in the war should pool their debts. That is coming up at the league meeting. It has been stated over and over again.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. A great many preposterous statements have been made.

Mr. LODGE. It is of no consequence to us what the league does?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Massachusetts would not credit for a moment any statement that 20 or 25 or 30 or 35 nations in the League of Nations would have anything to do concerning the distribution of the debts of the five or six nations who fought the war?

Mr. LODGE. Five or six nations? There were 32 signatories to the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly; but they were not engaged in the war; they did not incur debts in the war; and any such proposition as to pooling the debts of the war, preposterous as it is, could only be participated in by the nations interested.

Mr. LODGE. Even the greatest of foreign countries I do not think ever conceived the idea that the people who had no debts were going to pool them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. So if the article indicates that the League of Nations is to take up this inquiry it is preposterous.

Mr. LODGE. It is not preposterous at all. The opinions of these Frenchmen and Englishmen are not preposterous. Mr. Keynes's is not preposterous.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood this is a newspaper article from some unknown author.

Mr. LODGE. It is a press dispatch.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I do not quite understand the Senator's purpose in putting it in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. My purpose in putting it in the RECORD is that an effort is going to be made by them, and it is admitted by both French and English authorities that there is going to be an effort to so amend the league, if it needs amendment, as to form a combination for taking care of the war debts by a pool. That is what they are asking.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator think that the countries which had nothing to do with fighting the war would voluntarily assume a share of the indebtedness?

Mr. LODGE. I am not saying that they would assume it. The people who assume the debt would be the people who owe the debt, of course, and the object is to make it joint. But the neutrals will have no objection to having us pay the debts.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator credits the suggestion, then, that the 20 or 30 nations, outside of those who fought the war, intend to make a proposition that those who fought the war shall pool the debts——

Mr. LODGE. Who are the 20 or 30 nations outside the treaty?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not outside the treaty. I did not say that, but outside of the nations that fought the war. There were only six or seven nations that fought the war, and the League of Nations is composed already of something like 27, as I recall the number.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, the League of Nations was composed, to begin with, of the allied and associated powers, and they numbered 32, including Great Britain's dominions.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But those in the league now are those that have ratified the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. They are; and there are some neutrals there, too.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They number something like 27, as I recall it.

Mr. LODGE. There were 27, and if you include the five British dominions with subordinate votes, there were 32, as I recall it. I think now there are about 40.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he thinks it is worthy of any credence that those nations now composing the League of Nations are going to amend the constitution of the League of Nations so as to take over the jurisdiction and control of the debts of all the nations of the world?

Mr. LODGE. I think it is a most obvious thing in the world for them to do. Of course, those people who have no debt will not be in it, but those people who are in it will be very certain to vote that the people who do owe the debt should pay through the league. What is it to Holland or Spain whether we pay the debt or somebody else pays it? They do what European interests demand.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yet the Senator gives credence to the suggestion that the 20 or 30 nations that have not any interest in the debt, that did not fight the war, will presume to distribute the debt among the nations that did fight the war.

Mr. LODGE. They will furnish the votes to amend the constitution of the league, and that is all they have to do. Of course, the people who do not owe money will not be included in the agreement to pay money, but when Monsieur Poincare, who has been recently President of the French Republic, discusses in an elaborate article what will be done at this meeting of the league, I venture to say that he knows as much about it as the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am very much surprised that the Senator from Massachusetts, however much he criticizes the league, should seriously assert that the League of Nations' constitution could be so amended that the league could take over jurisdiction or control of the indebtedness of the nations of the world. It is such a preposterous suggestion that I am very much surprised that the Senator from Massachusetts indulges in it.

Mr. LODGE. Calling it preposterous is no argument at all. The facts are as I have stated them. The facts are given by men of undoubted authority, Mr. Asquith and the premier of Italy. They know what they are doing, and the point is, either through the league or outside by a separate agreement, to pool the debts of the world.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is no one in Great Britain who favors doing so.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Keynes simply wants us to rehabilitate Germany, not to pay the debts of the world.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator knows that when the suggestion was made in Paris it was simply laughed out of the council; it was too preposterous to be considered. There is no more possibility of the United States assuming the indebtedness of other countries than of the Senator from Massachusetts assuming my indebtedness.

Mr. LODGE. It was seriously considered there.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not by any nations that had any of the debts to assume.

Mr. LODGE. It was seriously considered there, and opposed by the United States alone.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was not seriously considered, I assert. It was not a debatable question.

Mr. LODGE. I know it was seriously considered. I know they were alarmed by it. I had information from members of the conference.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska how he knows it was not seriously considered behind the locked doors over there and how he gets his inside information?

Mr. LODGE. I have no doubt the information of the Senator from Nebraska is excellent. I have been discussing simply what all the world knows is an attempt that is being made. That is commonplace; everybody knows it. They want to pool the debts. They failed to do it in the treaty. They are now going to make another effort. There are two views as to how it shall be done. One is that we should undertake to finance Germany. The other is the French idea, which was brought up before, the pooling of the debts, and that attempt will be made. I never heard of anyone before who doubted it. But if they are going to try to use the league for that purpose I think it adds to its charms.

There being no objection, the press dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE FIGHT OVER FINANCES COMING IN MAY—WAR-DEBT POOL COMES UP—PARIS FEARS GERMANY WILL BE REHABILITATED AT EXPENSE OF FRENCH PEOPLE.

[Special cable dispatch to the Sun and New York Herald. Copyright, 1920, by the Sun and New York Herald.]

"PARIS, *April 24*.

"The interallied financial conference which has been called by the League of Nations to meet in Brussels at the end of May is expected to do more toward solving the world economic problem than did the peace conference. This is because the assembly will include all neutrals as well as former belligerents and, in addition to official representatives of the various Governments,

individual bankers and merchants of the greatest financial renown are expected to attend it.

"However, trouble is already foreseen in the renewed agitation by countries like France in favor of the old scheme for pooling war debts or for endowing the financial section of the league with power to negotiate an international bond issue of some kind. This suggestion, which was made repeatedly during the peace conference, always encountered disapproval by Americans, notable among whom were Thomas W. Lamont, Bernard M. Baruch, and Henry P. Davison, who regarded it as uneconomic and without a chance of obtaining American cooperation.

"Now some French publicists are urging France to adopt this plan for her offensive at the Brussels meeting, as against the idea advanced by J. M. Keynes, the British financial expert, author of The Economic Consequences of the Peace. The French fear the latter plan will have the support of the league body delegates.

"CULMINATION IN BRUSSELS.

"There is some reason to believe that the whole movement for treaty revision, in so far as economic terms will go, likely will culminate in Brussels and that the premiers are awaiting the results.

"Since France probably will be represented at the conference by Raymond Poincare, chairman of the reparation commission, there is considerable significance in an article by him in the Revue des Deux Mondes recently, in which he warns:

"'It can scarcely be concealed that if at the Brussels session, at which there will be present not only Government representatives but a large number of bankers and financiers, a program is not clearly defined and the discussion strictly limited in advance, we will wake up some fine day before the ruins of the peace treaty.'

"An article by Jacques Bardoux, in L'Opinion, insists that the French cabinet must be prepared for a fight in Brussels.

"'Neutrals and allies will come to Brussels with a program which is already known,' he says. 'Keynes has drawn it up, Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Asquith have adopted it, and now Premier Nitti has made it his own. This program aims at restoring German production at the expenses of Franco-Belgian credit.

"'OFFENSIVE ADVISED FOR FRANCE.

"'Our defensive will be efficacious only in the measure wherein it becomes a concerted offensive which will have for its object the creation of an international organization to coordinate the liquidation of our war debt.

"'Whether the financial section of the league gives more value to Germany's obligations; whether it liquidates the interallied loans, or assumes charge of any part of the war debt and damages, it can, at all events, in issuing its own bonds and in realizing an equal distribution of exchanges, permit France to improve the situation in her treasury while awaiting Germany's payments.'"

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11892) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] proposing to increase the amount reported by the committee from $20,000,000 to $24,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the reasons given by Senators who favor the increase of the amount are very largely the reasons that influenced the committee in increasing the amount to be appropriated by the bill over that provided by the House. The reasons stated by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] as to why we determined upon the amount of $20,000,000 make it unnecessary for me to discuss the matter further.

