Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KING. I will yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. I was going to ask unanimous consent to call up a bill.

Mr. KING. I think I shall have to object. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 2, 1920, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *June 1, 1920.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Father of light and life, justice and mercy, love and purity, let Thy spirit, we beseech Thee, possess our souls, to guide us in the closing days of the first regular session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, that, with patience, urbanity, efficiency, these Thy servants may discharge the duties devolving upon them to the good of the common weal. In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 370. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," approved May 31, 1920.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 6222) to remove a certain tract or lots of land in Cristobal, Canal Zone, from the operation and effect of the Executive order of the President of December 5, 1912, pursuant to the act of Congress of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., ch. 390, p. 565), in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on May 31, 1920, approved and signed bill of the following title:

H. R. 12272. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

RIGHT TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is an extension of remarks by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER] on the adjusted pay for service men. The House so far has refused to give to anyone leave to extend remarks on that subject, but I presume the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER] left the city under the impression that general leave would be given. For that reason I shall not at this time move to correct the RECORD, but I expect to endeavor to get into communication with the gentleman from North Dakota with a view to having the RECORD corrected; and I want to say now——

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. In just a moment. I want to say now that Members ought not to extend their remarks when specific objection has been made.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SINNOTT. In justice to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER], I wish to state that I had a talk with him the other day and he informed me that he intended to extend under leave given him some time ago. As he is not present, I wish to make that statement.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state that not so very long ago I heard the gentleman from North Dakota ask leave to extend his remarks, and leave was granted. I remember that distinctly, because I told him afterwards that I did not object on account of a certain matter.

Mr. BLACK. I do not wish to do the gentleman from North Dakota any injustice, and if these gentlemen remember the facts correctly, of course I gladly stand corrected. I was assuming that the gentleman from North Dakota had extended his remarks after the speech that he made Saturday afternoon on the bill then before the House, and that was what I called attention to.

Mr. SINNOTT. The gentleman from North Dakota casually mentioned the matter to me.

Mr. BLACK. I am glad the gentleman has made that statement.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman will notice that this extension is of a speech delivered in the House on Saturday, May 29. It could not as a matter of right be printed as of that date under a prior leave given.

Mr. BLACK. I think the gentleman from Illinois is correct as to his statement of the rules of the House.

Mr. BEE. May I ask the gentleman from Texas also whether he thinks the word "applause" at the close of the speech should be stricken from the RECORD. I doubt if there was any applause.

Mr. BLACK. Without taking the time of the House any further, I will look into the matter and later bring it to the attention of the House.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be in accord with the proprieties for gentlemen who obtained general leave prior to consideration of the bonus bill to extend their remarks now on that bill. There is objection to it. There is determined objection that there shall not be unanimous consent for the extension of remarks upon the bonus bill. It would be unfair to Members of the House who desire to extend their remarks upon that bill for those who heretofore have obtained general leave to utilize that leave and extend upon a subject that was not then before the House, and had not been considered.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman will readily see that, whether they extend or not, they can not extend under date of last Saturday.

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly not. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in view of the known opposition to the extension of remarks upon this subject, I think that gentlemen hereafter who ask permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD should make it perfectly clear that they are not seeking, either directly or indirectly, to print remarks on the bonus bill. I am not accustomed to making objections to gentlemen extending their remarks. Very few times have I ever done so; but I do intend to object, and I wish I could now make an objection which would remain throughout the rest of this session to any extension of remarks upon that bonus bill. I intend to object to that, and a number of other gentlemen do; and, in order to avoid any embarrassment of having to inquire of gentlemen what they desire to extend upon, I wish to say that I hope Members who ask consent to extend their remarks will state on what subject they propose to extend them, and will distinctly understand that if they do extend upon this bonus bill, directly or indirectly, without specific authority, they will subject themselves to the proposition of a motion to strike their remarks from the RECORD.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a moment?

Mr. BLACK. If I have the floor, yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want to suggest that this matter of extension seems to give rise to abuse unless there is constant objection made. Within a few days I have noticed an extension in the RECORD of a purely personal political document by a Member of this House. Owing to his absence, I will not mention his name, but it is a purely political document, that never should have any place in the RECORD. I investigated the RECORD of the date assigned to that document and I was unable to find under that date any permission given the gentleman to extend for any purpose. Now, it would seem to me that at least the House has the right to have a date assigned that will enable us to verify the leave given. In the case I have in mind I have not been able to find that any leave was given. The insertion was a gross abuse of the privileges of the House.

Mr. BLACK. I agree with the gentleman that Members ought to get specific leave before they take the liberty of extending.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to suggest that the Chair thinks whenever a Member extends remarks he should extend them as of the date when the permission was granted.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 370) to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," approved May 31, 1920.

Resolved, etc., That the provision of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," approved May 31, 1920, which reads as follows: "That hereafter each lot of cotton classified as tenderable in whole or in part on a section 5 contract of said act as amended shall give to the buyer the right to demand that one-half of the contract shall be delivered in the official cotton standard grades of the United States from the grades of middling fair, strict good middling, good middling, strict middling, and middling, and that the seller shall have the option of delivering the other half of said contract from any of the official cotton standard grades as established in said act," be, and the same is, hereby repealed.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution has reference to the so-called Comer amendment. Through some oversight or error in enrolling the bill, that amendment was included in the bill as it was signed by the Speaker and the Vice President and approved by the President. As will be recalled, the Senate receded from its disagreement on their amendment to the bill. As I have stated, through some oversight or error in the enrollment of the bill, this Comer amendment was included, when it had no place there. This joint resolution is offered simply to repeal that part of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the conference report on the bill H. R. 13108, the naval appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up the conference report on the naval appropriation bill and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13108) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 7, 8, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27, 29, 35, 36, 55, 56, 57, 58, 68, 69, 72, 74, 75, 77, 81, 86, 88, 91, 92, 93, 100, 102, 103, 104.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 34, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 70, 71, 73, 76, 79, 83, 84, 89, 90, 94, 96, 97, 98, 101, 105, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the first line of said amendment strike out the figures "$50,000" and reinsert in lieu thereof the following: "$30,000"; and, in the fourteenth line of said amendment, after the word "oil," occurring in the phrase "and those from all royalty oil," insert the following: "from lands in the naval reserves"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$3,883,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$4,962,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"The Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, is hereby directed to furnish to the proper officers in the several States, Territories, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia of the United States, on or before June 30, 1921, statements of the services of all persons from those several places who served in the Navy during the War with Germany, and for that purpose a sum not to exceed $200,000 is hereby appropriated for obtaining the necessary material and the employment of the necessary clerical force, and the further sum of $100,000 shall be allotted of the appropriation of $404,140 for temporary employees, Bureau of Navigation, contained in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921: *Provided*, That no part of the said appropriation of $404,140, or of the appropriation of $200,000 herein made, shall be used for the pay of any employee who is engaged on other than work of the Bureau of Navigation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "two persons"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$1,200,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$300,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following "$275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$600,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "$575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$500,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following, "$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to establish at two of the permanent naval training stations experimental summer schools for boys between the ages of 16 and 20 years. For this purpose he is authorized to use such buildings, or other accommodations, at such training stations; to loan any naval equipment necessary for such purposes, and to give instructions which will fit them for service in the Navy of the United States. He is empowered to establish and enforce such rules within the camp as may be necessary and to detail such members of the naval personnel as may be required in order to encourage and execute the spirit of this act. The Secretary of the Navy is further authorized to loan the necessary naval uniforms during the period of training and to furnish subsistence, medical attendance, and other necessary incidental expenses for those attending these schools: *Provided*, That those under instruction, with the consent of their parents or their guardians, shall enroll in the Naval Reserve Force for not less than three months, and no person not so enrolled shall be admitted to said training schools. For carrying out the provisions of this paragraph the sum of $200,000 is appropriated."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That, until June 30, 1922, of the Organized Militia as provided by law, such part as may be duly prescribed in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia shall constitute a Naval Militia; and, until June 30, 1922, such of the Naval Militia as now is in existence, and as now organized and prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of the act of Congress approved February 16, 1914, shall be a part of the Naval Reserve Force, and the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to maintain and provide for said Naval Militia as provided in said act: *Provided further*, That upon their enrollment in the Naval Reserve Force, and not otherwise, until June 30, 1922, the members of said Naval Militia shall have all the benefits, gratuities, privileges, and emoluments provided by law for other members of the Naval Reserve Force; and that, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, duty performed in the Naval Militia may be counted as active service for the maintenance of efficiency required by law for members

of the Naval Reserve Force: *And provided further*, That all moneys appropriated for the Naval Reserve Force or for the Naval Militia shall constitute one fund and hereby are made available, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for both."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$200,000" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 65, 67, 78, 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 65, 67, 78, 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendments and in lieu thereof insert, on page 20, after line 6, the following:

"That a special joint committee is hereby created, to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The committee shall investigate the advisability of establishing, developing and maintaining a naval base on San Francisco Bay or the waters tributary thereto. The committee shall prepare comparative estimates of the cost of acquiring, establishing, developing, and maintaining such sites and shall report to the Congress of the United States not later than December 31, 1920, the result of its investigation, together with such other recommendations, estimates, and information as it deems proper, including information concerning a deeper channel to Mare Island Navy Yard and a sufficient water basin at Mare Island.

"That said committee shall also investigate and report in like manner as to the advisability and cost of establishing an aviation base at Sand Point, King County, Wash.; a submarine base at Los Angeles Harbor (San Pedro), Calif.; and a submarine, destroyer and aviation base at Port Angeles, Wash.

"That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to detail such technical experts to assist the committee as the committee may request.

"That the expenses of said committee shall be paid, one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers authorized by the committee and signed by the chairman thereof; and for the cost of borings and the procuring and collating of all other technical data in connection with such investigation, there is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "$10,751,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"That hereafter, immediately upon official notification of the death from wounds or disease, not the result of his or her own misconduct, of any officer, enlisted man, or nurse on the active list of the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps, or on the retired list when on active duty, the Paymaster General of the Navy shall cause to be paid to the widow, and if there be no widow to the child or children, and if there be no widow or child, to any other dependent relative of such officer, enlisted man, or nurse previously designated by him or her, an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate received by such officer, enlisted man, or nurse at the date of his or her death. The Secretary of the Navy shall establish regulations requiring each officer and enlisted man or nurse having no wife or child to designate the proper dependent relative to whom this amount shall be paid in case of his or her death. Said amount shall be paid from funds appropriated for the pay of the Navy and pay of the Marine Corps, respectively: *Provided*, That nothing in this section or in other existing legislation shall be construed as making the provisions of this section applicable to officers, enlisted men, or nurses of any forces of the Navy of the United States other than those of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and nothing in this section shall be construed to apply in commissioned grades to any officers except those holding permanent or probationary appointments in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall apply to the officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and the Secretary of the Treasury will cause payment to be made accordingly."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"That the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall have the relative rank, pay, and allowances of a captain in the Navy, and that hereafter he shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the list of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey not below the rank of commander for a term of four years, and may be reappointed for further periods of four years each."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following: "including not to exceed $20,000 for the purchase of land necessary for radio shore stations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 99: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"The authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps is hereby permanently established at 27,400, distribution in the various grades to be made in the same proportion as provided under existing law: *Provided*, That all officers serving temporarily in the grades of captain and below upon the date of the passage of this act shall be eligible to fill existing vacancies and those hereby created in the permanent authorized strength in said grades by transfer to or reappointment in the permanent Marine Corps in the grades not above that of captain. Transfers so made shall be without regard to age, and if found not qualified for transfer to the same grade as that held by them on the date of transfer then to lower grades after qualification. All officers so transferred shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy, under such rules as he may prescribe, their mental, moral, professional, and physical qualifications to perform the duties of the grade to which transferred or reappointed and shall take precedence with each other and with other officers of the Marine Corps in such order as may be recommended by a board of marine officers and approved by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That all persons who served honorably as officers in the Marine Corps or Marine Corps Reserve on active duty at any time between April 6, 1917, and the date of the passage of this act and who have been honorably discharged or assigned to inactive duty shall be eligible for permanent appointment in the same or a lower rank than that held on discharge or assignment to inactive duty, but not above the rank of captain, to fill vacancies existing or hereby created in the permanent authorized strength of the Marine Corps under the same conditions as those above prescribed for officers now in the service: *Provided further*, That officers now holding temporary commissions in the Marine Corps and who have had more than 10 years' service therein, if not found qualified for permanent commissions, and who are recommended by the board herein provided for, may be appointed warrant officers in the Marine Corps; and the authorized number of warrant officers is hereby increased by a number not to exceed 50 to provide for the appointment of the aforesaid officers: *Provided further*, That all transfers and appointments made in accordance with the provisions of this section shall be accomplished by June 30, 1921: *Provided further*, That the officers now holding temporary appointments as commissioned officers in the Marine Corps may retain their temporary commissions until the permanent appointments provided for in the foregoing section shall have been made."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to employ on active duty, with their own consent, members of the Naval Reserve Force in enlisted ratings, the number so employed not to exceed during any fiscal year the average of 20,000 men: *Provided*, That the number of naval reservists, so employed on active duty, together with the total number of enlisted men in the Regular Navy, shall not exceed the total enlisted strength of the Navy as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That such members of the Naval Reserve Force so employed shall serve on active duty for not less than 12 nor more than 18 months unless sooner released: *Provided further*, That hereafter no person shall be enrolled in the Naval Reserve Force except for general service: *And provided further*, That the number of commissioned officers of the line, permanent, temporary, and reserve on active duty shall not exceed 4 per

cent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the Regular Navy, and the number of staff officers on active duty of whatever kind shall be in the same proportions as authorized by existing law: *Provided further*, That 500 reserve officers are also authorized to be employed in the aviation and auxiliary service: *And provided further*, That, until December 31, 1921, temporary appointments now existing may be continued in force in any grade or rank, not to exceed the number allowed in any grade or rank based upon the total permanent authorized commissioned strength of the line or of any staff corps; and, within the limitations herein prescribed, officers of the Naval Reserve Force may, with their own consent, be continued on active duty ashore or afloat, including three on shore duty in the Historical Section of the Office of Naval Intelligence, who may be retained on active duty beyond the age of disenrollment but not beyond June 30, 1922: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as reducing the permanent commissioned or enlisted strength of the Regular Navy as authorized by existing law.

"That all officers of the Naval Reserve Force and temporary officers of the Navy who have heretofore incurred or may hereafter incur physical disability in line of duty shall be eligible for retirement under the same conditions as now provided by law for officers of the Regular Navy who have incurred physical disability in line of duty.

"SEC. 3. That officers holding temporary commissioned and warrant ranks in the Navy and members of the Naval Reserve Force of commissioned and warrant ranks shall be eligible for transfer to an appointment in the permanent grades or ranks in the Navy for which they may be found qualified not above that held by them on the date of transfer, but not to exceed a total of 1,200 commissioned officers in the line, of which number 500 may be appointed from class 5, Naval Reserve Flying Corps, with proportionate number in all Staff Corps as now authorized by law, except that the Medical, Dental, and Supply Corps shall be entitled to such additional numbers as are necessary to make up the full quota of officers in those corps, as now authorized by law: *Provided*, That officers so appointed to the line of the Navy shall take rank in accordance with their precedence while holding temporary rank, and members of the Naval Reserve Force of commissioned and warrant ranks found qualified for a given rank shall be arranged according to their precedence among themselves and commissioned in the permanent service next after the lowest temporary officer who qualifies for the same rank and is appointed in accordance with the provisions of this act:

"*Provided further*, That included in the number of transfers and appointments hereinbefore allowed, commissioned officers of the Coast Guard, who have served creditably under the Navy Department in the War with the German Government, upon suitable application approved by the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury, may be appointed to a permanent rank or grade in the Navy for which found qualified by a board of naval officers under the provisions of existing law, but not above the rank of lieutenant commander, and shall take such precedence therein as the Secretary of the Navy may determine: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of computing longevity pay and retirement privileges of officers and enlisted men of the Navy, all creditable service in the Coast Guard and former Revenue-Cutter Service shall be counted.