Mr. LENROOT. Just one word, Mr. President.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] asked to have inserted in the RECORD the report of Col. Taylor, of the Engineers. The Senator said that report refuted every word I have said concerning the Delaware and Ohio Rivers. The Senator from Missouri did not read all of Col. Taylor's report. I merely wish to state to the Senator that I have read that report since he has had it inserted in the RECORD and that there is not one word in the report which even hints that the expenditure of this money will be of any immediate benefit to commerce, either in the case of the Delaware River or the Ohio River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to the amendment of the committee. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). Making the same transfer of my pair as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I understand, however, that if that Senator were present he would vote as I shall vote. I therefore feel at liberty to vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McLEAN. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. He is paired. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. KING. Upon this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. KENDRICK. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD). The Chair transfers his pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and votes "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (after having voted in the affirmative). I notice that my pair, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], has not voted. Therefore I shall have to withdraw my vote.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the affirmative). I understand that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], with whom I have a pair, voted for the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], proposing a larger increase in the appropriation than that now proposed. I assume, therefore, that if present, he would now vote for the lesser appropriation, and I shall take the liberty of permitting my vote to stand.

Mr. OWEN (after having voted in the affirmative). I ask if the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. OWEN. I withdraw my vote, having a pair with that Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Ashurst	Harris	Nugent	Simmons
Chamberlain	Harrison	Overman	Smith, Ariz.
Comer	Henderson	Phelan	Spencer
Culberson	Hitchcock	Pittman	Sterling
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Swanson
France	Kendrick	Reed	Thomas
Gay	McKellar	Sheppard	Trammell
Glass	McNary	Shields	Underwood

NAYS—22.

Calder	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Sutherland
Capper	Kellogg	Nelson	Townsend
Curtis	Keyes	New	Wadsworth
Fernald	Lenroot	Page	Warren
Gronna	Lodge	Phipps	
Hale	McCumber	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—42.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Gerry	McLean	Smith, Md.
Borah	Gore	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Harding	Newberry	Stanley
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Dillingham	Kenyon	Penrose	Watson
Edge	King	Poindexter	Williams
Elkins	Kirby	Pomerene	Wolcott
Fall	Knox	Robinson	
Fletcher	La Follette	Sherman	

So Mr. HARRISON's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask now to have stated the next amendment which was passed over, being the amendment on page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, after the word "*Provided*," it is proposed to strike out:

That $5,000,000 of the sum herein appropriated may be allotted for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and $7,000,000 of the sum herein appropriated may be allotted for the prosecution of works of improvement heretofore authorized by Congress: *Provided further*.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely wish to say that I hope the amendment will be agreed to. It is proposed in the interest of economy. Col. Taylor has assured the committee that without the limitation he could accomplish far more with the amount of money which we propose to appropriate than to have it divided as proposed by the language recommended to be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The next amendment passed over, I think, is on page 18, being section 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 18, after line 14, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 10. That section 4 of the river and harbor appropriation act approved June 25, 1910, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That whenever any vessel belonging to or employed by the United States engaged upon river and harbor works collides with and damages another vessel, pier, or other legal structure belonging to any person or corporation, and whenever, in the prosecution of river and harbor works an accident occurs damaging or destroying property belonging to any person or corporation, and whenever personal property of employees of the United States, who are employed on or in connection with river and harbor works, is damaged or destroyed in connection with the loss, threatened loss, or damage to United States property, or through efforts to save life or to preserve United States property, the Chief of Engineers shall cause an immediate examination to be made, and if, in his judgment, the facts and circumstances are such as to make the whole or any part of the damages or destruction a proper charge against the United States, the Chief of Engineers, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, shall have authority to adjust and settle all claims for damages or destruction caused by the above designated collisions, accidents, etc., in cases where the damage or expense does not exceed $500, and pay the same from the appropriation directly involved, and to report such as exceed $500 to Congress for its consideration."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order raised by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is pending to the amendment just stated.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the Senate committee amendment on page 12, line 16, was adopted. The word "including" was stricken out, and the words "with a view of" inserted. As the provision was prepared by the House committee and as it passed the House the word "including" would permit a survey not only for the purpose of considering the methods to be employed in removing the submerged rock but also in deepening the channel. The Senate committee, however, in changing the wording, have restricted the provision so that it now only contemplates a survey for the purpose of removing the submerged rock. I desire it to remain as provided in the House bill, and therefore ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon. I think it ought to be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the amendment referred to was agreed to will be reconsidered. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The committee amendment should be rejected.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SWANSON obtained the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will wait until we dispose of section 10. As I understand, a point of order has been raised against that section.

Mr. SWANSON. Very well, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I simply desire to say that I do not believe the point of order, which is that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill, is well taken. Assuming that the river and harbor appropriation bill is to be treated as any other general appropriation measure, I do not think that the amendment proposed is general legislation. It relates only to a particular subject, to a particular class of people, and applies only to a particular class of work.

The section amends section 4 of the river and harbor act of June 25, 1910, under which provision was made for the settlements of claims for damages growing out of collisions, and so on. The amendment leaves that section as it was, but adds to it certain language. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the particular language in line 24:

and whenever personal property of employees of the United States—

That is a restriction; it applies only to employees of the United States; and it does not apply to all such employees, but only to those—

who are employed on or in connection with river and harbor works—

Particular ones employed on a particular work—

is damaged or destroyed in connection with the loss, threatened loss, or damage to United States property, or through efforts to save life or to preserve United States property—

It is restricted further; it does not apply to a general loss of property by even this class of employees, but is confined to the loss or damage of property in connection with a particular circumstance, and that is when the property—

Is damaged or destroyed in connection with the loss, threatened loss, or damage to United States property, or through efforts to save life or to preserve United States property.

Mr. President, it seems to me that that can not be construed as general legislation, for it is clearly special legislation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator know that the courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, have held repeatedly that legislation is general even though it is limited to but one class; for instance, legislation dealing with insurance companies alone? In the Kansas insurance case such legislation was denominated general legislation, and was held not subject to the attack which was made upon it that it was special legislation, although it related to insurance companies alone.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, we are not controlled in the construction of our rules by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. I give a great deal of weight and a great deal of credence to the rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States, but they have no control with reference to the construction of the rules of the United States Senate in governing itself in determining the conduct of its business. I do not believe that this would come in line with that case, anyhow.

I can not see anything that would lead to the conclusion that this is general legislation in the sense in which that term is used in the rules of the Senate, but I am perfectly willing to allow the Chair to pass on the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I take it for granted that there is no question but that the river and harbor bill is an appropriation bill in every sense of the word, and I do not want to take the time of the Senate to point to the decisions bearing out that question.

As to the question of whether or not this amendment is general legislation, I call your attention to the precedents of general legislation on river and harbor bills. I am not going to take very much of the time of the Senate, but I think the Chair, if he will read them, will come to the conclusion that this and similar amendments is general legislation without a question of a doubt, and it has been so decided by the Senate time and time again.

On page 161, I find the following:

The Senate resumed, as in Committee of the Whole, the consideration of the bill (H. R. 28180) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

On the question to agree to the reported amendment, beginning on page 53, line 6, and extending down to and including line 6, page 55, as follows:

"The Secretary of War is hereby directed to make and enter into an agreement with the Municipal Electric Co., a public corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota, for the purpose of utilizing the hydroelectric power developed by the surplus waters not needed for navigation by the dam described and provided for in House Document No. 741, Sixty-first Congress, second session, as adopted by Congress in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes,' approved June 25, 1910"—

And so forth.

That is one particular electric-light plant, and that was ruled and passed upon by the Senate as to whether it was general legislation on an appropriation bill on February 20, 1913.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? Do I understand that the Senator claims that what he read was general legislation?

Mr. SMOOT. The question was raised:

Mr. THOMAS raised a question of order, viz, that the amendment proposed is general legislation to an appropriation bill, and is therefore not in order under the rule.

The President pro tempore (Mr. Gallinger) submitted the question to the Senate, Is the amendment in order?

It was determined in the affirmative.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that is, that amendment was held in order on the river and harbor bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That it was not in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was held in order. The Chair decided in the affirmative.

Mr. SMOOT. No; that it was general legislation, and that was the point that was made.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senator is acting on that belief, all right.

Mr. SMOOT. There are three or four pages of decisions covering my contention. I do not know that it is really necessary to read them, as they are so plain.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to call his attention to this? The Senator has misread it. At the bottom of the page it says:

Mr. THOMAS raised a question of order, viz, that the amendment proposed is general legislation to an appropriation bill, and is therefore not in order under the rule.

The President pro tempore (Mr. Gallinger) submitted the question to the Senate, Is the amendment in order?