"SEC. 4. That in addition to the number of transfers and appointments hereinbefore allowed, commissioned warrant officers of more than 15 years' service since date of warrant or date of first appointment as paymaster's clerk, pharmacist or mate, who have creditably served in the war with the German Government in temporary commissioned ranks or grades in the regular Navy, shall be appointed to a permament rank or grade for which they may be qualified as established and shown by their records of service during their term of service not above the temporary rank or grade held by them at the time of transfer: *Provided*, That officers so transferred to the line of the Navy shall take rank therein in accordance with their precedence while holding temporary rank: *Provided further*, That all officers so transferred in accordance with sections 3 and 4 of this act to the staff corps of the Navy shall take precedence with each other and with other officers in the Navy in such order as may be recommended by a board of naval officers and approved by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That no transfers or appointments made in accordance with sections 3 and 4 of this act shall be to a higher grade or rank than lieutenant in the Navy: *And provided further*, That officers appointed to the permanent Navy in accordance with the foregoing sections who now hold permanent warrant or permanent commissioned warrant rank in the United States Navy shall, if they thereafter fail professionally on examination for promotion, revert to such permanent warrant or permanent commissioned warrant status.

"SEC. 5. That officers appointed under any of the foregoing provisions shall be not more than 35 years of age when so appointed to the line of the Navy, Construction Corps, or Supply Corps, and not more than 43 years of age when so appointed to the Corps of Chaplains, or to the Medical, Dental, or Civil Engineering Corps: *Provided*, That said age limits shall be increased in the cases of officers who have rendered prior service as paymaster's clerks, or as mates, or as warrant or commissioned officers in the naval service to the extent of all prior naval service: *Provided further*, That officers originally appointed to the Dental Corps above the said age limits shall be eligible for appointment and promotion under this act irrespective of age: *And provided further*, That officers of the line of the Navy who are appointed thereto pursuant to this act from sources other than the Naval Academy shall not be ineligible for promotion by reason of age as prescribed by the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat., p. 579), until they have rendered 10 years' service in the grade of lieutenant commander, 6 years' service in the grade of commander, or 8 years' service in the grade of captain, respectively, upon the completion of which service such officers, if then ineligible for promotion by reason of age, shall be retired in accordance with said act: *And provided further*, That until June 30, 1923, promotions to lieutenant (junior grade) and lieutenant may be made without regard to length of service: *And provided further*, That until June 30, 1923, officers of the permanent Navy who have served satisfactorily during the war with the German Government in a temporary grade or rank shall be eligible under the provisions of existing law for selection for promotion or for promotion to the same permanent grade or rank without regard to statutory requirements other than age and professional and physical examination: *And provided further*, That in making reductions in rank as may be required by this act, officers holding temporary appointments may be given temporary appointments in lower grades, and officers so appointed shall take precedence from the dates of their original appointments in such lower grades.

"SEC. 6. That in case any enlisted man or enrolled man who, since the 11th day of November, 1918, has been or hereafter shall be discharged from any branch or class of the naval service for the purpose of reenlisting in the Navy or Marine Corps or heretofore has extended or hereafter shall extend his enlistment therein, he shall be entitled to the payment of the $60 bonus provided in section 1406 of the act entitled 'An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes,' approved February 24, 1919, and to travel pay as authorized in section 3 of the act enitled 'An act permitting any person who has served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the present war to retain his uniform and personal equipment and to wear the same under certain conditions,' approved February 28, 1919: *Provided*, That only one bonus shall be paid to the same person.

"SEC. 7. That hereafter enlistments in the Navy and in the Marine Corps may be for terms of two, three, or four years, and all laws now applicable to four-year enlistments shall apply, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, to enlistments for a shorter period with proportionate benefits upon discharge and reenlistment: *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to establish such grades and ratings as may be necessary for the proper administration of the enlisted personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps.

"SEC. 8. That section 125 of the act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, shall hereafter be in full force and effect as originally enacted, notwithstanding anything contained in the act entitled 'An act permitting any person who has served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the present war to retain his uniform and personal equipment and to wear the same under certain conditions,' approved February 28, 1918: *Provided*, That the words 'or the Secretary of the Navy' shall be inserted immediately after the words 'the Secretary of War' wherever those words appear in section 125 of the act approved June 3, 1916, hereinbefore referred to.

"SEC. 9. That hereafter the Secretary of the Navy may, in his discretion, withhold any part or all of the retainer pay which may be due a member of the Naval Reserve Force where such members fail to perform such duty as may be prescribed by law for the maintenance of the efficiency of the Naval Reserve Force: *Provided*, That any money so withheld shall be credited to the appropriation for organizing and administering the Naval Reserve Force to be used for any purpose that the Secretary of the Navy may consider proper to increase the efficiency of the Naval Reserve Force: *Provided further*, That

hereafter the minimum amount of active service required for the maintenance of the efficiency of the Fleet Naval Reserve shall be the same as for the Naval Reserve.

"SEC. 10. That the age limits for promotion by selection, which, under existing law, will become effective on June 30, 1920, are hereby deferred until June 30, 1921, in the cases only of those officers who may request such deferment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS S. BUTLER,
PATRICK H. KELLEY,
FRED A. BRITTEN,
L. P. PADGETT,
D. J. RIORDAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARROLL S. PAGE,
L. HEISLER BALL,
MEDILL MCCORMICK,
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13108) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, submit the following statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report, namely:

Of the Senate amendments agreed to by the managers on the part of the House, the following are merely changes of totals, namely: 51, 53, 60, 62, and 82.

Of the amendments of the Senate agreed to by the managers on the part of the House, the following involve simply the clarification of language, or the correction of clerical errors, and do not materially change the substance of the bill, to wit: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 54, 83, 84, 89, and 90.

On amendment No. 3: Increases the appropriation "Pay, miscellaneous," from $3,550,000 to $5,332,000; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 7 and 8: In the item "Investigation of fuel oil," alter the phrase "and the temporary employment of civilian experts and assistants" to read "and the employment of civilian experts and assistants at Washington, D. C., and elsewhere"; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 9: Increases from $30,000 to $50,000 the appropriation for "Investigation of fuel oil," and contains a proviso designed to provide the necessary machinery for the operation of the naval oil reserves, so that offset wells may be drilled for the protection of the Government's reserves against drainage from adjacent lands and to supply oil for the Government's needs; and the House recedes with an amendment, reinserting the original figures in the appropriation, $30,000, and also inserting a minor change in the language of the proviso.

On amendments Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 19: These amendments concern the appropriation for naval aviation, and increase the same by $9,124,000 (or to $25,000,0000). The House recedes from its disagreement to amendments Nos. 10, 11, and 13 and agrees with amendments, the effect of which is to provide a total increase of $4,124,000, making the appropriation for naval aviation $20,000,000. This increase is itemized as follows: For necessary aircraft, $419,000; for new construction of facilities at stations, to be expended largely upon development on the west coast and in Hawaii, $3,705,000. The Senate recedes from amendments 12, 14, 17, and 19.

On amendment No. 21: Adds to the items specified under the appropriation, "Bureau of Navigation, transportation and recruiting," the following: "rental, maintenance, operation, exchange, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use"; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 22: Directs the Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, to furnish to the several States the records of services of all persons from those States who served in the Navy during the late war, and carries an appropriation of $300,000 for that purpose. The House recedes with an amendment reducing the amount of the appropriation to $200,000, but making available additionally $100,000 from the appropriation for temporary employees, Bureau of Navigation, contained in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921; also inserting a minor change in language.

On amendment No. 23: In the appropriation "Recreation for enlisted men": Strikes out the item "and for such other purposes of like character as the Secretary of the Navy may deem advisable"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 24: Provides, under the appropriation "Recreation for enlisted men," that not more than five persons shall be employed at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum; and the House recedes with an amendment placing the limitation at "two" persons, instead of five, as authorized in the Senate amendment.

On amendment No. 25: Increases the appropriation for "Gunnery and engineering exercises" from $100,000 to $150,000; and the Senate recedes.

On amendments Nos. 26 and 27: In the provisions relating to "Outfits on first enlistment," these amendments change the phrase covering "the uniform gratuity paid to officers of the Naval Reserve Force" to read as follows: "and the uniform gratuity paid to members of the Naval Reserve Force, which shall not exceed $100 for the first enrollment or $30 for any subsequent enrollment of enrolled (enlisted) men." This would change existing law and very materially enlarge the gratuities thereby provided; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 28: Increases from $500,000 to $1,200,000 the appropriation "Instruments and supplies," which includes gyrocompasses on ships and similar equipment; and the House recedes with an amendment making the amount of the appropriation $850,000 instead.

On amendment No. 29: Increases from $125,000 to $250,000 the appropriation for maintenance of the naval training station at Goat Island, Calif.; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 30: Increases the appropriation for maintenance of the naval training station, Newport, R. I., from $250,000 to $300,000; and the House recedes with an amendment reducing the figure to $275,000.

On amendment No. 31: Increases the appropriation for maintenance of the naval training station, Great Lakes, from $500,000 to $600,000; and the House recedes with an amendment reducing the amount to $575,000.

On amendment No. 32: Increases the appropriation for maintenance of the naval training station, Hampton Roads, Va., from $300,000 to $500,000; and the House recedes with an amendment reducing the amount to $375,000.

On amendment No. 33: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to establish at each of the four permanent naval training stations summer schools for boys between the ages of 16 and 20 years, and appropriates $375,000 for that purpose; and the House recedes with an amendment permitting the establishment of such schools at two of said training stations as an experiment, and reducing the amount of the appropriation therefor to $200,000.

On amendments Nos. 34 and 37: Include the Naval Militia within the appropriation for the expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve Force; and provide also that, until June 30, 1922, such of the Naval Militia as now is in existence and as now organized under the act approved February 16, 1914, shall be a part of the Naval Reserve Force and shall be maintained and provided for as prescribed in said act. As to amendment No. 34, the House recedes; and as to amendment No. 37, the House recedes from its disagreement and agrees with an amendment which changes the phraseology, but does not alter the substance of the proviso.

On amendment No. 35: Increases the appropriation for organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve Force from $50,000 to $500,000; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 36: Qualifies with the expression "except in case of emergency" the provision prohibiting the use of any money for the training of any member of the Naval Reserve Force except with his own consent; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 38: Inserts an appropriation of $200,000 for the maintenance of receiving barracks; and the House recedes with an amendment reducing the amount appropriated to $100,000.

On amendments Nos. 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 52: Increase, severally, the pay of the various employees at the Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa., and alter the number employed in certain classes of employees; and also increase, by $5,000, the amount authorized for the maintenance of the home. All sums provided for in these amendments are paid out of the income from the naval pension fund, and do not in any way affect the amount of the appropriations carried in the bill. The House recedes.

On amendment No. 55: Authorizes the use of $100,000 of the appropriation for "Ordnance and ordnance stores" for drafting and technical force to be employed in the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department at Washington, D. C.; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 56: Inserts an appropriation of $200,000 for the torpedo station, Newport, R. I., for labor and material, general care, etc; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 57: Increases the appropriation for "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks" from $6,500,000 to $9,000,000; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 58: Inserts an appropriation of $300,000 for accessories and equipment for the Commonwealth dry dock at the navy yard, Boston, Mass.; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 59: Inserts an appropriation of $100,000 for two cranes for building slips at the New York Navy Yard; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 61: Inserts an appropriation of $100,000 for two cranes for building slips at the Philadelphia Navy Yard; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 63: Inserts appropriation of $50,000 for crane for building slip, and appropriation of $250,000 to continue water-front improvements at the Norfolk Navy Yard; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 64: Inserts an appropriation of $75,000 for a distilling plant at the naval station, Key West, Fla.; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 65. Inserts an appropriation of $1,000,000 toward the establishment of a docking and repair plant on San Francisco Bay, and provides that a naval board, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, shall advise and report to Congress not later than November 15, 1920, as to which of three proposed sites should be selected therefor; and the House recedes with an amendment eliminating the appropriation and providing for a special joint committee, composed of five Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, and five members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker, to investigate the entire matter as well as the desirability of the several proposed sites, and to report thereon to Congress not later than December 31, 1920; and the said committee is also to investigate and report upon other projects on the west coast proposed in the Senate amendments numbered 67, 78, and 80; the expenses of said committee to be paid from the contingent funds of Senate and House, and for the cost of borings and the procuring and collating of all other technical data in connection with the investigation an appropriation of $50,000 is made.

On amendment No. 66: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to make an exchange of certain lands heretofore used in connection with the naval radio station at South San Francisco, Calif., and provides an appropriation of $6,000 to cover the necessary expenses, including compensation for dismantling the radio mast and terminating existing lease; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 67: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to accept from King County, Wash., a certain tract of land for use as an aviation base at Sand Point, Wash.; and the House recedes with the amendment set forth under amendment No. 65, providing for an investigation and report on the proposal.

On amendment No. 68: Inserts an appropriation of $190,000 for joint Army and Navy water-supply system for Fort Kamehameha and Ford Island, Hawii; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 69: A change in totals, made unnecessary by the action on amendment No. 68; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 70: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to make an exchange of lands at the Puuloa Rifle Range Reservation, Pearl Habor, Hawaii; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 71: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to exchange certain land now part of naval station property at Honolulu for land northeast of naval station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 72: Inserts an appropriation of $50,000 for pontoon for floating derrick at naval station, Olongapo, P. I.; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 73: Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to construct a hospital building at Olongapo, P. I., at a cost not exceeding $75,000, to provide which amount the proceeds to be derived from the sale of the U. S. S. *Repose* are made available to that extent; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 74: Inserts an appropriation of $1,050,000 for fuel-oil storage at Puget Sound, Wash., and an appropriation of $1,000,000 for fuel-oil storage at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 75: Change of total, made unnecessary by action on No. 74; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 76: Makes immediately available the sum appropriated for sanitation purposes at the naval operating base, Hampton Roads, Va.; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 77: Inserts an appropriation of $60,000 for railroad connections at naval hospital, Las Animas, Colo.; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 78: Provides an appropriation of $500,000 toward the development of a submarine base in Los Angeles Harbor (San Pedro), Calif., and authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to accept title to certain land for use in connection therewith; and the House recedes with an amendment eliminating the appropriation and proviso and providing for an investigation and report on the proposal as set forth under amendment No. 65.

On amendment No. 79: Inserts an appropriation of $50,000 toward the completion of a submarine base at New London, Conn.; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 80: Provides an appropriation of $100,000 toward the development of a submarine, destroyer, and aviation base at Port Angeles, Wash., and the House recedes with an amendment eliminating the item and providing for an investigation and report on the project, as set forth under amendment No. 65.

On amendment No. 81: Increases the appropriation for "Repairs and preservation at navy yards" from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 85: Restores the law repealed by the war-risk insurance act of October 6, 1917, providing for the payment of a gratuity equal to six months' pay to the widow or dependent relatives of any officer or enlisted man dying in the service from wounds or disease incurred in line of duty, and the House recedes with amendments making minor changes in language and adding the proviso (shown in amendment No. 88) extending the benefits of the section to officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard.

On amendment No. 86: Provides for the restoration to active duty with full pay and allowances and on his own application of any officer or enlisted man on the retired list, and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 87: Provides that the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall receive the rank and pay of a captain in the Navy and be appointed for a term of four years, and the House recedes with amendment making minor change in wording.

On amendment No. 88: Inserted here through clerical error and is covered in the House amendment to amendment No. 85. The Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 91: Under the appropriation for "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," provides for the use of $95,000 from the "Proceeds of sales" for pay of necessary employees in the Navy Department in connection with salvage and disposition of excess stocks; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 92: Increase the appropriation for "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," from $10,500,000 to $12,500,000; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 93: Authorizes the use of $75,000 of the appropriations provided under the item "Fuel and transportation" for "technical and clerical assistance in the District of Columbia and elsewhere"; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 94: Increases the appropriation for "Construction and repair of vessels" from $30,000,000 to $31,000,000; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 95: Under the appropriation for "Engineering" enlarges the item "Maintenance and operation of coast-signal service" so as to include the purchase of land necessary for radio shore stations; and the House recedes with an amendment altering the phraseology and placing a limit of $20,000 on such expenditures.

On amendment No. 96: Increases from $2,250,000 to $2,500,000 the limitation upon expenditures for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, etc., under the Bureau of Steam Engineering; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 97: Increases from $28,000,000 to $29,050,000 the appropriation for repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery on naval vessels, etc.; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 98: Increases from $275,000 to $385,000 the appropriation for the pay of professors and others at the Naval Academy, which increase was provided in the pay bill (H. R. 11927) approved May 18, 1920; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 99: Provides for the establishment at 27,400 of the authorized, permanent strength of the Marine Corps and also provides legislation necessary for the transfer to the permanent service, up to the authorized strength, of those officers who served in temporary grades or as reserves during the late war; and the House recedes with an amendment inserting qualifying provisos, but retaining the substance of the original provisions.

On amendment No. 100: Increases the appropriation for temporary employees at Marine Corps headquarters and at Marine Corps posts from $100,000 to $145,852; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 101: Provides for the use of $318,000 of the unexpended balances in existing appropriations for the current fiscal year, for "Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps," to replace with cast-iron piping the wood

conduit which furnishes the Marine Corps base at Quantico, Va., with its water supply; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 102: Increases from $48,000,000 to $52,000,000 the appropriation for "Increase of the Navy, construction and machinery"; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 103: Inserts an appropriation of $11,700,000 for the completion and fitting out, from fabricated material on hand at the Hog Island plant of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, of seven type B vessels as aviation and destroyer tenders; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 104: Change in totals, rendered unnecessary by the action on amendment No. 102; and the Senate recedes.

On amendment No. 105: Increases the limit of cost of hospital ship *No. 1* from $3,250,000 to $4,355,000, but does not affect the amount of the appropriation carried in the bill; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 106: Embodies sections numbered 2 to 10, inclusive, authorizing the employment on active duty, with their own consent, of members of the Naval Reserve Force, to a number not exceeding 20,000, and in no event exceeding the total authorized enlisted strength of the Navy; providing for the transfer to the permanent Navy, but within the total authorized limit in numbers, of certain temporary and reserve officers; providing for the payment of the $60 bonus and travel pay to persons in the naval service to whom it had been denied because of their immediate enlistment therein; making permanent the provisions of the act of July 11, 1919, relating to the terms of enlistment in the Navy; amending section 125 of the national defense act of June 3, 1916, so as to make it applicable to naval matters of similar import; providing for the withholding of the retainer pay of members of the Naval Reserve Force who fail to perform the duty prescribed for them by law; and providing, lastly, that the age limits for promotion by selection which under existing law become effective on June 30, 1920, are deferred until June 30, 1921; and the House recedes with divers amendments inserting qualifying provisos and clarifying the phraseology, but retaining the substance of the legislation.

The bill as originally passed carried appropriations aggregating $425,289,574. The amendments of the Senate added to this amount $41,962,852; but in conference the amount of this increase was reduced to $7,990,000, so that, as agreed to by the committee of the conference, the bill carries appropriations totaling $433,279,574.

THOMAS S. BUTLER,
PATRICK H. KELLEY,
FRED A. BRITTEN,
L. P. PADGETT,
D. J. RIORDAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the House to the last paragraph of the statement? The Senate amendments increased the appropriations for the naval service by something over $42,000,000. After six days of hard work we succeeded in reaching an agreement with the Senate conferees. The Senate amendments to the bill as it passed the House increased the amount by seven or eight millions of dollars. That increase, in my judgment, is very large. If you gentlemen have ever been in a conference, you will know the difficulty one has in enforcing upon others his own views; and, indeed, he may be wrong and those differing with him right.

I think your conferees on the part of the House felt that seven or eight million dollars was a good deal of money to add to the bill. It is made up of four items. There is $4,000,000 for aviation. The Senate asked for an increase of $10,000,000, and we receded on $4,000,000 for aviation. That is one of the subjects of which I know but little about, and I deal largely with it as I do with the sick and disabled people—rather lean toward its side in order that aviation may be developed.

Gentlemen will see that that largely accounts for the increase—$4,000,000 for aviation, and that is to be employed largely on the west coast, together with the improvement of aviation in the Sandwich Islands.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. To what particular part of aviation development is the $4,000,000 to be devoted? I am somewhat interested in that.

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask the gentleman to turn to the House bill, where the items under the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] are made for the appropriation for aviation. [At this point some disturbance occurred in the galleries.]

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the Speaker ought to order the galleries absolutely cleared.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen of the House will take their seats.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Speaker be authorized to order the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the Speaker already has that authority.

Mr. MONDELL. The regular order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I think we can proceed with the business of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I think, Mr. Speaker, we ought to have the galleries cleared.

Mr. TAGUE. I protest against the clearing of the galleries.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that the Members of the House preserve order, and the Chair notifies the galleries that in case there is any further disturbance the galleries will be cleared.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], if he will turn to the disposition of the moneys appropriated by the House in its bill as originally reported, he will find the distribution of the amount of money appropriated for aviation in items which were added to in the bill, made largely in accordance with the directions laid down by the House.

I have accounted for $4,000,000 of the amount of money which the conferees have agreed to. We also agreed to increase the construction and repair of vessels by $1,000,000 and to give to the Bureau of Steam Engineering for further construction of machinery in these vessels $1,000,000. That accounts for $6,000,000. The balance of the fund is distributed largely through items a list of which I hold here in my hand, and to which I would be very glad to speak if gentlemen desire to make an inquiry.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the chairman to Senate amendment No. 22, and in doing so to commend the conferees upon the excellent work they have done. If my calculation is correct, you have succeeded in causing a recession upon the part of the Senate in an amount equal to $500,000, which was placed in the bill by the Senate for additional clerical hire more than the amount appropriated for clerical hire in the legislative appropriation bill. I notice you do appropriate $200,000, and authorize $100,000 appropriated by the legislative bill to be used for the purpose of making a statement concerning sailors, seamen, and marines. I call the attention of the House to the fact that in the hearings before the Legislative Committee on the legislative appropriation bill this item was given consideration. The Legislative Committee gave the Navy every penny that they asked for this service, but notwithstanding that fact I understand that they asked for about $700,000 additional. The bill finally gives them $300,000. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER. I do wish the House would listen while the gentleman from Indiana is commending the conferees. I do not care to have them listen so particularly when he scolds us. The gentleman is exactly right. An estimate was made for $750,000 to do this work. We objected to appropriating the money. This money is appropriated for the purpose of making up the records of the sailors in the naval service during the war. Those of the marines are already made up. Every State in the Union, so far as I know, asked to have these records made and they should be made. In the judgment of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House $750,000 was entirely too much. There came to us later an offer to make these records for $300,000 and we concluded that we would agree to the Senate amendment, provided $100,000 of the amount was used—as provided for in the legislative appropriation bill—and expended for this purpose. I would say to my friend that we could do no better than that.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I commend the members of the conference committee very heartily. With this exception they should be highly commended. This is but another demonstration of what a duplication of appropriations from different committees will do. The Navy Department was given every cent that they asked for for this item.

Mr. BUTLER. There is no question about that.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The hearings were full with reference to the amount necessary to complete the records, but notwithstanding that fact they are now seeking to obtain $300,000 more than they said was necessary.

Mr. BUTLER. And aside from the $500,000 saved there, as I calculate, we have saved between four and five hundred thousand dollars asked for clerk hire.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman is entirely too modest in calling the attention of the House to what the conferees have actually accomplished. I desire him to briefly state the amount the conferees have saved from the amount the Senate recommended.

Mr. BUTLER. Between $34,000,000 and $35,000,000 out of the $42,000,000 which the Senate added. I am endeavoring not to excuse but to explain to the House why your conferees permitted an addition of $7,000,000 over what the House appropriated.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. I think the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] a question in regard to aviation, which, perhaps, I can answer a little more fully.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Merely for the information of the gentleman, I wish to say that in the House bill we carried for aviation, exclusive, of course, of pay, a trifle under $16,000,000. The conferees have agreed upon $20,000,000. The difference is made up in items of this kind: A proposition, if the conference report is accepted, to erect at San Diego, Calif., a great dirigible station costing $2,775,000; another to erect in Hawaii an aviation base for the Navy, costing about $900,000. The difference of some $450,000 will be expended in the procurement of different types of aircraft, both lighter than air and heavier than air. In view of the importance of aviation and its ultimate growth, I am very glad the increases have been made.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. BURDICK. I call the attention of the gentleman to amendment No. 56, striking out $200,000 for labor, material, and general care of the torpedo station at Newport. I am told that that means that the grounds and buildings will not be kept up during the coming year. Can the gentleman inform me in regard to that?

Mr. BUTLER. That opens a very large question. We discovered that the department has expended for the Navy on the land within the last three years more than $334,000,000. The Naval Affairs Committee of the House has resolved that the end is here. It is true that it is very likely that these buildings will be abandoned.

Mr. BURDICK. At the torpedo station?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The item of $200,000 for the torpedo station, or whatever the item provides for, was eliminated for the reason that the item of $20,000,000 for all stations of similar character will take care of it. Plenty of money has been appropriated to take care of the torpedo station at Newport.

Mr. BURDICK. Then it is not a fact that the grounds and buildings will be allowed to deteriorate?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, no; there is ample money in the sum appropriated covering all of these stations to take care of this particular station and there was no need of particularizing this particular one.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, of course, it is probably true that when the Navy Department begins to smear the butter over the bread there will be a part of the bread that will not have much butter on it. I do not know whether this station will be bread under the butter or not.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There was no need of carrying this as a separate item.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would suggest that a large appropriation is carried in the bill now for the maintenance of proving grounds, torpedo stations, gun factory, and other stations under the Bureau of Ordnance, which, of course, includes the expenditure necessary for the maintenance of this torpedo station.

Mr. Speaker, with the assistance of the Office of Naval Intelligence, I have made a very careful comparison between the first-line battleships and battle cruisers of Great Britain, and the same character of ships of the American Navy, and I think I can prove without fear of successful contradiction that in first-line 20,000-ton ships of at least 20-knot speed, the United States now has in built and building the most powerful navy in all the world.

It is interesting to note that with the launching of our first 20,000-ton battleship, *North Dakota*, immediately followed by the *Delaware* and *Utah*, in 1909, Great Britain launched her *Neptune*, of 20,200 tons, so that we each started to build dreadnaughts about 11 years ago.

In subsequent years, when the United States was laying down but one ship or two per annum, Great Britain was launching from five to eight ships whose tonnage varied from 20,600 to 28,500.

During the years 1916, 1917, and 1918, the United States has made tremendous strides in battleship authorizations, with the result that 1923 will see the American Navy the predominant navy of the world and capable of defeating the navies of any three nations combined, excepting, of course, Great Britain.

Beginning with the *North Dakota*, *Delaware*, and *Utah* (leaving out the *South Carolina* and *Michigan* because of their light tonnage, although they each carry eight big guns), I find that we have 33 battleships and battle cruisers built and building, all of which will be available for action in 1923, while Great Britain has 35 first-line ships of the same character, thus giving England an advantage of two ships, which we immediately offset by greater speed and tonnage, bigger guns, superior muzzle velocity, heavier armor, and more modern construction.

It will be noted in my figures that the American ships have a total tonnage of 1,118,650 tons as against the British of 884,100 tons, showing a superiority of 234,550 tons, or an advantage of 8,638 tons per ship, equaling 34.2 per cent.

In average speed of all vessels we are practically the same, showing a fraction less than 23.7 knots average per ship.

In main batteries we show 340 guns to 314 for the British, with an average of 10.3 big guns per ship to the British 8.97 guns per ship, while our guns will average 14½-inch caliber as against the British 13⅝-inch, and this would appear to give us a tremendous advantage in weight of cold steel thrown by one broadside when we will hurl 548,400 pounds as against 452,000 pounds by all British big guns. It will be shown that our ships will average 16,618 pounds of projectiles as against 12,914 pounds for a British broadside of main guns, thus proving that our ships will throw 3,704 pounds more steel than the British, ship for ship, or 28.7 per cent superiority.

In the secondary battery our percentage of superiority is even greater than in the main battery, where our 494 guns average 5.4-inch caliber as against the British of 526 guns, with an average of 4.9 inches, showing our guns to average one-half inch larger in caliber and throwing 40,158 pounds of projectiles as against 32,080 for the British secondary battery, which means that our ships will average 1,216½ pounds as against 916½ pounds for the British, or more than 33 per cent superiority in our favor.

It is shown that one volley from all guns on our 33 ships will throw 588,638 pounds of steel as against 484,080 pounds from all British guns, or an excess in our favor of 104,558 pounds, or 4,006 pounds per ship, or a superiority of 29 per cent.

We find ourselves confronted with positive figures showing 34.2 per cent more tonnage, carrying larger guns, throwing 28.7 per cent more long-range steel, more modern ships, with greater radius of action and power than England has ever possessed in first-line fighting ships.

Great Britain has 350 destroyers built and building, while we have 322, but as ours are a little larger than theirs, faster and more modern, it is not unreasonable to assume that our superiority in destroyers is even greater than in first-line battleships and cruisers.

In submarines it will be observed that England has 150 built and building, while we also have 150 built and building, and I am willing to take my chances with American mechanical ingenuity on our underwater ships performing at least as good, if not better, than the British subs.

It is argued by friends of Great Britain that she simply will not allow us to supersede her on the high seas, and to these I can only reply that England is now completing but one battle cruiser of the *Hood* type of 41,200 tons displacement with a 31-knot speed, carrying eight 15-inch guns, which is in no direction the equal of our *Indiana* type of superdreadnaught of 43,200 tons and 23-knot speed, carrying twelve 16-inch guns, and that during the past 12 months Great Britain has destroyed the form works and keel of at least one sister ship of the *Hood* type in the interest of economy, and I maintain that until she can pay interest on her bonded indebtedness, at least to her foreign creditors, she would not be justified in going ahead with a costly competitive battleship program, and particularly so not with us, when she realizes fully that we have no designs upon anything she may have.

While the pride of England may be hurt by her slide into second place among the naval powers of the world, she certainly can not hope to successfully compete against us if we are really determined to take the place we are entitled to on the seas as the world's foremost Nation and where American commerce can receive the protection it failed to get prior to our entrance into the World War.

The phrase "the freedom of the seas" will mean just exactly what it says, and our supremacy thereon will never justify the control and regulation of the commerce of all nations merely because we have the power to do so, as England has done in the past, much to our disappointment and, at times, humiliation.

Mr. Speaker, I will here insert in the RECORD a couple of sheets prepared by the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department, which will give a detailed description in fighting value, at least, of the first-line ships of Great Britain and the United States:

Comparison of United States and British Navies, capital ships launched 1908 to 1920, inclusive, and ships building or authorized, 1920.