It was determined in the affirmative.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the Senator is right on that, but I know that it is not necessary for me to go on and read this long list of precedents holding amendments similar to the pending one is general legislation on a river and harbor bill, because they have all been held as general legislation and in cases more specific in terms than this particular one.

The Senator says that this applies only to all those employed on river and harbor works. Why, of course it applies to all those employed on river and harbor works, and that is general. It makes no difference where located, whether in New York or San Francisco or any river in the United States; it applies to every person employed on them. It is just as general as it could possibly be, because it takes in every employee that is engaged upon this class of work. It does not say the employees upon any particular class of work, but it is the whole of the employees, and in my opinion it could not be more general than the wording of this amendment, and under the previous rulings of the Senate it is general legislation.

I am willing that the Chair shall rule upon it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if the Chair will turn to page 60 of the precedents, he will find a definition of general legislation that I think is the rule followed by the Senate. Citing from Bouvier's Law Dictionary:

General law (legislation), laws which apply to and operate uniformly upon all members of any class of persons, or places, or things, requiring legislation peculiar to themselves in the matters covered by the laws. Statutes which relate to persons and things as a class.

So I do not think the contention of the Senator from Washington can be sustained, that because this relates only to a class of persons it is not general. The precedent seems to be directly the opposite.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I wondered, as I have listened to this discussion, whether another rule does not apply here, or at least a precedent that we have followed, I think, again and again in the Senate. Is this not a limitation upon an appropriation, and therefore not open to the objection that it is general legislation?

Mr. SMOOT. In what way would it be a limitation on an appropriation?

Mr. STERLING. Let me read a few of the lines here, beginning with line 8:

The Chief of Engineers, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, shall have authority to adjust and settle all claims for damages or destruction caused by the above designated collisions, accidents, and so forth, in cases where the damage or expense does not exceed $500, and pay the same from the appropriation directly involved, and to report such as exceed $500 to Congress for its consideration.

It occurred to me that here, in any given case, where an appropriation is involved, and a collision, an accident, occurs, a claim for damages on that account is to be paid out of that appropriation which we have provided in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. It is a privilege that that power is granted to the Secretary of War. That is exactly what the change of the law is, and it becomes general legislation. It does not apply to one accident; it applies to every accident that may happen. It does not apply to one person; it applies to all persons who may be engaged in that work.

If this is not general legislation, there never was general legislation.

Mr. STERLING. What does the Senator understand by the language "from the appropriation directly involved"? It means, does it not, that which is set apart for that particular project or enterprise? That is "the appropriation directly involved."

Mr. SMOOT. It changes the present law, as was said here the other day by the Senator from Minnesota. There is no doubt of that. If this is general legislation, then it has no business on an appropriation bill when a point of order is made against it, and I have made the point of order.

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

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that, instead of this being a limitation, it is an extension. There is no limitation at all. There is no such authority at all now to pay money for these purposes, so it could not be a limitation. It is, in fact, an extension to the Secretary of War of authority that he does not have to-day.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Wisconsin understand, by the language "and pay the same from the appropriation directly involved," the part of a general appropriation—say twenty to twenty-four million dollars—that is set apart for that particular project? It comes out of the general appropriation, of course.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; but no part of the $24,000,000 can be used for any such purpose now; and if that is so, how can the Senator say that this is a limitation?

Mr. STERLING. It can be used for the purpose of that particular project or enterprise at which the accident or collision occurs, where the damages arise.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; but they could use it for this purpose, and so it could not be a limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). The question under discussion is one upon which there may be a great divergence of opinion, as the Chair sees there is, by good lawyers of the Senate. The occupant of the chair, who is here temporarily, is not inclined to make a ruling on the matter but is disposed to leave it to the judgment of the Senate, and he will therefore put the question, Is the point of order well taken?

On a division, the Senate decided that the point of order was not well taken.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what does the Chair decide?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That the point of order is not well taken. The Senate has so decided.

The question now is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That completes the committee amendments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 5, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert:

Warwick River, Va.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, this is simply to provide for a survey. My attention was called to this matter by the Member of Congress from this district, who informs me that Gen. Taylor, of the Army Engineers, and Gen. Heywood, who is commander at Camp Eustis, desire that this survey be made in order to facilitate the means of getting supplies at Camp Eustis. They think they will save a great deal of money if this is allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It relates to a survey, and is to be inserted after line 2 on page 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 9, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

Outlet of Cass Lake, Minn., with a view of securing a navigable connection with the Mississippi River.

Mr. NELSON. This is simply to provide for a survey.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether that amendment was submitted to the committee for consideration?

Mr. NELSON. No; it has not been submitted to the committee for consideration.

Mr. KING. I inquire of the chairman whether it is his policy, and the policy of the committee, to permit to be added to appropriation bills of this character——

Mr. NELSON. This is simply asking for a survey. Cass Lake is one of the sources of the Mississippi River. It is desired to improve the channel from the lake, so that the farmers around that large lake who are raising a lot of potatoes can find an outlet by shipping them out on barges down the Mississippi River. That is the object of the amendment.

Mr. KING. I was about to put a question to the chairman of the committee——

Mr. NELSON. It is simply for a survey. If the Board of Engineers report against it, that is the end of it, and if they recommend it favorably, it has to go from the local engineer to the division engineer, and from him to the board of review, and from that to the Chief of Engineers, before it comes before the committee for consideration. It has to run through practically three tribunals.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I am entirely familiar with the modus operandi followed in respect to these matters. I have not read more than 25,000 pages of reports respecting rivers and harbors without getting some little information respecting their character and the methods employed to secure favorable reports upon little brooks and streams and creeks which can not be considered as arteries of commerce and upon which millions of dollars have been expended.

But if I may be permitted to return to the question which I have attempted to ask the chairman of the committee, is it the purpose and policy of the committee to permit, without any objection whatever, the placing upon bills of this character in the Senate any survey or any item or project which any Senator desires or cares to suggest?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned I do not know about these propositions which are presented. I do not know of any way by which I can learn about them, except through a report from the engineers or the statements of a Senator. When a Senator comes and states that he thinks a survey ought to be made, and that one has not been made within very recent years, I am perfectly willing to let it go on and get the facts here. If the Senator from Utah were to come to me and state that he thought a survey ought to be made of a river or a harbor in his State, if there were rivers and harbors in that State, I would feel perfectly justified in giving my consent to such a provision going into this bill.

We must not forget the character of these provisions. They are simply provisions calling for information to be presented to the Senate with reference to different propositions. They entail but very little expenditure and do not add to the appropriation in the bill. They furnish information upon which Congress will determine its future action as to whether a project is to be taken up or not.

As was brought out the other day, the engineers do not take this as an instruction, or even a suggestion, to report favorably; but they understand that it is simply a proposition calling upon them for an impartial and unbiased statement with reference to the facts of the situation.

The records show that during the last few years only about 7 per cent of the surveys we have ordered have been favorably reported upon or recommended by the engineers. Under those circumstances, and from the fact that I know nothing about the situation, as I said, and can learn nothing about it except through these reports and statements of engineers, I have followed the course we have always followed with reference to surveys, that when a Senator asked for them I have made no serious objection to it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the present system does not permit that freedom and independence upon the part of the engineers and officials that are necessary to secure economy and a proper and serviceable river and harbor system. I do not have the confidence in the reports of the engineers and boards which act upon their reports that is manifested by the Senator from Minnesota and the chairman of this committee. Moreover, the records furnish numerous examples of the utter failure of scores of projects approved by the engineers, and upon which tens of millions of dollars have been expended, and there are examples showing that in the face of adverse recommendations by the engineers Congress has authorized the expenditure of large sums for the development of streams and rivulets which carry no commerce and never will be of advantage or service to the people. Indeed, there are hundreds of projects which have received the approval of the Engineers of the Army and the appellate board which passes upon their recommendations that had no merit, and for the development of which not a single dollar should have been appropriated. My belief is, after a careful examination of all the reported projects, that a majority of them were wholly unworthy and the money appropriated therein was wasted.

The Senator from Minnesota has just offered an amendment which calls for a survey of a local and unimportant project. In my opinion, it should not be a Federal charge. If the people residing in the vicinity of the lake referred to desire to improve the small stream flowing from the lake, they should undertake it themselves or the State should make the desired improvement.

I want to read a sentence or two from the proceedings of the Senate under date of February 20, 1913. The then Senator from Nevada, now deceased, Mr. Newlands, was discussing river and harbor bills, and the imperfect, inefficient, and wasteful system which had been employed by the Government in providing for the improvement of rivers and harbors. He was denouncing the policy of the Government, and that policy is the existing policy. Notwithstanding the criticisms of the Senator from Nevada, than whom there was no greater authority upon rivers and harbors and internal improvements in the United States, as well as the criticisms of Senator Burton, of Ohio, and other able men of the United States, including Mr. Roosevelt when President, Congress refused to adopt any reform and perpetuated the system which has been condemned by all persons who have intelligently and rationally and patriotically considered the subject of the development of water transportation and the improvement of rivers and harbors.

But let me recur to what was said by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. There was a colloquy between the Senators from Minnesota and Nevada, and the Senator from Nevada then propounded a question to the Senator from Minnesota, who responded as follows:

Mr. President, in answer to the kindly question of the Senator from Nevada, I beg leave to say that in a general way the Senator has expressed my sentiments. I have come to the conclusion that we could do much better work and should squander—

Mark the word "squander"—the Senator's words were a condemnation of the system—

less money if we appropriated a gross sum and placed it in charge of a board of five or seven competent Army engineers with power to determine what improvements should be made, and where, in our rivers and harbors.

Proceeding, the Senator said:

While a great many of the improvements we are making are fully justified in the interests of navigation, yet my observation has led me to believe that in a great many instances we really squander money. It is wasted on improvements that never ought to have been made, but what can we do? Representatives and Senators are clamorous; they introduce their bills, and it is utterly impossible to resist them.

What an indictment of the present policy of the Government in dealing with its waterways! And yet we blindly follow it; it finds expression in the present bill before us. No Senator, so far as I remember, has during this debate demanded a change in the manner of dealing with rivers and harbors. All seem satisfied, or at least no improved plan is presented for our acceptance or rejection. I should add, though, that the chairman of the committee has indicated a purpose to strike down in the future some of the obnoxious features of the present plan.

In a humorous way, let me inquire at this point, having in mind the statement which I have just read "that Senators and Representatives are clamorous at the introduction of bills and it is utterly impossible to resist them": How is it possible for us to "resist" the amendment just offered by the Senator from Minnesota, whom we all love and esteem? What can we do when he asks that a survey be made? What can the chairman of the committee do when the great Senator from Minnesota asks for an appropriation for a survey? The chairman of the committee does not resist the request and no other Senator has offered objection. Under the existing system perhaps an objection would be improper. The plan contemplates that Senators and Represen-

tatives shall, when the rivers and harbors bills are before the Senate for consideration, request that surveys or projects be made with a view to having the projects adopted as governmental undertakings. The residents of the various communities quickly learn that the mere asking for a survey of some creek or stream or lake will bring the needed legislation, and they, of course, will importune Senators and Representatives to take affirmative action. Individuals living upon some little stream unquestionably might be benefited by the expenditure of several thousands of dollars in cleaning its bed and in repairing its banks. If the Government will assume control of the stream and keep it in repair and maintain its banks it will perhaps bring some local advantage and will result in placing in circulation in the section where the improvement is made thousands and tens of thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of the public treasure.

The Senator proceeded:

I think it would require almost supreme power to infuse a new spirit into Representatives and Senators, as well as into the American people, to bring about a reform.

I think the work should first be started through our great newspapers and the magazines, from the pulpit, and along educational lines to infuse people with a new spirit, with less of the spirit of Mammon, so that we would all come to look upon this question just as we would if it were our own business.

Mr. President, the Senator understood the Herculean task in securing a reform of the abuses attending river and harbor appropriations. It will require "almost supreme power" to "bring about a reform." But let me urge the Senator to join in the effort to secure a reform. Now is the time to begin. Now is the time to practice economy and to introduce greater efficiency in administrative methods. From every quarter demands are being made for appropriations from the Federal Treasury. We should possess sufficient courage to resist such demands and there should be enough wisdom to effectuate changes in existing laws and policies that will result in economies and conduce to the general welfare.

Following the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Senator Newlands continued:

I call attention to the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, who has long served upon the Commerce Committee of the Senate, who has had a large experience in the development of our rivers, who has served on committees that have made investigations of the Mississippi, the Missouri, and other rivers, and whose experience has probably been as large as that of any Member of this body. He testifies to the ineffectiveness of the present system, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Burton] has also testified to it. * * * He said there has been lack of care in the selection of projects and lack of care in methods. He speaks of the ineffectiveness of expenditures already made, but he also speaks of the experimental side of this question as if we had to go through a further period of experiment before we could agree upon an effective system.

In this connection let me read just a word from Senator Burton. In 1913 he said:

For years we have been struggling under a vicious system of river and harbor improvements. For instance, the river and harbor bill of 1910 contained items favoring 296 out of the 391 congressional districts. This bill was a masterpiece of geographical distribution and a striking tribute to the cohesive power of legislative logrolling.

I would have some fear of a rebuke were I to employ language so cutting and so condemnatory of Congress. It might be denominated unparliamentary. But having come from a former distinguished Senator, one who has been in public life for many years and has served in the House as chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and also upon the Commerce Committee of the Senate, I feel that I am warranted in calling attention to this language, strong and denunciatory though it be. He also said:

There are two ways of framing a river and harbor bill. The popular method of drawing a bill is to make such concessions to all the different States and localities that you will have an overwhelming support for the measure. The other method, and the right one, is to select those projects which would benefit the whole country and then finish them with promptness. The first method is irresistible. It will win every time—consult the wishes of the varied localities and projects of the country and they will all join together and pass a bill.

Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that I had examined thousands of pages of testimony relating to projects for which appropriations had been asked and obtained at the hands of Congress. I affirm again, as I have stated upon the floor of the Senate upon former occasions, that 50 per cent—and I think more—of the billion dollars which we have appropriated for rivers and harbors has been wasted. I think the criticism of the able Senator from Minnesota, that our system has been wasteful and inefficient, has been justified and warranted by the facts and by the records which have been presented to Congress and have been given to the public. Yet we are perpetuating the system. The experiences of the past, disappointing and nauseating though they have proven to be, fail to rouse us from our lethargy or stimulate us to higher resolves.

We listen to the criticisms of those who have studied the question in a scientific way. We obtain suggestions from them, and then we promptly pigeonhole their recommendations and proceed in the old, archaic, obsolete, destructive, wasteful, and extravagant way. Efforts have been made, Mr. President, to secure a system under which a competent board would function with full authority and power to select streams and projects for improvement, and to determine where the appropriations made by Congress shall be expended. Under this plan Congress would make an appropriation annually or whenever in its judgment it should be made, and the board or commission of scientific and trained men would expend the same at such places as in their judgment the needs of commerce demanded.

Mr. President, I submit that a perusal of the records, an examination of the little ditches and streams and rivulets that have received large appropriations at the hands of Congress, will fill with resentment and indignation any honest investigator. He will rise from a perusal of the record with an overwhelming conviction, an ineradicable one, that we have pursued a wasteful and vicious policy and have squandered between four and six hundred million dollars in so-called rivers and harbors improvements.

Of course, we all agree that the harbors of our country should receive adequate appropriations for their development. I think that it has been a mistaken policy that has led to the development of some of the harbors upon the Atlantic coast to the exclusion of harbors upon the Gulf coast. There is no reason why we should not have developed export centers in New Orleans and other points along the Gulf coast, but our railroad development and our appropriations have been all in the line of concentrating trade and traffic and commerce in the harbors of New York and one or two other eastern points.

The capitalists of New York, the interests of New York, the great railroad interests of the United States, apparently have determined that they would draw all of our export and import trade into the great metropolis of New York and a few other cities upon the eastern coast. We have ignored the southern ports. We have ignored the great port of Charleston, S. C., and we have trifled with the harbors upon the Gulf and the Pacific coast. It is time that we should adopt a rational, sane, and genuinely American policy, one that will increase our trade and commerce, develop all sections of our country, and tend to cheapen rates and promote prosperity in all sections of this Republic. Improvements must not be sectional. The welfare of all the people must be considered and a broad, liberal, and businesslike plan of procedure must be adopted and consistently followed.

I believe that the great waterways of our country should be improved and be made available for carrying the commerce of our country. The harbors upon our coasts should receive attention and rendered suitable for the ships that seek our shores. But I am opposed to this piecemeal, inefficient, wasteful, extravagant, vicious system of dealing with the great question of rivers and harbors improvements that has been followed by the American Congress for so many years.