GREAT BRITAIN.

No.	Year and name.	Type.	Normal displacement.	Speed.	Main battery.	Secondary battery.	Weight of one main broadside.	Weight of secondary broadside.	Total weight of broadside.
	1909.			*Knots.*			*Pounds.*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
1	Neptune	Battleship	20,200	21.00	10 12-inch	20 4-inch	8,500	500	9,000
	1910.								
2	Colossus	Battleship	20,600	21.00	10 12-inch	16 4-inch	8,500	400	8,900
3	Hercules	do	20,600	21.00	do	do	8,500	400	8,900
4	Orion	do	22,500	21.00	10 13.5-inch	do	12,500	400	12,900
5	Lion	Battle cruiser	26,350	28.00	8 13.5-inch	do	10,000	400	10,400
	1911.								
6	Thunderer	Battleship	22,500	21.00	10 13.5-inch	16 4-inch	12,500	400	12,900
7	Monarch	do	22,500	21.00	do	do	12,500	400	12,900
8	Conqueror	do	22,500	21.00	do	do	12,500	400	12,900
9	King George V	do	25,000	21.00	do	20 4-inch	14,000	500	14,500
10	Centurian	do	25,000	21.00	do	do	14,000	500	14,500
11	New Zealand	Battle cruiser	18,750	26.00	8 12-inch	do	6,800	500	7,300
12	Princess Royal	do	26,350	28.00	8 13.5-inch	16 4-inch	10,000	400	10,409
13	Australia	do	18,800	26.00	8 12-inch	14 4-inch	6,800	350	7,150
	1912.								
14	Ajax	Battleship	25,000	21.00	10 13.5-inch	20 4-inch	14,000	500	14,500
15	Marlborough	do	25,000	21.00	do	12 6-inch	14,000	1,200	15,200
16	Iron Duke	do	25,000	21.00	do	do	14,000	1,200	15,200
	1913.								
17	Agincourt	Battleship	27,500	22.00	14 12-inch	20 6-inch	11,900	2,000	13,900
18	Erin	do	23,000	21.00	10 13.5 inch	16 6-inch	14,000	1,600	15,600
19	Canada	do	28,000	22.75	10 14-inch	12 6-inch	14,000	1,200	15,200
20	Benbow	do	25,000	21.00	10 13.5-inch	do	14,000	1,200	15,200
21	Emperor of India	do	25,000	21.00	do	do	14,000	1,200	15,200
22	Warspite	do	27,500	25.00	8 15-inch	do	15,600	1,200	16,800
23	Queen Elizabeth	do	27,500	25.00	do	do	15,600	1,200	16,800
24	Tiger	Battle cruiser	28,500	28.00	8 13.5-inch	do	10,000	1,200	11,200
	1914.								
25	Valiant	Battleship	27,500	25.00	8 15-inch	12 6-mch	15,600	1,200	16,800
26	Barham	do	27,500	25.00	do	do	15,600	1,200	16,800
27	Royal Oak	do	25,750	23.00	do	14 6-inch	15,600	1,400	17,000
	1915.								
28	Revenge	Battleship	25,750	23.00	8 15-inch	14 6-inch	15,600	1,400	17,000
29	Royal Sovereign	do	25,750	23.00	do	do	15,600	1,400	17,000
30	Malaya	do	27,500	25.00	do	12 6-inch	15,600	1,200	16,800
	1916.								
31	Resolution	Battleship	25,750	23.00	8 15-inch	14 6-inch	15,600	1,400	17,000
32	Ramillies	do	25,750	23.00	do	do	15,600	1,400	17,000
33	Repulse	Battle cruiser	26,500	31.00	6 15-inch	17 4-inch	11,700	425	12,125
34	Renown	do	26,500	31.00	do	do	11,700	425	12,125
	1918.								
35	Hood	do	41,200	31.00	8 15-inch	12 5.5 inch	15,600	1,380	16,980

The term "broadside" as used here signifies one discharge from all guns and not from the guns of one side only.
The year given is the year in which the ships were launched.

UNITED STATES.

	1908.			*Knots.*			*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
1	North Dakota	Battleship	20,000	21.01	10 12-inch, 45 caliber	14 5-inch, 51 caliber	8,700	1,080	9,780
	1909.								
2	Delaware	Battleship	20,000	21.56	10 12-inch, 45 caliber	16 5-inch, 51 caliber	8,700	1,080	9,780
3	Utah	do	21,825	21.04	do	do	8,700	1,008	9,708
	1910.								
4	Florida	Battleship	21,825	22.08	10 12-inch, 45 caliber	16 5-inch, 51 caliber	8,700	1,008	9,708
	1911.								
5	Arkansas	Battleship	26,000	21.05	12 12-inch, 50 caliber	16 5-inch, 51 caliber	10,440	1,008	11,448
6	Wyoming	do	26,000	21.22	do	do	10,440	1,008	11,448
	1912.								
7	New York	Battleship	27,000	21.47	10 14-inch, 45 caliber	16 6-inch, 51 caliber	14,000	1,008	15,008
8	Texas	do	27,000	21.05	do	do	14,000	1,008	15,008
	1914.								
9	Nevada	Battleship	27,500	20.53	10 14-inch, 45 caliber	12 5-inch, 51 caliber	14,000	756	14,756
10	Oklahoma	do	27,500	20.58	do	do	14,000	756	14,756
	1915.								
11	Arizona	Battleship	31,400	21.00	12 14-inch, 45 caliber	14 5-inch, 51 caliber	16,800	882	17,682
12	Pennsylvania	do	31,400	21.05	do	do	16,800	882	17,682
	1917.								
13	Mississippi	Battleship	32,000	21.00	12 14-inch, 50 caliber	14 5-inch, 51 caliber	16,800	882	17,682
14	Idaho	do	32,000	21.00	do	do	16,800	882	17,682
15	New Mexico	do	32,000	21.08	do	do	16,800	882	17,682

Comparison of United States and British Navies, capital ships launched 1908 to 1920, inclusive, and ships building or authorized, 1920—Continued.

UNITED STATES—Continued.

No.	Year and name.	Type.	Normal displacement.	Speed.	Main battery.	Secondary battery.	Weight of one main broadside.	Weight of secondary broadside.	Total weight of broadside.
	1919.			*Knots.*			*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
16	California	Battleship	32,300	21.00	12 14-inch, 50 caliber	14 5-inch, 51 caliber	16,800	882	17,682
17	Tennessee	do	32,300	21.00	do	do	16,800	882	17,682
	1920.								
18	Maryland	Battleship	32,600	21.00	8 16-inch, 45 caliber	14 5-inch, 51 caliber	16,800	882	17,682
	NOT YET LAUNCHED—AUTHORIZED 1916.								
19	Colorado	Battleship	32,600	21.00	8 16-inch, 45 caliber	14 5-inch, 51 caliber	16,800	882	17,682
20	Washington	do	32,600	21.00	do	do	16,800	882	17,682
21	West Virginia	do	32,600	21.00	do	do	16,800	882	17,682
22	Constellation	Battle cruiser	43,500	33.25	8 16-inch, 50 caliber	16 6-inch, 53 caliber	16,800	1,728	18,528
23	Lexington	do	43,500	33.25	do	do	16,800	1,728	18,528
24	Ranger	do	43,500	33.25	do	do	16,800	1,728	18,528
25	Saratoga	do	43,500	33.25	do	do	16,800	1,728	18,528
26	Indiana	Battleship	43,200	23.00	12 16-inch, 50 caliber	do	25,200	1,728	26,928
27	Montana	do	43,200	23.00	do	do	25,200	1,728	26,928
28	South Dakota	do	43,200	23.00	do	do	25,200	1,728	26,928
29	Constitution	Battle cruiser	43,500	33.25	8 16-inch, 50 caliber	do	16,800	1,728	18,528
30	Iowa	Battleship	43,200	23.00	12 16-inch, 50 caliber	do	25,200	1,728	26,928
31	Massachusetts	do	43,200	23.00	do	do	25,200	1,728	26,928
32	North Carolina	do	43,200	23.00	do	do	25,200	1,728	26,928
33	United States	Battle cruiser	43,500	33.25	8 16-inch, 50 caliber	do	16,800	1,728	18,528

Mr. Speaker, I have reduced the voluminous figures of the Office of Naval Intelligence to a concrete percentage basis and will insert my figures in the RECORD for future reference:

	United States.		Great Britain.		United States over Great Britain.			
	Total.	Average per ship.	Total	Average per ship.	Total.	Per cent.	Average per ship.	Per cent.
Number of ships	33		35					
Tonnage	1,118,650	33,898½	884,100	25,260	234,550	26.5	8,638	34.2
Speed, knots, average		23.64		23.68				
Main battery:								
Size—								
12-inch guns	64		60					
13½-inch guns			144					
14-inch guns	124		10					
15-inch guns			100					
16-inch guns	152							
Guns	340	10.3	314	8.97	26			
Size per gun, inches		14.5		13¾				
Weight, in pounds, of 1 main broadside	548,400	16,618	452,000	12,914	96,400	21.3	3,704	28.7
Secondary battery:								
Size—								
4-inch guns			276					
5-inch guns	302							
5½-inch guns			12					
6-inch guns	192		238					
Guns	494	14.9	526	15.0				
Size per gun, inches		5.4		4.9				
Weight, in pounds, of 1 secondary broadside	40,158	1,216½	32,080	916½	8,078	25.2	300	33.7
Combined weight, in pounds, of 1 broadside	588,638	17,837½	484,080	13,831	104,558	21.6	4,006	29.0

Mr. Speaker, I am sincerely sorry and disappointed that the Senate and House conferees could not have agreed on the establishment of certain necessary naval establishments on the Pacific coast, where we have heretofore never had even so much as a single battleship based and where from now on we will probably always maintain the greater portion of the American Navy.

If the naval establishments on the Pacific coast prior to the last year were but adequate for a few obsolete cruisers and gunboats, they certainly are now thoroughly inadequate to supply the wants of that portion of the American Navy which must in the future base on the Pacific coast for the protection of American commerce and diplomacy, and it is quite hard to explain just why a great naval base in San Francisco Bay is not now in course of construction.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago the Helm Commission was appointed by act of Congress to make a thorough study of conditions on the Pacific coast and to report its findings to Congress.

Among other things, the commission said that in order to be as effectively operated in the Pacific as in the Atlantic the size of the fleet now existing and authorized makes desirable immediate provision for a marked extension in berthing, docking, and repair facilities on the Pacific coast.

For strategic reasons it was found necessary and desirable that there should be at least two navy yards of the first class on the Pacific coast of the United States; that the strategic location, physical characteristics, industrial advantages, and defensibility of the navy yard at Puget Sound are of such character as to make its development as one of these yards not only necessary and desirable but imperative, in view of the requirements of that region for national defense; that the extension of the present navy yard at Mare Island adjacent to San Francisco Bay to meet the requirements of one of two main navy yards on the Pacific coast is impracticable, due to physical limitations, but that its development within certain restrictions is desirable, practicable, and recommended.

In view of the limitations of the Mare Island yard, an additional navy yard capable of accommodating the largest vessels of the fleet is suggested, and that strategic advantages, physical characteristics, industrial development, and defensibility of the San Francisco Bay region makes that location the most desirable for the establishment of another navy yard of the first class on the Pacific coast.

It has been suggested that the capacity of the Pacific coast yards for the maintenance and repair of the fleet should be at least treble that now provided and that development of navy yard facilities to the above requirements should be undertaken without delay and should subsequently keep pace with the development of the Pacific fleet.

Mr. Speaker, the principal objection to the immediate development of a great naval base in San Francisco Bay seems to be the fact that the Government has already expended some $29,000,000 in land and permanent improvements at Mare Island, and it is feared that this vast expenditure will be nullified by the establishment of another base.

Of course, I do not concur in these views and am sure that experts in the Navy Department all agree that the Mare Island yard will always be a first-class repair and construction yard, and the money heretofore expended there will certainly not have been wasted.

Friends of the Mare Island yard have said that if a great base is established on the Pacific that this yard should be the favored one, not because of its desirable location but because of the fact that the Government has already spent so much money upon it.

From my point of view—and I have visited there several times—I feel that it can never be developed into a first-class base because of its physical limitations and its location at the end of a long, narrow channel, which can only be maintained at great expense and with considerable uncertainty.

I question whether a channel of greater depth than 30 feet could be maintained, to say nothing of the other physical limitations at Mare Island which seriously affect its development as a navy yard of the first order. Among these may be mention narrowness and limited area of water adjacent to the

navy yard and swift current in Mare Island Strait; wholly inadequate berthing space and no possibility of obtaining such berthing space within reasonable range of repair shops in amounts sufficient for the accommodation of a large number of vessels of the fleet necessarily based thereon if there were no other navy yard in the vicinity; difficulties of navigation to and from the yard during foggy weather, especially for large vessels; the effect of silt in the water in clogging condensers and flushing systems of larger vessels where the injections are low down; insufficiency and undesirability of anchorage ground, even beyond Mare Island Strait; the question of getting a damaged heavy-draft vessel to the yard at any time.

Mr. Speaker, the Helm Commission considered everything in connection with the Mare Island yard and was of the opinion that economical and physical limitations prevent the development of that yard to any extent beyond that necessary for building operations and the maintenance and repair of vessels for the fleet, which could be based and maintained there under conditions of a 30-foot channel approach and of the practical development of berthing space, and because of these circumstances Mare Island could not be considered for development as a naval base suitable for the largest vessels in the Navy.

Mare Island has many advantages due to the defensible location, climate, labor supply, existing dry docks and shops, plant equipment, and various navy-yard accessories of great value and possible service to the fleet; and for these reasons its retention and use for shipbuilding and the repair and maintenance of the fleet within the limitations imposed by the 30-foot channel approaches will always be a desirable yard.

San Francisco Bay must and will be the home of the Pacific fleet, and there will sooner or later be established in that bay one of the greatest naval bases of the world, and the quicker the better.

Mr. Speaker, some three years after the Helm Commission reported on Pacific coast projects the Secretary of the Navy appointed a board known as the "McKean Board," which made a special study of Pacific coast naval projects, and it was in full agreement with the Helm Commission as to the necessity of establishing a first-class naval base on deep water in San Francisco Bay and recommended that the necessary appropriations be obtained from the last Congress to undertake or to begin that project, but up to the present time nothing substantial has come of that recommendation.

With the appointment of the commission provided for in the conference report now pending in the House, final borings will be made at the Alameda and Hunters Point sites before the present Congress ceases to exist, and I hope that we may then pass a suitable appropriation looking toward immediate construction of a naval base of the first class, which is so urgently necessary on the Pacific coast at this time.

Mr. BURDICK. That is what I understood.

Mr. BUTLER. There is no necessity——

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman understands that I am talking about the torpedo station, not the training station, and that the torpedo station is a very important station?

Mr. BRITTEN. We understand that thoroughly, and there is plenty of money under "Ordnance" to care for maintenance and provide for all of the factories and stations we have.

Mr. BURDICK. I so understood, but the folks at home do not.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I propose to yield now to my colleague [Mr. PADGETT], but the gentleman will understand that it is not the purpose of Congress, so far as we understand it, to provide for the repair and preservation of buildings and shops erected purely for war purposes. We can not afford it, but this permanent establishment at Newport will be provided for out of the general fund.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Is there any assurance that any portion of this money out of the general fund will be so used?