I repeat that an examination of the records will show that a majority of the projects upon which appropriations have been expended ought never to have been surveyed and ought never to have received a dollar of appropriation. There are streams by the scores, if not by the hundreds, that never have borne commerce and never will be required for commercial uses. The reports furnish evidence of streams which have received large appropriations which carry but a few tons annually, some of them 20 tons, some of them 100 tons, and others a thousand tons or a few thousand tons.

One river, as I recall it, had an appropriation of more than $3,000,000; and yet, after years of development, the commerce upon that river for a given year was only 800 tons, and most of that consisted of underbrush and logs and waste timber.

I may say, in passing, that a majority of the streams for which appropriations have been made carry that sort of trade and commerce. Many are little creeks that have to be snagged out every year, streams so small that a few months will fill them with moss and underbrush. Some of the streams are so insignificant and unimportant that they are dry during a portion of the year; and yet they are "rivers, great arteries of commerce," demanding and receiving large sums from the Treasury of the United States.

Soberly and solemnly we declare that these little streams are necessary for the welfare of the people; that they are important in developing the commerce of the country. It is so ludicrous as to provoke laughter, if it were not for the serious aspect resulting from the waste of public money.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has just stated that a survey only is asked for and that there is no obligation to make an appropriation. Mr. President, the survey necessitates the expenditure of money. It calls for the serv-

ices of a corps of engineers and their assistants. No survey can be made without the expenditure of money, and these surveys must be paid for by the Government of the United States. Why should not the States or communities, which feel that they have a project that is worthy of consideration, make the survey themselves, ascertain the facts, prepare a brief in respect to the merits of the project, submit scientific and technical information bearing upon the project, its necessity, its cost, the engineering difficulties, and problems to be encountered in the execution of the scheme or project, and present the entire matter to the committee or to some official or board of the Government?

If that step were taken hundreds of these unworthy projects would not be knocking here at the doors of Congress. But as long as the people know that they can have an investigation made at the hands of the Government by merely having their Senator or their Representative make the request for a survey, when they know that that will be done and their demand will be acceded to, of course, they will not undertake the work or make contribution thereto; they will insist that it is a national matter, one which the Federal Government should alone undertake.

Uncle Sam is regarded as the Atlas of the people, and he must, upon his bowed shoulders, carry all individual burdens, community responsibilities, and the obligations of the States. The feeling is that there need be no further initiative, no local or State pride, no community spirit. The spirit is that Congress should be appealed to upon all matters, that the Federal Government should open its Treasury and pour out the money wrung by taxation from the people to aid in all sorts of private schemes and ventures and experiments.

Mr. President, every faddist and doctrinaire, every selfish and unscrupulous individual who thinks that he can work the Government, comes here and demands that committees recommend and that Congress make appropriations or exercise the power of the Federal Government to aid in the consummation of the plan or scheme or fantastic idea suggested. Be it said to the discredit of our Government and by way of criticism of public officials that too often these wild and fantastic demands are acceded to. The record of appropriations for rivers and harbors shows that Congress has acceded to unrighteous and visionary and unpatriotic demands made by communities, individuals, and sections.

I repeat, why should we not ask the State or the community to make appropriations for these rivers and harbors, at least appropriations amounting to 50 per cent of the amount asked of the parent Government? If it is a great harbor, national in its operations, relating to the entire country, I can understand that in a case of that kind the local community might perhaps be immune from contribution and no exaction should be made of it; but where a little stream is brought to the attention of Congress and an appropriation is asked for it, a stream which is local in character, the benefits of which are local, provincial, limited to the people who live along its banks or in close proximity to it, there is no reason in the world why the Federal Government should be called upon to bear the burden of developing that stream if it is to be developed at all.

I have been unable to comprehend the logic of those who justify appropriations for little streams, local in character, and yet deny an appropriation to build a highway into a farming community to aid the farmers in transporting their products to the markets. If I happen to live upon a little stream 50 or 100 miles in length, and other people reside upon its banks, why should the Government maintain that stream in a condition of repair to float down the products of my farm and the products of the farms abutting upon the stream and refuse to aid in constructing highways or other means of transportation for the purpose of carrying the products of other farms that may be farther inland? If it is the duty of the Federal Government to transport the products of every individual to market, then there can be no discrimination or distinction between individuals who reside upon little creeks and individuals who may reside some distance in the interior and remote from water connection.

But the idea seems to prevail, under the vicious system which controls us and binds us, that any little creek, no matter how few reside upon it or in its vicinity, regardless of whether it is or can become interstate in character, should be the subject of cognizance by the Federal Government and the object of appropriation through the Rivers and Harbors Committee. The policy is wrong.

Mr. President, many of the American people, and all who fully investigate, will be against the present method of appropriation for rivers and harbors, against this indiscriminate assault upon the Treasury for these little creeks and streams, as long as the present method is adhered to. When we create a scientific body of technical, impartial men, men of standing and ability in the community, men who have the confidence of all parts of the country, and commit to them the making of surveys of the streams and the harbors that should be the subjects of development by the Federal Government, and commit to them the expenditure of whatever sums Congress feels the Government can afford to appropriate annually, and permit them, unhampered and unembarrassed by local influences, to make the selections and to expend the appropriations made, then the American people will be satisfied with river and harbor legislation, and with the conduct of Congress and the appropriations which shall be made.

After the pending amendment is disposed of I shall offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill. It is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of its provisions, because I realize that nothing which I can say will prevent the passage of the pending measure or modify or change the old discredited and indefensible system followed in dealing with rivers and harbors. Upon a number of occasions during the past three years I have called attention to the extravagant and, indeed, vicious policy which has been fastened upon the Government in dealing with appropriations for rivers and harbors. I discussed the question somewhat extensively on the 17th of February, 1919, when a similar measure to that now before us was under consideration. I insisted then, as I insist now, that there should be a radical change in the policy of the Government with respect to appropriations for rivers and harbors. I offered upon that occasion a substitute for the measure that was then before the Senate. It was in harmony with the recommendations of Senator Newlands and President Roosevelt, former Senator Burton, and the National Waterways Commission, which, under authority from Congress, had studied the question and submitted their report for the enlightenment of Congress and the country. The substitute which I offered then is as applicable now as it was upon that occasion, and with slight modifications I shall submit it within a few moments for the action of the Senate.

While I have the floor let me submit a few observations in explanation of the substitute. The pending bill as it came from the House called for $12,000,000 to be expended for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, to be expended for various projects under the direction of the Engineers of the War Department. The substitute calls for $12,000,000, to be immediately available, and to be expended under the direction of the Waterways Commission created by the act of Congress approved August 8, 1917. Senators will recall that the act referred to was sometimes called the Newlands Act. It created a Waterways Commission consisting of seven members, to be appointed by the President, at least one of whom was to be chosen from the active list of the Engineer Corps of the Army, at least one to be a hydraulic engineer from civil life, and the others to be selected either from civil life or public service. The act further provided that this commission should act under such rules and regulations as the President might prescribe and subject to the approval of the heads of the several executive departments concerned.

The duty of the commission was to bring into coordination and cooperation the engineering, scientific, and constructive bureaus, boards, and commissions of the several departments of the United States, as well as commissions created by Congress that relate to the study, development, or control of waterways and water resources and subjects related thereto, and to the development and regulation of interstate and foreign commerce, with a view to uniting such services in investigating, with respect to all watersheds in the United States, questions relating to the development, improvement, regulation, and control of navigation as a part of interstate and foreign commerce, including therein the related questions of irrigation, drainage, forestry, arid and swamp land reclamation, clarification of streams, regulation of flow, control of floods, utilization of water power, prevention of soil erosion and waste, storage, and conservation of water for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other purposes. The commission was further charged with the duty of submitting a comprehensive plan for the development of waterways and the water resources of the United States, and was to make recommendations or modifications for the dismissal of any projects adopted theretofore or thereafter.

It will be observed that the scope of the labors of this commission were very broad. It was believed that there would be selected men of the highest engineering and technical skill; men whose character and standing would commend them to the confidence of the people. Such a commission could safely be intrusted with the expenditure of such sums as Congress might from time to time appropriate for the improvement of rivers and harbors of our country. As I have stated, recommendations had repeatedly been made by those who had given the subject earnest consideration that a commission or board of scientific

and competent persons should be created and charged with the responsibility of making surveys and selecting such rivers and harbors as were necessary for the commerce of the country, and of expending upon the projects so selected the appropriations made by Congress. It is obvious that any plan that would commit to a commission of trained and competent persons the selection of projects for improvement and development and the completion of the same, uninfluenced by local or provincial considerations or local influences, would be a decided improvement over the present and past method of providing for the improvement of waterways and harbors.