Mr. BUTLER. We have the assurances given us by the Chief of Bureau of Ordnance, and I have no doubt it will be provided for in some way. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT]. He says that length of time will be sufficient.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I shall not discuss at length the conference report. The Senate amendments, in round numbers, amounted to about $41,000,000 or a little more, and the conferees of the House have agreed to a little more than $7,000,000. I want to say that in my judgment if the conferees have made any mistake it has been in too big a cut upon some of the Senate amendments. It is in the line of economy and reduction by cutting too closely, if we have made any mistake at all. I do not think that we can be charged with any element of extravagance in what we have done.

Mr. Speaker, I state it as a fundamental proposition that the administration is entitled to credit for what is accomplished during its term and likewise is responsible for what it fails to accomplish. In other words, the administration is to be judged by results and be known by the fruits of its labors. If success crowns its efforts, it should have commendation; if failure is the result of its efforts or inaction, it should be held responsible. By these principles let the Democratic administration be tested.

In view of the fact that the Sixty-sixth Congress met in extra session May 19, 1919, and has been almost continuously in session since, and the Republicans in control of the Congress have devoted their time and energy to criticizing the Democratic administration and have appointed numerous investigating committees for the purpose of and in an effort to discredit the Democratic administration, I deem it appropriate to compare the achievements and accomplishments of the Democratic administration in the management and upbuilding of the Navy during the seven years of President Wilson's administration, since March 4, 1913, with the Republican administrations from March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1913, under Presidents McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft. This comparison will clearly show that the Democratic Party has been the real friend and true builder of the American Navy. History also shows that the Democratic Party in the past has been the real friend and builder of the American Navy.

For weeks past there has been exhibited in the lobby of the House prominent placards, placed there by Republicans, showing a comparison between the Navy of the United States and the Navy of Great Britain and setting forth comparative figures showing the superiority of the Navy of the United States. This statement placed on public exhibition in the lobby of the House by Republicans is so illustrating and such a positive commendation and proof of the splendid and successful administration of the Navy by the Democratic administration under President Wilson and Secretary Daniels that I wish to set it forth herein.

This statement makes a comparison of the condition of the American Navy and the British Navy in the year 1923, by which time it is expected that the 1916 building program authorized by a Democratic Congress, upon the recommendation of President Wilson, will be completed. The American Navy total broadside fire 588,638 pounds, as compared with the British broadside fire of 484,080 pounds. Actual superiority in total weight of broadside projectiles: United States Navy 22 per cent, and in weight of broadside projectiles per ship 29 per cent. First-line battleship comparison, 1923, shows United States superiority in total displacement 26.5 per cent; superiority in displacement of average ship 34.2 per cent. United States Navy total displacement 1,118,650 tons; average per ship, 33,898 tons; average speed, 23.64 knots. British Navy: Total displacement 884,100 tons; average per ship, 25,260 tons; average speed, 23.68 knots:

United States Navy:	
Main battery guns, total	340
Average caliber, inches	14½
Average number of guns per ship	10.3
British Navy:	
Main battery guns, total	314
Average caliber, inches	13⅝
Average number of guns per ship	8.97

As I have stated, these placards were placed on public exhibition in the lobby of the House by Republicans, and they bear testimony of the remarkable and successful administration of the Navy by the present Democratic administration.

Mr. Meyer, when Secretary of the Navy under President Taft, in his annual report says:

> Germany is now second among the principal naval powers in warship tonnage built and building, and the United States is third.

I could cite other official statements showing that the Navy of the United States was No. 3 when the Democratic Party came into power in 1913, and now Republicans are proudly advertising and boasting that it is superior to the British Navy, and citing in support thereof the comparisons above given. It should also be remembered that in 1909 the Navy of the United States held second place but under the Republican administration it soon fell to the third place.

I feel justified in calling attention to this matter and emphasizing it because it has been the policy, practice, and delight of the Republicans in Congress to criticize and find fault with and seek to disparage the Democratic administration in every conceivable manner, and yet they have unwittingly borne testimony to the splendid administration and successful upbuilding of the Navy by placing and keeping these placards for weeks on public exhibition in the lobby of the House. It should be

remembered that it was the Democratic administration in 1916, for the first time in the history of this country, passed the great constructive legislation authorizing the three-year building program, comprising a total of 157 ships, the result of which was to bring the Navy of the United States from its position of third to its present position of superiority in fighting efficiency and military value as shown by the placards posted by Republicans in the lobby of the House.

It should also be borne in mind and emphasized that the Republicans since they gained control of the Senate and the House in March, 1919, have not added one single ship or authorized the addition of one single ship to the Navy of the United States. Its present preeminent position is due to the present Democratic administration.

It was also the Democratic administration and the Democratic Congress which in 1915 created the office of Naval Operations in the Navy Department, thereby creating for the first time in the history of the Navy a systematic and coherent organization of the Navy for the successful and scientific operation of ships. It was because of this legislation, as well as the other personnel legislation, embraced in the act of August 29, 1916, that the Navy was such a capable, efficient, and coordinated organization when we entered the war in April, 1917. All that was necessary for the Navy to do was to add men and material in order to expand and meet all the demands and emergencies of the war. It was also the Democratic administration and the Democratic Congress which in 1916, for the first time in the history of the Navy, gave proper and necessary rank and title to the officers of the several staff corps of the Navy and created and established in time of peace the rank and title of admiral and vice admiral for the commanders of our naval fleets, thereby relieving the Navy of the United States from the embarrassment and humiliation under which it had been suffering for years.

I should also call attention to the fact that, under the legislation of the Democratic administration and the Democratic Congress, when we entered the war the Navy was splendidly equipped and prepared with powder, projectiles, mines, and other equipment necessary for the successful operation of the ships of the various fleets.

The manufacture of 100,000 mines and the laying of a mine barrage from the north end of Scotland to the southern boundaries of Norway—about 230 miles across the North Sea—thereby bottling up the German submarines and preventing their entrance into the Atlantic Ocean, was a marvelous and most wonderful feat of naval strategy and naval accomplishment and reflects credit upon the American Navy and the Democratic administration in charge of the Navy.

The convoying of almost 2,000,000 soldiers 3,000 miles overseas without the loss of a soldier under American convoy challenges the admiration of the world and entitles the American Navy to the love and affection of all those who esteem courage and cherish patriotic duty, and commands the plaudits not alone of the people of the United States but of the world. This is another splendid achievement of the Democratic administration.

It was a Democratic Congress, upon the recommendation of a Democratic administration, that in 1916, by legislation, authorized and provided for a Naval Reserve personnel for the first time in the history of the Government, and under the operation of this Democratic legislation, when the war came on, the Navy was enabled to enroll in the Naval Reserve and use in the active operation of the war something like 500,000 Naval Reserves. These Naval Reserves did splendid service during the war, and this legislation, provided for by a Democratic Congress and a Democratic administration prior to our entrance into the war, enabled the Navy to expand in an orderly and organized way and utilize this vast Naval Reserve Force in the naval operations of the war. Had it not been for this Democratic legislation authorizing and establishing the Naval Reserves the Navy would have been at a great disadvantage and badly crippled in its effort to meet the requirements of the war. This is another evidence of wise legislation of the Democratic administration and the Democratic Congress.

I might cite many other instances of wise legislation and of the splendid ministrations of the Democratic administration and of the Democratic Congress to show the foresight in having the Navy prepared for times of emergency, and how splendidly it was operated during the war, and how justly and well it earned and received the plaudits and affection of the American people, but I deem it useless to do so. The splendid conduct and great work and achievements of the Navy are known and recognized by all the world. It was the Democratic administration and Democratic Congress which made it so and it is entitled to and should receive the approbation of all the people who believe credit should be given when and where due.

I feel justified in calling attention to the fact that not only during the Democratic administration since 1913, but all through the history of our country, the Democratic Party has been the real friend and builder of the American Navy. After the War of the Revolution the American Navy was allowed to disintegrate and largely go to pieces, and it was Thomas Jefferson who, in 1786, urged the establishment of a naval service for this country in order that there might be put an end to the depredations that were being committed upon our commerce by Barbary pirates. At that time it was being urged that there was no money in the Treasury to be used for the purpose of a naval force, to which Jefferson replied:

> There never will be money in the Treasury until the Confederacy shows its teeth, and a naval force can never endanger our liberties nor occasion bloodshed.

It was during the administration of President James K. Polk and Mr. Bancroft, then Secretary of the Navy, both Democrats, that the Naval Academy at Annapolis was established, thereby providing the means for the education and training of the commissioned personnel of the Navy, which time has shown to be the most efficient and best equipped naval commissioned personnel in all the world. Later again the Navy had been neglected, and Franklin Pierce, another Democratic President, took active steps to have it rehabilitated and remove from it the stigma of being the "Rip Van Winkle of our national defense." At the close of the Civil War the United States possessed a creditable and capable Navy judged by the standards of that period. The Republican Party remained in power and control of the Government from 1860 through 1884, and we find the good Navy that we had at the close of the Civil War was neglected, disintegrated, and became in such a condition that no one would do it reverence. President Cleveland, a Democratic President, came into control in March, 1885, and under Mr. Whitney, a Democratic Secretary of the Navy, new life and vigor were imparted to the Navy and the foundation was laid for the creation of a modern, up-to-date Navy. The Republicans again came into control in March, 1887, and we find that the Navy was again neglected and began to retrograde and to lower its standards and efficiency until the second administration of President Cleveland, in 1892, when, under the administration of Hilary A. Herbert, a Democratic Secretary of the Navy, new life and vigor were imparted into the Navy and its restoration to its proper place was again undertaken. In 1897 the Republicans again came into power and control of the Government, and the Republican administration continued until March, 1913. During these 16 years the American Navy lagged behind and the German Navy progressed, developed, and passed the American Navy, until we find at the close of the administration of President Taft the Navy of the United States occupied the third position among the navies of the world. President Wilson and a Democratic Congress began to give considerate attention to the rehabilitation and upbuilding of the Navy. The President, in his recommendations to Congress and in his addresses to the public, recommended and advocated the importance and necessity of rehabilitating the Navy, and the Secretary of the Navy cordially seconded and cooperated with the recommendations of the President, and the Democratic Congress enacted legislation, so that during the seven years of Democratic administration the Navy has risen from third place to have, receive, and enjoy the distinction of having Republicans publicly placard in large letters in the lobby of the House of Representatives in parallel positions the statements quoted above, showing that in ships, tonnage, speed, gunpower, and projectiles the superiority of the American Navy over that of the British Navy, which has always heretofore been recognized as the ruler of the seas, the splendid and well-deserved testimonial from Republicans of the great success and wonderful achievements of the Democratic administration in the management and upbuilding of the Navy of the United States. These placards silence criticism and proclaim the splendid success of the Democratic administration.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request, to extend my remarks on the Navy.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the conferees on the part of the House for the very great reductions which were made in the Senate amendments. The bill as now agreed

to is some $34,000,000 less in amount than as passed by the Senate. I believe that the service would not have suffered had there been still further reductions. I think the bill is over-liberal, but with the present extravagant management of the Navy Department, with the constant pressure of the administration for increases, this bill is as low as we could hope to have it, and I congratulate the House, the members of the House committee, and the conferees on the part of the House on the successful efforts they have made to cut this bill as low as it is. The bill as it now goes to the President carries $433,279,574; this is $139,851,680.80 less than the estimates. In other words, the Congress has saved this sum in appropriating for the Navy, and yet the sum appropriated is overgenerous. What a commentary this is on the reckless and extravagant estimates of the departments!

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report, and move the previous question on that motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the motion by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks on the subject of general legislation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on general legislation. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. And, Mr. Speaker, if I refer to the bonus legislation at all it will be simply a reference to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wyoming if he is to show us exactly how much we will save?

Mr. MONDELL. I shall try to do so.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman gotten us out of debt yet?

Mr. MONDELL. Not quite.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming calls up a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on the 5th day of June, 1920, at 4 o'clock.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I think in the consideration of this important resolution there ought to be more Members here than there are, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. There is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Ellsworth	Kahn	Riddick
Anthony	Elston	Kendall	Rowan,
Bacharach	Emerson	Kettner	Rowe,
Baer	Evans, Nev.	Kiess	Rucker
Booher	Ferris	Kitchin	Sanders, La.
Bowers	Frear	Kreider	Sanford
Brinson	Fuller, Mass.	Langley	Scully
Brooks, Ill.	Garland	Lankford	Sears
Brumbaugh	Godwin	Lazaro	Sherwood
Campbell, Pa.	Goodall	Lehlbach	Shreve
Cantrill	Gould	Lesher	Slemp
Caraway	Graham, Pa.	McClintic	Small
Carss	Greene, Mass.	McCulloch	Smith, Ill.
Carter	Griffin	McKeown	Smith, Mich.
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	McKinley	Smithwick
Cole	Hardy, Colo.	McLane	Snyder
Cooper	Hardy, Tex.	McPherson	Steele
Copley	Harreld	Mason	Strong, Pa.
Costello	Hastings	Moore, Ohio	Sullivan
Crowther	Hayden	Morin	Taylor, Tenn.
Curry, Calif.	Heflin	Nelson, Wis.	Tillman
Dale	Hernandez	Newton, Minn.	Towner
Dempsey	Hill	Nicholls	Upshaw
Dewalt	Houghton	Paige	Vare
Doremus	Howard	Parker	Venable
Drane	Hulings	Randall, Calif.	Ward
Drewry	Hutchinson	Randall, Wis.	Watson
Echols	Ireland	Reber	Yates
Edmonds	Jefferis	Rhodes	Young, N. Dak.

The SPEAKER. On this call 303 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to amend the resolution which I presented by adding at the end of it the letters "p. m."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks leave to add the letters "p. m." Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think amendment is necessary, but some gentlemen thought it was, and so we will make assurance doubly sure.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has been in session almost continuously for more than a year. During that time it has considered a very great volume of highly important business. We have passed or will have passed before we adjourn all of the regular appropriation bills of this session and eight of the regular appropriation bills that should have been passed by the former session. We have had some of the most important questions and problems before us that any legislative body has ever considered. All the more important legislation has been disposed of. We have not and we will not by Saturday night have considered and settled all of the questions that have been brought to the attention of the Congress, possibly not all of the questions that ought to be passed upon one way or another; but we shall have disposed of, so far at least as the House is concerned, practically every important matter before us for consideration.

Congress is a very important body in America, and yet there are times when the country is just as well off and just as happy with the Congress in adjournment. [Applause.] We might remain in session all summer, and possibly if we did we might settle some questions not wholly, fully, and completely settled now. But, after all, I know of none and I think of none that we can settle that is so important that it can not wait until December. The Members of the Congress have earned a vacation—have abundantly earned it. [Applause.] In my opinion the country will justify and approve our standing in adjournment when the regular appropriation bills are passed and the other measures now immediately before us are disposed of.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment.

I realize that in a matter of this kind there is always an opportunity, or at least a temptation, to play politics. I know personally that practically every man in the House—well, there are some exceptions, but they are negligible in number—practically every man in the House desires and hopes for an adjournment. [Applause.] I want to express the hope that gentlemen feeling that way will not make the effort to secure a little possible political advantage at home by voting against this adjournment resolution and praying at the same time that it will pass. [Applause.] If we vote our convictions on this resolution, convictions as I know them, for I have taken the trouble to talk with Members on both sides about this matter, we will vote for the adjournment.

I have not brought this resolution in hurriedly, without consideration, without consultation with gentlemen on both sides of the aisle; I have brought it in only after I was satisfied that the overwhelming majority of the Members of this House desire an adjournment, and I have only brought it in in this form because I believed that it embodied and proposed the action which gentlemen desire. I have presented it here for the purpose of meeting the view, accomplishing the hope and the expectation, of gentlemen on both sides. Therefore I trust there will be few, if any, votes against it.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the country realizes that whether or not this Congress has lived up to the best expectations of the American people, whether or not it has accomplished all that might have been accomplished, it has been earnest, it has been industrious, and it has been devoted to the public service. It has, or will have by the time the hour of adjournment comes, provided fully for the public service in the matter of appropriations and in the matter of legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. And in that state of affairs I think the people will indorse the good judgment of the Congress in adjourning.

Mr. BLANTON. Unfortunately, the Congress has not pleased Mr. Gompers.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I agree with what the gentleman has said as to the desire of this Congress to adjourn. However, there is a matter, I think, if we are to adjourn, should receive attention before we do so. A great many of the Congressmen here, no doubt a majority of them, know something about the very serious condition that is prevailing throughout the country with reference to coal. Many manufacturing institutions in Indiana are now shutting down; some of the very largest will have to shut down in a very few days. They can not get coal because of the fact that they say when they go to the mines to get it they can not get it because the mines are filling export contracts.

Mr. MONDELL. As I understand it, the gentleman thinks we ought to have a coal embargo—an embargo on exports?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If it is necessary in order to take care of our coal, I will say, yes.

Mr. MONDELL. That is a very large question, a question that has very many sides to it, and on which there would be a very great diversity of opinion.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, we shall not have settled all of the questions and all of the problems that all of the people of the country have in their thoughts and on their minds, and we never will, and no Congress ever will, no matter when the hour of adjournment shall come. The work of a Congress, like the work of a housewife, is never done, and the time will never come when it can be said that every question and every problem that anyone may think should be disposed of has been disposed of when a Congress adjourned. If we were here a month or two or three months, for every matter settled two would arise.

Mr. OLIVER. The small city and country newspapers are vitally interested in certain legislation now pending before a Senate committee in reference to print paper. Is the gentleman informed as to whether any legislation on that subject will be considered before adjournment?

Mr. MONDELL. I think it is rather doubtful, because I do not think that the majority of the Congress now has in mind very clearly any legislation that Congress should enact that would cure the situation, but if there is anything we can do we should and before we adjourn.

Mr. OLIVER. My information is that definite recommendations have been made to the Senate committee on the subject, and it is thought that if legislation following such recommendations is now enacted it will be of material help to a most distressing situation.

Mr. BRIGGS. I want to ask the gentleman if it is contemplated to take any definite action in the way of passing legislation in connection with the recommendations of the joint commission on postal salaries at this session?

Mr. MONDELL. I can not say definitely but I hope so.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say in reply to the question of the gentleman, if the gentleman will permit, that the joint commission has made its report, that the report is unanimous, and it was accompanied by a bill, which bill was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads last night; that bill has been reported to the House to-day, and it is contemplated that we shall ask for its consideration on Thursday morning. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PADGETT. There is a very pressing and important matter in which the farmers of the country are interested, and for lack of which they are suffering; that is, nitrates. I wanted to know if there is any purpose to relieve that situation by legislation? There are bills pending, one introduced by the gentleman for California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. MONDELL. I think there is no one who knows better than my friend who just interrupted that there is nothing that this Congress can do at this time that will aid in securing at any time in the near future an additional supply of nitrates for the farmer. There are bills pending which would allow the expenditure of a very great amount of public money in the hope on the part of some gentlemen that out of that very great expenditure, some time in the very distant future, we might have an increased supply of nitrates.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit a further question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. There is legislation pending which, if enacted, would relieve the situation, in my opinion, by operating plants that the Government has already constructed and that are ready for operation.

Mr. MONDELL. We will try to take care of all these matters that can be cared for.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. EAGAN. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], is it the gentleman's opinion that we will have definite legislative action on the report of the Joint Commission on Postal Salaries?

Mr. MONDELL. That is my understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays are demanded. Those who desire taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-six gentlemen have risen—not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed and move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was passed and to lay that motion on the table. Without objection, the motion will be agreed to.

Mr. WINGO. I object, Mr. Speaker. I objected to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the gentleman. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 125, noes 52.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-five Members are present—a quorum. The ayes have it, and the motion to lay on the table prevails.

CHANGE IN THE RULES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately on the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to consider House resolution 324, under the general rules of the House.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Has this resolution been reported to the House?

Mr. FESS. It has been. Does the gentleman mean from the Committee on Rules?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The other committee.

Mr. FESS. Yes. The rule makes in order for immediate consideration resolution 324, which provides for a change in the rules of the House on matters pertaining to appropriations.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] begins will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GARRETT. It occurs to me that it might be desirable, if the gentleman is agreeable, to see about the arrangement for time. I suspect there are a number of gentlemen who do not know just what this is. This is the budget rule that provides for an appropriation committee of 35 members. I want to say now that I have at this time no request for time on the rule, and I am not opposed to the rule, but some gentlemen have indicated that they desire time on the rule which comes from the Budget Committee; and under the practice of this rule, if it is adopted, there will be just an hour, which, of course, will be held within the control of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]; and it just occurred to me that perhaps we might couple the two propositions together and agree upon time.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There is no limit upon the time.

Mr. GARRETT. So far as the rule is concerned there is not.

Mr. FESS. I understood that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. GOOD] would try to get an agreement as to time as soon as we have disposed of the rule.

I yield to my friend from Tennessee for any suggestion he might make.

Mr. GARRETT. Let us for the moment couple the two propositions together and see if the gentleman from Iowa can help us out of the situation. Has the gentleman from Iowa any proposition in mind as to time?

Mr. GOOD. I have conferred with those who are opposed to the proposition and with those who are in favor of the proposition, and I am frank to say to the gentleman that when the rule is adopted I shall ask that my time be extended for one hour, and then I will yield one-half of that time to those who are opposed to the proposition, and if additional time is required the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], the ranking member on that side, will be entitled to one hour. The matter is technical, and I understand a motion to recommit has been prepared and that it will be offered as a substitute at the close.

Mr. GARRETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I will call the matter to the attention of the gentleman now. I had not heard of that motion to recommit before, but I doubt if that motion would be in order if anybody would make a point of order. It is not in order to move to recommit a report from the Committee on Rules. It is true that this is not a report from the Committee on Rules, but this is the report of a rule, and I doubt if it would be in order to recommit it.

Mr. GOOD. I wanted to make this suggestion to the gentleman, that it is the character of the committee that reports it which determines. The Budget Committee is a legislative committee, and while it reports out the rule, so far as I am concerned I have no objection to the motion to recommit, and will not raise that question, and I hope no one else will.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not know. I just merely suggested that question. I presume that the arrangement which the gentleman from Iowa has suggested will be carried out, and that he will request an hour additional; that is to say, two hours in all.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. And will divide that time equally between those for and those against. I presume that will be adhered to by the House when the time comes to make the request; and with that statement I have no requests for time on the rule.

Mr. GOOD. I want to suggest that the time which I yield will be only for debate and not for the offering of amendments, and it is to be equally divided.

Mr. GARRETT. As I understand, it is the purpose of the gentleman himself to offer one amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I am going to offer one amendment suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and another amendment to correct a typographical error only.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the purpose to confine the debate exclusively to the subject matter of the budget proposition?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is it the understanding that H. Res. 324 is to be read by sections, that each section is subject to amendment to be read under the five-minute rule?

Mr. FESS. It is to be considered as a House bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It will not be read for amendment—not read under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HAUGEN. And what is the arrangement as to the general debate?

Mr. FESS. That will be reached after the adoption of the rule. The understanding is that we are to have two hours, to be equally divided between those for and those against the resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the new rule would eliminate the numerous appropriating committees as appropriating committees, leaving them simply as legislative committees, and confining the appropriations to one committee, which, I think, it is quite apparent was the original idea when the Committee on Appropriations was first established, in order to centralize all the appropriations under one committee and thus avoid duplication and waste of public funds. But since that date the appropriating function has been so extended that as you now recognize, instead of one Committee on Appropriations, as originally planned, we have at least eight appropriation committees. The purpose of this resolution is to confine the appropriations to one committee, to be created under the authority of this resolution now before us, which the rule makes in order for immediate consideration. The committee is to be composed of 35 members, so that evidently it will permit subcommittees representing all of the committees which now are appropriation committees.

I have noted that there has been a good deal of opposition to that suggestion from individual Members, but I feel that the opposition is not tenable, for the reason that we are trying to get away from the one position of making the committee which reports a bill purely a committee of advocacy, giving it a trading position, which has come to be known as pork-barrel legislation. We are trying to get away from the practice of providing for a particular activity of the Government with no relation at all to the other activities of the Government. Under the present system we find not only duplication but that the committee reporting one of these bills is anxious not to hold down the estimates, but rather to get a larger appropriation to meet the alleged needs of that particular branch of the service as estimated by the spokesman of the service. Another committee is equally anxious, indeed it may be said that every committee is ambitious for funds, and we see eight committees working, not together, but each working for itself with no relationship whatever to one another, and with small regard to the sum total of all the committees. This proposed rule is intended to cure that, to make all of the appropriating agencies in one committee, so that every part of that committee will be making its appropriations with reference, not only to each part, but especially to what the whole committee will ultimately make. The committees of the present Congress have made a splendid record in economies, but it is largely due to the general demand. As soon as this demand passes we will be back to the old order.

It seems to me that among all the constructive and reconstructive measures of this Congress or any other Congress that has sat in the past years, here is a proposal that is going to meet not only with the approval of the business of the country, but also with the approval of the people at large.

I think the passage of the budget bill almost unanimously showed the universal demand for it. That bill is now before the President, and is likely to be signed very shortly. This resolution is the last step to make the budget system a reality. It is supplemental to the budget bill, and is necessary to make it workable. I want to say to my friends who have spoken to me in antagonism to it that I think that to refuse this proposed change of rule would be to adopt a plan and then emasculate it by denying the power of making the plan workable. To me it would be totally inconsistent to go to the extent to which we have already gone, to adopt the budget system in response to an almost universal demand of the country and then refuse to do the one thing necessary to make the system operative. The refusal to make it workable leads to the conviction that those who refrain from openly opposing the system so universally demanded have seized upon this plan to conceal their opposition most effectively.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman has stated his view as to how this committee of 35 would be made up. Is that just the gentleman's notion? There is certainly nothing in the resolution to provide how this enlarged Committee on Appropriations shall be made up.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman from Ohio has expressed only his individual opinion. I should think that would be a very reasonable statement to make.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman refer to the reasonableness of my statement? It was not a statement, but a question.

Mr. FESS. I refer to both of them—the reasonableness of my statement and the reasonableness of the gentleman's inquiry. Both are rational.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman knows that this committee of 35 can be made up just as the House shall direct how it shall be made up, and perhaps the gentlemen connected with other committees will not be consulted when this committee is made up. The gentleman gives me only his personal opinion as to the composition of this committee.

Mr. FESS. I have no right whatever to say how a committee of this sort will be made up, first because I have no information on the matter.

Mr. BUTLER. Would it not have been well to have obtained some information?

Mr. FESS. But it strikes me that in making up the committee certainly the men who from long service on the committees have been informed on the various activities of the Government would be recognized in the appointments which are to be made.

Mr. BUTLER. Would there have been anything really objectionable in having the gentleman's views incorporated into this resolution, so that the resolution itself should state how the committee should be composed? That would have given us some information to go upon.

Mr. FESS. Speaking for myself, I do not think that would be at all essential.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman says that in carrying out the budget plan this is the one thing that remains to be done. Is this the only plan that the committee recommending the proposition has considered and is able to tell us about, or has it considered other plans, so that perhaps we might be able to choose between different plans?

Mr. FESS. This is the one plan that has come from the Budget Committee to the Committee on Rules, and it seems to me that it is a most rational proposal and sufficiently valuable that no other plan would need to be submitted, at least I have not thought of any other plan, and the committee submitted it, or at least has reported no other plan.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Was no other plan discussed by the committee?

Mr. FESS. I am not a member of the Budget Committee and I do not know whether there was or not.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It seems to me that there was room for some difference of opinion as to the proposition, and some members of the committee might have had other views in the way of carrying out the budget proposition beside this.

Mr. FESS. I am not a member of the Budget Committee and therefore could not speak as to whether there was any other suggestion or not. I am satisfied, however, with this proposition as far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman from Ohio will yield, the Budget Committee considered every plan presented to it, and we had a large number of the most distinguished people in the United States before us.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will we be able to hear what other plans were considered, so that we can intelligently decide in regard to it?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Undoubtedly the chairman of the committee will answer that question fully.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In the event that this rule is adopted what will be the functions of committees that have heretofore been appropriation committees?

Mr. FESS. They will be legislative committees only, just as the other committees of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. And they will not have the right to recommend appropriations?

Mr. FESS. Yes, they can recommend appropriations but can not make appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. CANNON. Under the Constitution the House organizes itself. You may adopt this rule now, and if it goes into effect the budget system will be carried out so far as the recommendations are concerned. But when a new Congress is elected it makes its own rules and it may adopt this rule or it may adopt another rule.

Mr. FESS. Yes, if they do not want this they can eliminate it and adopt other rules. Rules of the House are limited to the Congress which adopts them.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. I understood the gentleman to say that these other committees that have heretofore had jurisdiction of appropriations would be permitted to legislate.

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does not the gentleman understand that all legislation is dependent on appropriations? As stated by the gentleman from Ohio the other day, the bonus bill carried no appropriation. What becomes of a bonus bill unless you have an appropriation for it? So all along the line. We passed the Army bill the other day with the contention that there were three times as many men provided for as there ought to be, but it was said that it would be regulated by the appropriations. Why not be fair and say that if this rule is adopted it means that 435 Members surrender their power and jurisdiction to 35 Members? Why not be honest with the House and state the facts?

Mr. FESS. I was trying to state the facts. We do not eliminate any committees. Committees are still in existence and have all the power they had before save the one and only power of appropriation that we take away from them and put in one committee.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. JUUL. May I state a concrete case to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. FESS. I will yield.

Mr. JUUL. The Committee on Agriculture came in here with a bill on which the Senate had put 202 amendments, and every one of them was a matter of finance. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that if we pass this bill a committee of 35 will sit to pass final judgment on all those amendments?

Mr. FESS. No; I do not mean anything of the kind. When any committee other than the Appropriation Committee brings in any appropriation it is not authorized to bring in it will be subject to a point of order which anybody can make.

Mr. JUUL. I am favorably disposed to a budget system. But the gentleman knows that the committee just mentioned has spent weeks and months perfecting a bill, and that the committee of conference has sat some weeks, and how can 35 Members split themselves up so as to settle the differences that it has taken all nine committees days and days to settle?

Mr. FESS. It will be a continuous performance. The 35 men will sit in subdivisions, if you put it that way. Each subdivision considering its particular subject must consult with all other interests, and in this way will be better able to subserve the interests of the country at large than could be done with seven or eight committees running at cross purposes, each getting what it can with no regard for the others. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there will be plenty of time for general debate, I will move the previous question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman will withhold that, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] said that there was no request for time on the rule, but since he left—and he had to go away to attend another meeting of the Committee on Rules—he requested me to say that if there was any request for time on his side to yield it for him.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman want time?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] wants five minutes, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] wants five minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 38 minutes.

Mr. FESS. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, would not the minority, under the rule, be entitled to 20 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The previous question has not been ordered.