A moment ago I read from a speech delivered by former Senator Burton in which he pointedly called attention to the present vicious system of selecting projects for Government development. He emphasized the fact that the "log-rolling" method had been the one adopted. We are all familiar with the methods by which millions of dollars have been drawn from the Public Treasury to erect public buildings in villages and towns of limited population. No one can defend the pork-barrel method under which appropriations have been obtained for rivers and harbors. No one can defend expenditures of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars upon so-called waterways in the United States. Of course, many projects were worthy. There are some waterways which should have been improved and upon which the expenditures were entirely proper. It is imperative that adequate harbors be provided for the commercial needs of our country. There will be no criticism of appropriations for the improvement of our harbors and inland rivers which will serve the people and conduce to their commercial and industrial prosperity. But as long as the present method is followed there will be resentment upon the part of millions of the American people and condemnation of the millions which will be called for and the greater part of which will be wasted.

The Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Washington have stated that engineers passed upon the various projects referred to them by Congress, and that only a small percentage of the number of surveys authorized were finally adopted and received Federal appropriations. My recollection is that the number of projects which the engineers recommended exceeds the per cent suggested by the chairman of the committee. Whether that be true or not, the evidence is conclusive that a large proportion of the projects which do receive the approval of the engineering branches of the Government are wholly unworthy.

If I had time I could give to the Senate the names of scores and, indeed, hundreds of creeks and pools and streams and swamps and bayous upon which millions have been spent and which never have been and never will be of any benefit to the commerce of our country. The reports and records dealing with the subject under consideration are replete with illustrations of the methods employed in securing the approval of projects which call for millions and tens of millions of dollars and the construction of which can not be defended in any court of morals in the land. The present system makes for wastefulness and extravagance and is an invitation to localities to improperly extract money from the Public Treasury.

As long as the present system is perpetuated, under which waterway projects are approved, there will be waste and extravagance and inefficiency and the basis for charges of wrongdoing and misconduct, favoritism, and discrimination upon the part of the Government and its officials. Selfishness and human nature have cut a very important figure in the selection of projects in the past and in the huge appropriations made in behalf of many of the number. Streams that are purely local and upon which there never was and never will be any commerce carried have received immense sums for their development. Canals such as Hennepin, upon which $8,000,000 were expended, as well as other projects equally as bad, will be selected and developed and millions expended thereon if we adhere to the present condemned and improper system.

We have expended upon our internal waterways and harbors more than a billion of dollars. There is no question but what the commerce carried upon the waterways of our country is far less than it was many years ago. It would appear as though the commerce carried by our waterways decreased in proportion as the expenditures increased. I think I am within the bounds of truth in stating that there was more commerce carried upon the Mississippi River 50 years ago than at the present time.

Appropriations of a hundred millions of dollars have been expended for the improvement of the Mississippi River and yet its importance for commercial purposes has steadily declined. Writers who have investigated the appropriations made by the Government for our waterways have been filled with amazement upon examining projects for which appropriations have been made. They have not hesitated to charge that intrigues and misrepresentations and local and selfish interests have been instrumental in securing appropriations. It would seem that in the light of all the facts and the unimpeachable record that we have before us a reform would be inaugurated and a rational and scientific policy or system would be adopted for the improvement of our harbors and inland waterways. The time has come for the exercise in governmental affairs of the highest principles of morality and justice and sound business expediency. Too many of the public and too many of the public officials have been indifferent to the questions of efficiency and economy in public affairs. Local interests and local demands have too often influenced those who have had to do with governmental affairs. It is regrettable but it is nevertheless true that the American people have not learned the art of efficiency and economy in municipal or State or Federal affairs.

Persons of the highest integrity and morality have often, when they have been called upon to deal with public funds and public questions, applied a different rule from that which governed their conduct in their business dealings and relations with their fellow men. I have sometimes thought that public morality and public honesty and integrity were not as acute and as highly developed as that which found expression in the private dealings and relations between individuals.

What right have Congressmen or Senators to ask for appropriations for the improvement of some little creek or stream which never can be of importance as a carrier of commerce? A growing demand upon the Public Treasury calls for radical reforms in legislative action as well as in executive and ministerial conduct. The extravagance and inefficiency and wretched bungling and indefensible administration of public affairs have constituted an evil example for the people and have established precedents that are dangerous and destructive. I appeal to Senators to join in overturning the discredited and vicious system relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors which has fastened itself upon our Government.

I have suggested a broad and comprehensive plan which should be adopted for the improvement of the harbors and waterways of our country. In the execution of this plan the work should not be conducted in piecemeal fashion. Whenever any project has been approved it should be speedily completed and sufficient appropriation should be made for its completion. The policy which we have been pursuing, as I have stated, has been criminal and wasteful. Scores, if not hundreds, of projects were being contemporaneously developed. It is impossible with the machinery of the Government and the appropriations made to expeditiously complete all that were being developed. As a result we find even in projects upon which expenditures have been made for a long period of years that they are still incomplete. Much of the money expended has been wasted. The character of the project was such as to inevitably result in waste if the work were not speedily completed. Under the plan which I have suggested the board or commission would have full authority to complete the project. Indeed, it would be their duty to do so in the most expeditious manner.

The expenditure of the funds appropriated from time to time would be under their direction and they would have full authority, and it would be their duty to employ the same in order that projects commenced should not be carried along for indefinite periods in a haphazard, incompleted condition. As I have stated, we have expended nearly a hundred million of dollars in improving the Mississippi system. The improvements made extend over many years. If a comprehensive and scientific plan for the improvement of rivers and harbors had been adopted and the work for the execution of the plan prosecuted without interruption and in an expeditious manner millions of dollars would have been saved and lasting and permanent and valuable improvements would have been made, and the rivers as channels and instrumentalities for commerce would have measured up to the requirements and demands of the people of our country. The most vicious feature of the present system is that which calls for the appropriation for a small amount of work and dribbling expenditures upon a multitude of projects. Years elapse before they are completed, and indeed the work proceeds so slowly that the destructive processes countervail the expenditures and improvements made. If private enterprise were conducted along lines followed by the Government bankruptcy and ruin would attend the promoters of the same. It seems impossible to introduce sane and rational business methods into public affairs. Even where the personnel changes slightly and where civil service holds sway the same waste and extravagance and inefficiency rule.

Mr. President, most of the projects taken over by the Government possess peculiar local features and should be regarded in part as local enterprises. Projects of this kind should not be

constructed by the Federal Government alone. The States and communities to be benefited should make contribution. They should cooperate with the Federal Government in the development of the streams and waterways which in a peculiar and definite way are beneficial to them. This bill should be so amended as to require the local communities and States receiving special and peculiar advantages to aid in the improvement for which appropriations are carried. It is manifest that rivers like the Mississippi are to be distinguished from little streams that can scarcely be said to be interstate in character. There are scores of streams, many of them called rivers, which are but a few miles in length and which are used, if used at all, only by but a few persons who live upon the banks of the streams or in close proximity thereto. Of course, as I have insisted, most of the streams of this character ought not to be taken over by the Federal Government nor should appropriations be made thereon by Congress for their development, but if Congress shall go to such extreme lengths in expending the public funds upon these local waterways, then the States or local communities should be required to make contribution of at least 50 per cent of the cost involved in the plan of the improvement adopted.

Mr. President, the substitute which I shall offer strikes at the foundation of the discredited system under which we are now operating. I regret that the Senate evinces no enthusiasm for it or for any change in the plan for dealing with the harbors and waterways of our country, but I make the prediction that we shall soon be compelled to abandon the wasteful and unscientific and absurd policy which has cost our country hundreds of millions of dollars, and to adopt a broad, comprehensive, and rational system, one that will be adequate for the needs of the people and consistent with wise and statesmanlike policies.

I had hoped that the Republican Party when it came into power would profit by the mistakes of the party with which I am identified, and that they, with broader vision than that which we possessed, would submit a plan which would meet the needs of the hour and rise to the dignity of a rational American plan. I had such confidence in the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]—a man of the highest patriotism; a man who deserves well of his State and of the country because of his ability and devotion to duty—I had hoped that he, knowing the weakness of the old system, its imperfections—indeed, its viciousness—would present a plan that would remedy and indeed fully meet the requirements of the hour.

Mr. JONES of Washington rose.