Mr. FESS. We are proceeding under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. If the previous question had originally been ordered, there would be 20 minutes on a side, but the Chair understands that the gentleman from Ohio will yield.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, if it is considered the better plan, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to find out just what this rule provides for. It seems to me that Members of the House ought to have the opportunity to give a matter of this importance very careful and candid consideration. Here is a rule brought in to make in order another proposition to change the rules of the House. The principal point of the proposed change in the rules of the House, as I understand it, is to put into the hands of 35 Members of this House the right to report any and all appropriation bills. It takes away from the Committee on Agriculture, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, from the Committee on Military Affairs, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and from every other committee that now has the authority of appropriation the right to do so, and vests that power in one committee composed of 35 Members. I believe the place to defeat this resolution changing these rules is to vote down the rule that makes it in order to consider it, and that is the reason I am discussing the matter now. I am going to oppose the change in the rules. I am opposed to this one big committee that takes charge of all of the appropriations, and I believe the time to beat that proposition is to beat it right now, when we vote on this resolution that comes from the Committee on Rules.

I happen to have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture every year since I have been here, and I will have been here 10 years when I finish this term. I say to you that with 10 years of service on that committee I am in a better position to say what shall be appropriated for the various things that relate to agriculture than any two or three members on a subcommittee from an appropriation committee of 35 members. I say to you that there are gentlemen here who have been on the Military Affairs Committee for years and years, gentlemen who

have been on the Naval Affairs Committee for years and years, and they are acquainted with all of the intricacies that relate to the affairs of their committees and are in better position to say how much shall be appropriated and how it shall be apportioned in the Committee on Military Affairs and in the Committee on Naval Affairs, and so on, than a subcommittee of a committee of 35 members composing this proposed new appropriation committee. I believe you are going to make a mistake if you adopt this rule and if you go ahead and adopt the change in the rules of the House, and I hope that the resolution from the Committee on Rules will not be agreed to. Let us make the test vote on the adoption of the rule.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this House for some years, and I never yet have made a point of no quorum, but I think a quorum ought to be present to listen to these remarks.

Mr. RUBEY. I think the gentleman should not make that point now.

Mr. ALMON. Very well. I withdraw the point for the present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter and will affect every Member of the House. It is going to affect the future policy of the House. I take it that every Member has at heart the welfare of the country and is in favor of economical appropriations, but I want to say this: It took 40 years' fight in the House of Representatives to obtain the present system of appropriating committees. It was under Hon. John H. Reagan, of Texas, who became chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, that we broke away from the power and tyranny of the great appropriations committee. As everyone familiar with the history of the procedure of the House of Representatives knows, the Ways and Means Committee for a long time raised the taxes and made the appropriations until 1865, when Thaddeus Stevens was appointed chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and Justin Morrill was left as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. It was until 1885 before the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations was taken away and distributed to the various committees of the House. It was done with the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and I refer you to the language in the RECORD of the great Speaker Reed, who was quoted in this report as being in favor of an appropriation committee having all of the jurisdiction. I refer you to his speech at the time they broke away in 1885 from the power of this great committee.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Speaker Reed did say that, but Speaker Reed also said that he made the greatest legislative mistake in his career when he did so.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I concede that the gentleman from Illinois is correct in his statement as to what Speaker Reed said, and I want to say to you that when you put all the power of appropriating money in the hands of one committee of this House, the rest of you may just as well pack up your trunks and go back home and stay there, for they will not have any use for you then.

What brought about the reform? It was the absolute power that was exercised by this Appropriations Committee. I have no fault to find with the personnel of the Committee on Appropriations of this House. They are fine men, they are high-class citizens, and they are alert to their duties as Members. Here is what we ought to have: You ought to have an excise committee in this House, composed of a man from every State in the Union, consisting of 48 members, who will sit and determine what the total amount is that shall be appropriated for the different purposes, and permit the various appropriating committees to make their own selections as to how the amount shall be appropriated in conformity with the budget system that you are going to put into effect. If you do as is proposed here, you will turn back the House 40 years and fix upon us a system that you will regret to the longest day you spend here.

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

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Oklahoma knows as well as any man in the House, because he is one of the distinguished Members of the House, that there must be a stop to this indiscriminate spending of the public money, and it will never stop as long as this committee and that committee and the other committee has appropriating power, because they all come to believe that they are compelled to introduce a bill and pass it appropriating large sums of money.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman knows that the whole matter is referred to the Congress, and oftentimes when an appropriating committee comes in with a bill the House raises the appropriations or lowers them over the protests of the appropriating committee and its chairman. The matter is all left to the House. We talk a lot about economy, but many do not practice what they preach.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKEOWN. May I have two minutes more, in order to finish?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. McKEOWN. I am in favor of economy. I have undertaken to vote on every occasion in favor of economy, but what I want to say to you is this: You should not take away from these committees their power to assemble and make appropriations for the different purposes for which the amount is to be appropriated. If you want to regulate the amount, have your excise committee fix the total which can be appropriated by any committee, and let that committee then appropriate as their needs from the hearings show they are entitled to be appropriated. I want to say to you I am not on any of these committees which appropriate money, and I have no selfish interest in making this fight, but I simply want to call attention to what is going to happen, that when you put the power of appropriating money in this one committee, the personnel of the committee will change as times go on, and they will become the sole power in this House, and the other committees will be mere nonentities without power to do anything, and this House will have one committee, which will be the Appropriations Committee. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time at my disposal to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to take my chances with one appropriating committee that is to have all possible authority in the House. I am not afraid, like my colleague from Oklahoma, that they will treat the other Members of Congress with indifference. If they do not treat us right, we can devil the very life out of them, and my friend ought to know that. But the time has come when this Congress has got to stop spending the people's money indiscriminately. That time will never come until the appropriating power is put in the hands of an appropriating committee. Where every committee here and there indiscriminately has power of appropriation extravagance will never stop. This Nation, as has been said so many times by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], has not any money of its own. Every dollar that it has it gets out of the pockets of the people through taxation. We hear so much about reducing taxes. Taxes will never be reduced until we quit spending so much money, because when we spend less money we have to take less money from the people. That is the way to reduce taxes, to quit spending, and we are not going to quit spending until we have some new system of economy in Congress, and I am glad to see this proposition come before the House. It is not any big bugaboo anyhow, and I hope both the rule and the resolution will pass. It will save at least $100,000,000 per annum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, what I have to say here is impersonal. It matters not to me what you may do. I do not expect to take part in making appropriations very much longer for the support of the Naval Establishment, and therefore what I say has nothing in it that is personal or selfish. Permit me to say I have done the best I could do to be economical. Within the last half hour gentlemen of the House have commended the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House for its economy. Now you propose to take from this committee authority which you have said your servants have well exercised. I want, however, to join, if it can be possible to them, enough gentlemen having a similar view; that we should have further assistance in the way of reducing appropriations—that is, keeping them down to the minimum and as much restraint as may be necessary—I will join with you in obtaining, but to take from these committees the work of distributing and allotting these sums after the sums have been fixed, I think, is unfair to them and the great work they have been doing. I believe you will dwarf the membership of the House if you do it and destroy the usefulness of Members of the House. This committee of 35 men to

be selected from the body of the House should have authority given it, in my judgment, to fix what the appropriations should be for the different bureaus and departments of the Government. Having once fixed the amount, even if it goes down to the appropriations for the different bureaus, that fixed sum should be handed over to these technical committees for the purpose of allotment, if I use the proper expression, for its distribution. Having once made the distribution the result should be reported back to this committee for its approval. That far I will go and I will be very glad if such a provision as that could be made.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Of course, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. How long does it take the Committee on Naval Affairs to hear the testimony regarding the appropriations for the naval appropriation bills? Weeks, does it not?

Mr. BUTLER. It takes from 10 to 12 weeks.

Mr. KAHN. Does the gentleman think that if one committee has charge of all these appropriations proper care and attention would be paid to the details?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I am not holding out as an example anything I have done in 24 years upon the Committee on Naval Affairs, for I do not. Other men must succeed us. We are growing old. I have known men who sat at the foot of the table finally come to the head on several occasions. I only ask that the right may be given to these men to make the distribution of the fund after another body has determined what the amount should be. I will go that far, but I do not think, as I said a while ago, it is worth while for me to make any suggestions.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER. You have to beg for time in order to express yourself in this House, and the time has certainly come when the membership of the House will assert itself.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I will.

Mr. HICKS. Can a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handle naval affairs as well or better than 21 men who give all their time to it?

Mr. BUTLER. I should think not. I have had many years of experience, and I know the time and patience required of men to sit and act intelligently on this committee.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, I am most heartily in favor of House resolution 324. The very essence of a budgetary system is concentration of appropriations in one committee. Having voted for the budget bill, we are in honor bound to adopt this resolution. In no other way can we consummate an effective national budget system.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am not exercised over the question of who shall wield the power in this House. It is not a question of who shall do the business of this House. The sole question is how the business of the House can best be done, and to that I intend, and to that alone, to address myself.

Now, let me give an illustration. I am at present one of the conferees on the rivers and harbors bill. The Senate is smaller than we are. They have 96 Members as against our 435. Their duties on committees are, consequently, very much greater. Take the situation: We found when we went over in conference that the members of the Senate committee did not know the facts, because they did not have the time to learn the facts. Now, how is it going to be humanly possible for the members of one committee to take all the proof that is required in order to learn, with patience and with diligence and with care, the basic facts upon which your appropriations ought to be made? Any man who has studied the work of these various committees knows that that can not be done.

Now, I want to go with the management of the House; I want to do what is the right thing to do. I am in favor of a budget plan, but it does seem to me that you do not, because you are going to take the step, have to jump at once from the top of a 17-story building down to the street. Why can you not try it out, at least, in this way—why can not you have the central committee determine the amount that can be spent by these various committees, and have the various committees take evidence, and then distribute those amounts? They can find the facts infinitely better than one committee can. And it is well said, too, that when you permit this central committee to put on it one or two men from these other committees, you are delegating to 2 men the work that is now performed by 21. And any man who has sat in these hearings knows that each one of the 21 contributes some individual thought. These men represent various parts of this Union. One man may not know about New Orleans, but another man may come from that vicinity and may understand the situation there. Another man may know about the California coast and about the situation there.

Mr. HICKS. Our colleague from New York [Mr. MAGEE] made a statement a moment ago that he felt the House was in honor bound to vote for this rule, because they voted for the budget system a day or two ago. My other colleague from New York can not agree with that suggestion, can he?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Why, I am in favor of the budget system which was adopted, as I have just said——

Mr. MAGEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Allow me to finish the sentence, please. But I am not in favor of the gentleman's method of carrying it out. I agree with him in principle. I do not think his plan is practical. I do not think it will work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAGO). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I ask for one minute more.

Mr. FESS. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do think that the modified plan which I have suggested, the plan of allowing the central committee to determine and allot the amount, and then allow these several committees to distribute that amount, is practical. I believe that it will work. I believe it will bring the combined intellect, and combined effort, and combined knowledge of a large number, nearly 150 men, where otherwise you will have the judgment of only two or three men. And I think we want that combined intellect, that combined effort; I think we want that combined knowledge; and for that reason I am in favor of a modification of this rule.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that if the resolution is adopted there will be two hours, at least, of debate on the merits of it, I therefore move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio moves the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of no quorum. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Elston	Kiess	Rhodes
Bacharach	Emerson	Kitchin	Riddick
Baer	Evans, Nev.	Kreider	Riordan
Booher	Ferris	Langley	Rowan
Brinson	Fisher	Lankford	Rucker
Britten	Freeman	Lehlbach	Sanders, La.
Brooks, Ill.	Fuller, Mass.	Lesher	Scully
Burke	Garland	Lufkin	Sears
Campbell, Kans.	Garrett	Luhring	Sherwood
Campbell, Pa.	Godwin	McClintic	Shreve
Cantrill	Goodall	McCulloch	Slemp
Caraway	Gould	McKenzie	Small
Carss	Graham, Pa.	McKinley	Smith, Ill.
Carter	Greene, Mass.	McLane	Smith, Mich.
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Mansfield	Smith, N. Y.
Cole	Hardy, Colo.	Mason	Smithwick
Cooper	Harreld	Moore, Ohio	Snyder
Copley	Hastings	Morgan	Steele
Costello	Hayden	Morin	Stephens, Miss.
Crisp	Hays	Nelson, Wis.	Strong, Pa.
Crowther	Hernandez	Newton, Minn.	Sullivan
Curry, Calif.	Houghton	Olney	Taylor, Tenn.
Dale	Hulings	Paige	Tillman
Dent	Hull, Tenn.	Parker	Towner
Dewalt	Hutchinson	Pou	Upshaw
Donovan	Ireland	Ramseyer	Vare
Drane	Kendall	Randall, Calif.	Watson
Echols	Kennedy, Iowa	Randall, Wis.	Yates
Ellsworth	Kettner	Reber	Young, N. Dak.

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eleven Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is pending.

Mr. HAUGEN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended one hour on the discussion of the rule, and that the time be equally divided between those for and against.

Mr. GOOD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution reported from the Committee on Rules.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CALDWELL. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 69, noes 69.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). One hundred and eighty-seven Members are present—not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. As many as are in favor of agreeing to the rule will, when their names are called, vote "yea"; those opposed will vote "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 154, not voting 115, as follows:

YEAS—158.

Ackerman	Fairfield	Kreider	Ricketts
Ashbrook	Fess	Lonergan	Robinson, N. C.
Babka	Foster	Longworth	Rose
Barbour	Frear	Luce	Sabath
Barkley	French	Luhring	Sanders, Ind.
Bee	Fuller, Ill.	McAndrews	Sanders, N. Y.
Benson	Gallagher	McFadden	Sanford
Black	Gallivan	McKenzie	Schall
Bland, Ind.	Garner	MacCrate	Scott
Bland, Mo.	Glynn	Madden	Siegel
Bland, Va.	Good	Magee	Sims
Blanton	Goodykoontz	Maher	Sisson
Box	Graham, Ill.	Mann, S. C.	Snell
Buchanan	Green, Iowa	Mapes	Stiness
Burdick	Griest	Mays	Stoll
Burroughs	Hadley	Merritt	Strong, Kans.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hamilton	Michener	Sumners, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hersey	Miller	Sweet
Cannon	Hersman	Minahan, N. J.	Taylor, Colo.
Casey	Hickey	Monahan, Wis.	Temple
Chindblom	Hill	Mondell	Thompson
Christopherson	Hoch	Montague	Tilson
Classon	Howard	Mooney	Timberlake
Connally	Huddleston	Moore, Va.	Tincher
Cramton	Humphreys	Moores, Ind.	Tinkham
Currie, Mich.	Igoe	Morgan	Treadway
Dallinger	James	Murphy	Valle
Davis, Minn.	Jefferis	Ogden	Vestal
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Ky.	Parrish	Walsh
Denison	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Walters
Doremus	Johnson, Wash.	Platt	Wason
Dowell	Johnston, N. Y.	Porter	Webster
Drewry	Jones, Pa.	Purnell	Wheeler
Dunbar	Juul	Quin	White, Me.
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Radcliffe	Wilson, Ill.
Dyer	Kelly, Pa.	Rainey, J. W.	Wood, Ind.
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	Young, Tex.
Elliott	Kinkaid	Rayburn	Zihlman
Esch	Kleczka	Reavis	
Evans, Mont.	Kraus	Reed, W. Va.	

NAYS—154.