Mr. KING. Let me complete the sentence. I grant that the bill which the Senator has reported has the germs of improvement, and I believe that those germs will fructify and bear fruit; but the Senator ought to have evolved a perfected system along the lines of recommendation so frequently made in the past, along the lines pointed out by Mr. Roosevelt, and by the commission which was appointed to investigate this subject, in the elaborate report found in Senate document, volume 15. I am sure if the Senator had presented a system along those lines and urged it with the ability and sincerity which characterize him in all things, he would have commanded a majority of the votes upon both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me just a word——

Mr. KING. I yield. I have concluded.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will merely take a moment.

I appreciate very much the kind words of the Senator from Utah, although I do not feel that they are entirely deserved. I simply wish to say that this bill is framed merely and solely for the purpose of carrying on works which are already under way; works that have been adopted by Congress and have been begun under appropriations heretofore made by Congress. Whether the action in these cases was wise or not it is not for me to say; but the work is under way, and the question is, which is the wisest course to follow—to let the work go down or to carry it on?

There is not any pork in this bill; no man can claim that there is. There is not a single new project in the bill. As I have said, it is simply to carry on work that has already begun and as to which the chances are that we would lose much more than we would save if we should stop our appropriations.

There is one provision in the bill of which I have been long in favor and of which many Senators on the floor have expressed themselves as being in favor. I refer to the provision that looks toward doing one of the things which the Senator from Utah has suggested, and that is to bring about the cooperation of communities, of localities, in carrying on projects and to require them to show their good faith in the project before it is undertaken by Congress. That is a very important matter, and it is one of the things which the Senator has urged.

I will state to the Senator my personal views with reference to one or two other matters, which I hope may be worked out in the next river and harbor bill, which will probably be a bill along constructive lines and not simply a bill to carry on work that is already under way. I am in accord with the principle of what the Senator has suggested. I doubt the necessity, however, of the creation of a new organization, but personally I am prepared to say that I am in favor of an appropriation by Congress of such sum as it thinks ought to be expended in the development of our rivers and harbors and the placing of that sum in the hands of the engineers of the Army, to be used in any way that they deem best and wisest for the commerce of the United States.

I believe that we shall get better results from such a system than in any other way. Of course, Congress will need to pass upon the projects that are to be taken up—that is, to pass upon the projects that we deem worthy of prosecution—and then give to the engineers sufficient money to carry on the projects that are most urgent and in the best and wisest and most economical manner, without any logrolling or anything of the sort; leaving it to their discretion and judgment from the knowledge they have as to what is the best and wisest thing to do.

I am also in favor, and have long been in favor—and I hope we may incorporate such a provision in the next rivers and harbors bill—when Congress provides for any project of any considerable size of not appropriating any money for it until we are prepared to carry it on to completion. For instance, take the Ohio River: If there is any river in this country upon which the wisdom of appropriating for the improvement of waterways can be demonstrated it ought to be the Ohio River, flowing, as it does, through a great beehive of industry and development. We ought to provide for the completion of that project and not have it dribble along from year to year, appropriating small sums of money, and in the end really doubling the cost of the improvement. As I have stated, I am in favor, when we undertake projects of that kind, of providing for their completion by the continuing-contract system, so that they may be carried on just as expeditiously as it is possible to do and get them finished. In the case of the Ohio River such a policy will demonstrate when the improvement is completed—and it can not be demonstrated before that time—the benefit of such an appropriation upon large rivers of that kind, which we hope may develop into great arteries of commerce, and which, I think, we can develop into great arteries of commerce.

Mr. President, that is all I propose to say at this time. That, in general, is what I hope to see worked out in the very near future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, several days ago, when the pending bill was being read, section 12, which, through inadvertence, had been reported as a committee amendment, was reached and an objection was made to it by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]. It developed that not a quorum of the committee was present when the amendment was passed upon, and at the request of the Senator from Ohio it was withdrawn.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator is somewhat mistaken in regard to the matter. It was not, in fact, reported as a committee amendment, but was printed as such by mistake.

Mr. SWANSON. It was, through a mistake, printed as a committee amendment, no quorum of the committee, as I understand, being present when it came up there, and it was, at the request of the Senator from Ohio, who wanted to look into the matter to see whether it was such an amendment as ought to be passed, withdrawn by the chairman of the committee. I saw the Senator from Ohio before he left the city and he advised me that he had seen the Secretary of War and that he did not wish the amendment to be delayed on account of his absence and did not care to urge any objection to its adoption.

I will state to the Senate what the amendment is. In dredging the harbor at Alexandria, Va., it became necessary for the Government to deposit the sand taken out of the bottom of the harbor on some submerged land near by, so it was deposited in Battery Cove, thereby making about 46 acres of land. The question arose as to whether the Government did not acquire the title to the made land on account of filling it in. The riparian owners insisted that the made land belonged to them, and I presume their contention is correct, because I do not think the Government can, by depositing material in front of a man's land and thus making additional land, deprive a man of his right to the land so made. When the war came on there happened to be some shipyards at Alexandria which could be enlarged and developed; and, in order to secure a plant there capable of building ships, an agreement was entered into between the Secretary of War and the shipbuilding company and the owners of the riparian rights that the title to this land—46 acres in extent—should be determined by a suit in court. That

suit is now pending. It was agreed that if the title should be determined to be in the riparian owners $70,000 should be paid to them, and that if the Government won the suit $70,000 should go to the Government.

In the meantime the land was rented. It was estimated that the land was worth $70,000, or about $1,500 an acre. The private owners agreed that that was a fair price, and the Government agreed that it was a fair price. Then the Government instituted a friendly suit to determine the title to the land, the rental in the meantime being fixed at $4,200 a year, or 6 per cent on the agreed price of the land. The Secretary of War rented it for five years. He also agreed that the shipbuilding plant should have the right to purchase it, so far as the Government was concerned, for $70,000, and the private owners, claiming the riparian rights, made a similar agreement in the event they obtained title. The shipbuilding company erected buildings on the land, but the Secretary of War had no authority to sell the land without an act of Congress. He has written a letter here asking Congress to approve that contract, and in case the Government should win the suit—which I think is a very remote probability—that the $70,000, which is held in trust, and the rental based on the $70,000, shall go to the Government, and that the shipbuilding company shall have the title to the land.

The necessity for the adoption of the amendment at this time is due to the following circumstances: The shipbuilding company expect to make this yard a private shipyard. They will soon complete the work they are doing for the Government, and they are desirous of floating a loan on this property. They erected on it under the agreement I have indicated about a million and a half dollars' worth of buildings, and they can not float the loan and develop the property unless the agreement with the Secretary of War is confirmed by the Congress. If there is any objection to it, I should like to have the letter of the Secretary of War read, although it has been read once. It states the matter clearly.

As to the Government getting a good price in case it obtains title, that is established by the report of the Army officers and by the fact that the private individuals agreed that in case their title was held superior to that of the Government they would take the amount agreed upon. It is a tripartite agreement between these parties, and under it the shipyard was constructed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Should not this matter be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. SWANSON. No; it is a question of river and harbor improvement. It is the most remarkable proposition that I ever heard of, in a way—that the Government, by improving a river and depositing sand in front of a man's land, can deprive him of getting to the water; but there is some little question about it, on account of the District of Columbia and its cession. Consequently, to make the title clear, the Government has brought a suit to obtain possession of the land, which is in the possession of these private owners, and they have made an agreement that they would abide by the result.

It is simply a question of carrying out the agreement with the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what river does this improve, or what harbor does it improve?

Mr. SWANSON. Alexandria City.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not a harbor.

Mr. SWANSON. Alexandria Harbor was improved in order to provide a certain depth, and it became necessary to deposit the sand in front of some land that jutted into the Potomac; and on that account the Government thought possibly they acquired title to that 46 acres, to the exclusion of the riparian owners.

Mr. SMOOT. It is just as clear as mud, Mr. President; and I will not make a point of order, because it would be overruled, anyhow.

Mr. SWANSON. The amendment does not propose general legislation. I do not suppose the Senator will claim that it does propose general legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no need of making a point of order against general legislation if it is going to be immediately referred to the Senate, to decide the question, because that has been done this afternoon.

Mr. SWANSON. By not listening to the discussions for about 15 or 20 minutes, Senators will sometimes destroy great enterprises. The enterprises of this country are entitled to some consideration. Here is a great shipyard, employing four or five thousand people. Its ability to continue is dependent upon this amendment. Here is the Government in good faith making an agreement with private parties during the war by which these people put their buildings on this land. Now, in order to float a loan, they simply ask that the Government shall keep faith with them. If the Senator will listen to the letter of the Secretary of War, it will not take 10 minutes to read it.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to take the time of the Senate even to listen to it, and I am not going to make the point of order upon it. I would not do so even though it were a claim upon an appropriation bill. I am not going to make any point of order. Anything can go on this bill. It does not make a particle of difference. I am not going to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. I offer as an amendment a new section to be known as section 6.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill a new section to be known as section 6, and to read as follows:

That as to the lands surveyed, investigated, and reported on in accordance with a provisions of the river and harbor act approved July 25, 1912, a full report of which is set out in House Document 1010, Sixty-second Congress, third session, wherein the Mississippi River Commission recommends that the title to said lands be acquired by the Government for use in river improvement, the owner of any of said lands may file petition in the Court of Claims, and in the adjudication thereof said court shall ascertain and determine whether the Government is equitably liable or responsible, and if so, for what proportion and to what extent for damage to or destruction of such lands as a result of the construction of levees or other improvements of said river, and render judgment therefor. In the trial of said suits, said court shall permit any party who, at any time since 1890, owned or held title to said lands or any interest therein, and who has become dispossessed thereof by reason of foreclosure proceedings, or otherwise compelled to sacrifice title thereto as a result of said injuries, to appear as a party claimant by filing petition therein setting up their former interest therein, and said court shall consider the claims of all of said parties and render judgment for whatever amount said court considers equitably or justly due the respective parties, but in no case shall any judgment exceed the proportion fixed by said court, and the payment of such judgment shall thereafter release the United States from further liability for any damage to said lands as a result of constructing improvements along or adjacent to said river.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I feel that I must make the point of order against that amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Washington that I offered the other day the amendment known as the Williams amendment that was adopted by the Senate and placed on the river and harbor bill at the last session. That amendment sent these claims to the Court of Claims for adjudication. Objection was raised by the Senator from Washington that the court in that instance would not pass upon the question whether or not these people had a just claim, and he did not think it went far enough. I have modified the amendment so that I thought it might meet the objection raised by the Senator from Washington, and the Senator will note from reading it that the amendment I now propose says:

And in the adjudication thereof, said court shall ascertain and determine whether the Government is equitably liable or responsible—

That was not in the other amendment at all. The other amendment just assumed that the Government was liable, and we assumed that because there has been commission after commission, and the Army Engineers time and again since 1894 have held that the Government should do something for these people who have been aggrieved.

This amendment goes further:

Said court shall ascertain and determine whether the Government is equitably liable or responsible, and, if so, for what proportion and to what extent.

It does not even say that the Government shall be liable for the whole amount, but that the court may decide for what proportion and to what extent—

for damage to or destruction of such lands as a result of the construction of levees or other improvements of said river, and render judgment therefor.

May I say to the Senator from Washington, also, that here is a report that the Senator has before him, the report of the Mississippi River Commission. I want to read just a part of it:

The attention of Congress has been called in former reports, beginning as far back as 1894, to the situation of the narrow and irregular strip of land lying between the Mississippi River and the highlands east of it between Vicksburg and Baton Rouge, a distance of 234 miles by the river.

Then, farther down, it says:

The case is manifestly one for legislative rather than judicial treatment. Relief in some form ought in justice to come from Congress and the State legislature in cooperation. But such cooperation would be so difficult to attain that it is hardly worth the thought.

They are talking about getting some cooperation from the States.

Meanwhile the litigation drags its slow length along, the lives of the landowners are passing away, and hope deferred is making their hearts sick.

Even a cold-blooded Army engineer makes such a statement as that.

The situation is pathetic and distressing in the highest degree. That these people should be condemned to perpetual inundation without possibility of relief or redress for the sake of an improvement from which their fellow citizens are enjoying great benefits is intolerable to any man's sense of justice.

And then follows their recommendation.

I want also to call to the Senator's attention the fact that this is not the first time this has been done; but, as the Senator knows—and I have here the debates in that case, known as the Fox River proposition, up in Wisconsin—the Congress took care of the people who were hurt by virtue of the overflow of the river.

This matter has been investigated so much, and the reports have all been unanimous about it. It does not take any money out of the Treasury of the United States. It allows the matter to go to the Court of Claims, and have it say whether or not these people have any equities; and I hope the Senator will not make a point of order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the only thing about this that is really embarrassing to me is the embarrassing situation to the Senator from Mississippi. I remember that his colleague [Mr. WILLIAMS] had substantially this amendment—at least, as he introduced it the other day—placed upon the river and harbor bill some little time ago. There was not any point of order made. There was not any special discussion. It went on in the Senate. Of course, it did not stay on the bill in conference.

I know that the Senator has given a great deal of attention to this matter, and that he has put forth every effort that a Senator could put forth to have this measure incorporated in this bill; but it involves so much that I do not feel that it should go on this bill, especially on the floor of the Senate. The whole proposition ought to be considered by a committee. It may involve the United States in an appropriation or an expenditure of several millions of dollars. The engineers, in their report, state that it would probably be something over $6,000,000, estimating the amount at $10 an acre.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Government should purchase it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; if the Government were to purchase it. Under those circumstances, I feel that it would be justice to the Senator for me to make the point of order against it. He has done everything he could do, so far as that is concerned. So I make the point of order that it is not only legislation upon an appropriation bill, but that it is in the nature of a claim that has not been estimated for and has not been recommended by any standing committee.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am quite sure that the point of order is well taken. I had hoped, however, that the Senator would not make it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and move its adoption as a substitute for the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed, as a substitute, to insert the following:

That the sum $12,000,000 be, and is hereby, appropriated for the fiscal year 1921, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available, to be expended under the direction of the Waterways Commission created by the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 8, 1917, for necessary and proper construction, completion, repair, preservation, and maintenance of harbors, river channels, canals, embankments, levees, wharves, and water terminals within the United States, its Territories and possessions.

SEC. 2. That the floating plant, consisting of dredges, barges, towboats, snagboats, and all other equipment under the control of the Mississippi River Commission and of the Chief of Engineers of the Army, is hereby placed within the control, use, and possession of said Waterways Commission to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. That the Mississippi River Commission created by the act approved June 28, 1879, and the Board of Engineers created by section 3 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1902, shall be abolished and terminated at the end of the present fiscal year, and that after the 30th day of June, 1919, said Waterways Commission shall become invested with all the powers and duties presently exercised by the Chief of Engineers of the Army, the Mississippi River Commission, and said Board of Engineers with respect to the maintenance and improvement of the harbors and waterways within the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. REED. I move that the figures "$24,000,000" be stricken from the bill, and in lieu thereof that the figures "$27,000,000" be inserted.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, Mr. President, I shall desire to have a yea and nay vote on that amendment. I hope the Senator will not insist upon the amendment. The Senate has already voted on the proposition in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator say to me that he believes it impossible to put it through Congress?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Absolutely.

Mr. REED. In view of that statement I will not insist on the amendment. I simply desire to say that I regard $24,000,000 as inadequate, but I am not going to insist upon the amendment, although I believe enough votes could possibly be mustered to pass it. I am not going to insist upon it, because if the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, who is to be chairman of the Senate branch of the conferees, is of the opinion that it can not be accomplished, I see nothing to be gained by putting the item in. I am particularly constrained to take this view because I fear that the chairman of the committee would not very vigorously contend for $27,000,000 if we got it in the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator that if the Senate should put it in I would contend strongly for it, and I would be perfectly willing, as far as I am concerned, to have those who have advocated the proposition go on the conference. But I really think we will get even more favorable results out of the conference by an appropriation of $24,000,000 than we would get with one of $27,000,000.

Mr. REED. I will not insist on the amendment. I feel that the sum allowed is inadequate, and I have expressed myself on that subject; but $24,000,000 is so much better than the amount carried in the bill as it came from the House that possibly it is the best we can do at this time.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I call up House bill 13677, making appropriations to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for the Federal control of transportation systems, and so forth.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13677.) making appropriations to supply a deficiency in appropriations for the Federal control of transportation systems, and to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE NICHOLS OF MICHIGAN.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. CHARLES A. NICHOLS, late a Representative from the State of Michigan, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolutions of the House of Representatives, which were read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 26, 1920.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHARLES A. NICHOLS, a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I offer the following resolutions and ask for their adoption.

The resolutions (S. Res. 353) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES A. NICHOLS, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed by the House of Representatives to take order for the superintending of the funeral of Mr. NICHOLS at Detroit, Mich.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Under the second resolution, Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. NEWBERRY, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. KEYES were appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 27, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.