Almon	Crisp	Griffin	Lee, Ga.
Anderson	Cullen	Hamill	Linthicum
Anthony	Darrow	Harrison	Little
Aswell	Davey	Haugen	Lufkin
Ayres	Dempsey	Hawley	McArthur
Bankhead	Dent	Heflin	McDuffie
Begg	Dickinson, Mo.	Hicks	McGlennon
Bell	Dickinson, Iowa	Hoey	McKeown
Benham	Dominick	Holland	McKiniry
Blackmon	Donovan	Hudspeth	McLaughlin, Mich.
Boies	Dooling	Hull, Iowa	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Bowers	Doughton	Hull, Tenn.	McPherson
Brand	Dupré	Jacoway	MacGregor
Briggs	Eagle	Jones, Tex.	Major
Britten	Edmonds	Kahn	Mann, Ill.
Brooks, Pa.	Evans, Nebr.	Kearns	Martin
Browne	Fields	Keller	Mead
Butler	Fisher	Kincheloe	Milligan
Caldwell	Focht	King	Moon
Candler	Fordney	Lampert	Mudd
Carew	Gandy	Lanham	Neely
Clark, Mo.	Ganly	Larsen	Nelson, Mo.
Cleary	Goldfogle	Layton	Newton, Mo.
Collier	Goodwin, Ark.	Lazaro	Nicholls
Crago	Greene, Vt.	Lea, Calif.	Nolan
O'Connell	Reed, N. Y.	Steenerson	Weaver
O'Connor	Riordan	Stephens, Ohio	Welling
Oldfield	Robsion, Ky.	Stevenson	Welty
Oliver	Rogers	Summers, Wash.	Whaley
Olney	Romjue	Swope	White, Kans.
Osborne	Rouse	Tague	Williams
Overstreet	Rubey	Taylor, Ark.	Wilson, La.
Padgett	Sells	Thomas	Wilson, Pa.
Park	Sinclair	Venable	Wingo
Pell	Sinnott	Vinson	Wise
Peters	Smith, Idaho	Voigt	Woods, Va.
Rainey, Ala.	Smith, N. Y.	Volstead	Wright
Rainey, H. T.	Steagall	Ward	
Raker	Stedman	Watkins	

NOT VOTING—115.

Andrews, Md.	Emerson	Kettner	Rowan
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Nev.	Kiess	Rowe
Bacharach	Ferris	Kitchin	Rucker
Baer	Flood	Knutson	Sanders, La.
Booher	Freeman	Langley	Scully
Brinson	Fuller, Mass.	Lankford	Sears
Brooks, Ill.	Gard	Lehlbach	Sherwood
Brumbaugh	Garland	Lesher	Shreve
Burke	Garrett	McClintic	Slemp
Campbell, Kans.	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Small
Campbell, Pa.	Goodall	McKinley	Smith, Ill.
Cantrill	Gould	McLane	Smith, Mich.
Caraway	Graham, Pa	Mansfield	Smithwick
Carss	Greene, Mass.	Mason	Snyder
Carter	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Ohio	Steele
Clark, Fla.	Hardy, Tex.	Morin	Stephens, Miss.
Coady	Harreld	Mott	Strong, Pa.
Cole	Hastings	Nelson, Wis.	Sullivan
Cooper	Hayden	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Copley	Hays	Paige	Tillman
Costello	Hernandez	Parker	Towner
Crowther	Houghton	Pou	Upshaw
Curry, Calif.	Hulings	Ramseyer	Vare
Dale	Husted	Randall, Calif.	Watson
Dewalt	Hutchinson	Randall, Wis.	Winslow
Drane	Ireland	Reber	Woodyard
Echols	Johnson, Miss.	Rhodes	Yates
Ellsworth	Kendall	Riddick	Young, N. Dak.
Elston	Kennedy, Iowa	Rodenberg	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. SLEMP (for) with Mr. RANDALL of California (against).

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota (for) with Mr. HASTINGS (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. HARDY of Texas.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. ELSTON with Mr. DRANE.

Mr. COLE with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. CARTER.

Mr. RHODES with Mr. TILLMAN.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. MASON with Mr. POU.

Mr. GARLAND with Mr. CARSS.

Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. SMITHWICK.

Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. PAIGE with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. VARE with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.

Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. MCLANE.

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. LESHER.

Mr. DALE with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. MORAN with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. JONES of Texas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. SHREVE with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. COADY.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. GARD.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. MANSFIELD.

Mr. HERNANDEZ with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. HUSTED with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. ECHOLS with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. LANKFORD.

Mr. COOPER with Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire if the gentleman from New York, Mr. HOUGHTON, is recorded as having voted on this roll call.

The SPEAKER. He is recorded as voting "nay."

Mr. PLATT. He is not present. He is out of town.

Mr. HICKS. He is not present. He went home Saturday night.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New York, Mr. HOUGHTON, present? The Chair being informed that he is not in the city, his vote will be stricken from the roll call. On this vote the yeas are 158, the nays 154, and the rule is agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this vote is so close that I ask for a recapitulation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is a reasonable request. The Chair will direct a recapitulation of the vote.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry: On the recapitulation, can any Member change his vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he can.

The Clerk recapitulated the names of those voting.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the conferees on the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 13266), I desire to report that the conferees have been unable to agree.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota presents a conference report for printing under the rule.

APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended one hour, and if that consent is granted I shall yield that amount of time to those opposed to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time be extended one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. CALDWELL. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman designate to whom he is going to distribute the hour on the other side?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield to such persons as may be indicated, if gentlemen will have a list made.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will ask the gentleman to change his request, so as to have the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] handle one-half of the time.

Mr. GOOD. I desire to retain the floor and the control of the resolution, but have no desire to yield the time during that hour to anyone except to those persons who are opposed to the resolution, and who may be agreed upon.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. Will not the gentleman yield one lump hour to some one who is opposed, so that he can distribute the time, and the gentleman from Iowa retain the other hour?

Mr. GOOD. I will say that if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] will ask recognition for one hour—he is the ranking Member on that side—and he will yield, I understand, one-half of his time to some one on that side.

Mr. RUBEY. In addition to the amount you are asking for?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; so that we may have three hours.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] would not be entitled to recognition.

Mr. GOOD. He is the ranking Member on that side.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But he is not opposed to the resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How much time would that give on the rule?

Mr. GOOD. That would give us two hours. Does the gentleman want further time?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I just wanted to know what it was.

Mr. PADGETT. I understood the gentleman to say three hours a moment ago.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has made the suggestion that the gentleman from Tennessee, not being opposed to the resolution, would not be entitled to the floor. I desire to retain the floor for obvious reasons which the gentleman can well understand, but do not desire to cut off the debate in any way.

Mr. FIELDS. Then is not somebody who is opposed to the resolution entitled to that hour?

Mr. CALDWELL. Instead of yielding five minutes to one Member and six minutes to another Member, and so on, will not the gentleman yield one hour of his time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT]?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] controls the time, either one hour or two hours, and should yield to anyone to offer an amendment, would he not lose the floor?

The SPEAKER. He would.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. So that evidently the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] does not intend to permit anyone to offer an amendment?

Mr. GOOD. I understand there will be a motion to recommit which will embody the ideas of those opposed to the resolution.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Somebody's ideas. I do not know whose.

Mr. PELL. Are you going to have two hours anyhow?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know whether there will be two hours general debate.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request, that my time be extended by two hours, and with that understanding I will yield one-half of the time for debate to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], but not for offering amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two hours. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Unless it carries with it the opportunity to offer amendments, I shall object. I do not think we should pass this resolution without the opportunity of offering amendments.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. This matter was discussed 12 years ago, and we spent months in the discussion, and now are we to dispose of this matter in a few minutes?

Mr. GOOD. I have tried to get three hours.

Mr. HAUGEN. And we considered it before for nearly three months.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman had better be thankful for what they will give him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time be extended two hours. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I shall object unless that carries with it the right to offer amendments.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my time be extended one hour, and I will yield one-half of that to the gentleman from Tennessee for discussion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks that his time be extended one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If it is to be simply for debate, I object.

Mr. GOOD. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he knows of any amendment that will be offered which will aid in perfecting the resolution.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think most any amendment would aid in perfecting it. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 324.

Resolved, That the rules governing the procedure of the House of Representatives are hereby amended in the following manner:

Rule X: Clause 3 shall read as follows:

"3. On appropriations, to consist of 35 members."

Rule XI: Clauses 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, and 56 shall read as follows:

"3. To appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government—to the Committee on Appropriations.

"10. To agriculture and forestry—to the Committee on Agriculture.

"11. To the relations of the United States with foreign nations—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

"12. To the Military Establishment, including the increase or reduction of commissioned officers and enlisted men and their pay and allowances, the militia, and the public defense—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

"13. To the Naval Establishment, including the increase or reduction of commissioned officers and enlisted men and their pay and allowances and the increase of ships or vessels of all classes of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

"14. To the post office and post roads—to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

"16. To the relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

"56. The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Rules, on rules, joint rules, and order of business; the Committee on Elections, on the right of a Member to his seat; the Committee on Ways and Means, on bills raising revenue; the Committee on Appropriations, the general appropriation bills; the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, bills authorizing the improvement of rivers and harbors; the Committee on the Public Lands, bills for the forfeiture of land grants to railroad and other corporations, bills preventing speculation in the public lands, and bills for the reservation of the public lands for the benefit of actual and bona fide settlers; the Committee on the Territories, bills for the admission of new States; the Committee on Enrolled Bills, enrolled bills; the Committee on Invalid Pensions, general pension bills; the Committee on Printing, on all matters referred to them of printing for the use of the House or two Houses; and the Committee on Accounts, on all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of the House."

Rule XX: Add an additional clause, as follows:

"2. Any amendment of the Senate to a general appropriation bill which would be in violation of the provisions of clause 2 of Rule XXI, if said amendment had originated in the House, shall not be agreed to by the managers on the part of the House unless specific authority to agree to such amendment shall be first given by the House by a separate vote on every such amendment."

Rule XXI: Add an additional clause, as follows:

"5. No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing an appropriation be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A question of order on an appropriation in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time."

This resolution shall take effect on July 1, 1920.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew my request that my time be extended for two hours, and if this is granted I will yield one half of the time to the gentleman from Tennessee. I make no reservation as to the right to amend. While I think it is ill advised, I do not want to be accused of taking snap judgment on a matter of so much importance.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman yields for an amendment, does he not lose the floor?

The SPEAKER. That is the rule—if he yields for an amendment he loses the floor, unless some agreement is made to the contrary.

Mr. GOOD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. If I yield an hour and a half to the gentleman from Tennessee and he offers an amendment, do I lose the balance of the time I have reserved?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman can not yield an hour and a half for he only has an hour.

Mr. GOOD. I am proceeding upon the theory that my time is extended two hours.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that if the gentleman yields one-half of his time and says that he makes no reservation as to amendments and an amendment is offered, he would lose the floor.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I couple with that the further request that I shall not lose the floor by reason of the fact that any Member may offer an amendment during the time that he is occupying the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Reserving the right to object, we are considering this legislation——

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this matter might be straightened out. I suggest that we have three hours' debate; that the gentleman yield an hour and a half of it to those opposed to it; that they can offer an amendment if they wish; and that the gentleman from Iowa have the right to move the previous question at the end of the three hours.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota objected to that proposition, as the Chair understood.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not hear the proposition put before the House.

Mr. GOOD. What is the request the gentleman from Missouri makes?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The same request that was made before; that the gentleman from Iowa have his time extended to three hours for debate; that he yield one-half of it to those opposed; and that he have the right at the end of the three hours to move the previous question.

Mr. GOOD. That would be entirely satisfactory to me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time be extended to three hours for debate, and during that time amendments may be offered, and that the gentleman from Iowa shall have the right at the end of the three hours to move the previous question on the amendments and resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, the Committee on Rules could have put that in the rule, but they did not do it. They put the rule through, now let them live up to it. I object.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when there should be some centralization of power in the legislative branch of the Government to regulate expenditures. We have just passed what is known as a budget law. We propose to regulate the conduct of the executive branch of the Government. That compels the executive branch of the Government to give to the Congress of the United States a photograph, if I may so speak, of its program for the entire year. Now, that program as photographed in the budget as presented by the President should be visualized by some central body in the Congress which will be able to prevent extravagant expenditures, and it will not do for us to say that we have performed our full duty when we have placed upon the executive branch of the Government obligations to show their entire program and at the same time say that we will not reform the legislative branch of the Government in such a way as to compel it to show its full program or policy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not yield in five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Have the gentleman from Iowa grant you more time.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not believe he will; he can not in an hour. I maintain that it is an impossibility with eight great appropriating committees, which travel in different directions, to visualize the financial situation of the Nation and to correlate the great work of reform which must be recognized as needed to keep the expenses of the Government within the revenues.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I can not yield in five minutes. I maintain, further, that unless this resolution be adopted, we will have failed in the performance of one of the most important duties ever imposed upon Congress. The time has come when economy must be the watchword, and that watchword must be maintained through some central organization of this House which will be able to write the word economy into law, and you will not be able to do that unless you adopt this resolution. Thirty-five men working through subcommittees will be able to get all the information from the various departments which will enable them to so appropriate the money paid into the Treasury by the people as to work out the best possible means of economy. Only a few years ago we had but 300,000 taxpayers who paid money directly into the Treasury of the United States. To-day we have 3,400,000, and it will not be long before we have 5,000,000, and these 5,000,000 taxpayers are all alert to the need for economy. Extravagance such as has never been known before has existed throughout the Nation for a long period, and to-day we are confronted with a deficit now carried in Treasury certificates of more than $3,500,000,000. It is only by the most rigid system of economy that we can hope to pay this deficit with the revenues at our command. We can not afford to add to the further burdens of the taxpaying public. We must give them assurance of our sincerity in the claim that we are for an economical, efficient conduct of Government affairs, and unless we register our votes in favor of this resolution we will have said by our action that we are not in favor of economical reform in Government. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I had cherished the hope and belief that the question of autocracy, either by way of a change in the rules of this House or otherwise, a proposition thrashed out on this floor, voted on by the people, fought out 140 years ago, and again recently in France, one universally repudiated by the American people, had been forgotten. To my surprise, notwithstanding the fact that autocracy is generally looked upon with scorn and contempt, it appears here in a more malignant form than ever.

First, the stepping stone, the camouflage, the so-called budget bill, which, of course, has nothing to do with this proposition—the change in rules. The budget bill is one thing. It has reference to the preparation of the estimates or a budget by the executive branch of the Government. This is another. This change in the rules of the House has reference to the legislative branch; that is, it has reference to how appropriations shall be disposed of in the House. The question is, Shall 35 Members be given jurisdiction over appropriations instead of the 153 Members that now have jurisdiction over them? That is autocracy as against democracy, pure and simple.

My colleague, Mr. GOOD, stated:

> We not only make the President responsible for the amount asked for to run the Government, but we give the machinery.

When asked the question as to what extent it changes the responsibility of the President, the gentleman avoided the question. The Constitution defines the duties of Congress as well as the duties of the President. It is the duty of Congress to enact laws and to appropriate money. As everybody knows, not one dollar can be legally taken from the Treasury without authority by law. It is the duty of the President to administer the law, to expend the money in accordance with the acts of Congress, and from time to time to give the Congress information and recommend to its consideration such measure as he shall judge necessary and expedient. Thus the duties have been defined. It is unnecessary to say that Congress has not the sole power to change the Constitution, so nothing has been added to nor detracted from the prerogatives of either by the proposed legislation. All there is to it, is that a simple duty has

been performed. If the necessary machinery has not been provided for in the past, this is an acknowledgment of a dereliction of duty imposed upon Congress. It is either that, or it is camouflage, pure and simple. In the past the budgets, or the estimates, it matters not by which name you call them, have been made up and submitted, first, by the bureau chiefs; next, scrutinized and passed upon by the Secretaries for their respective departments; then by the Cabinet, including the President of the United States; and finally submitted to Congress. It is now proposed that one Secretary shall be given jurisdiction in the matter. If one Secretary can do better than ten Secretaries in preparing them, well and good. Nobody cares particularly whether estimates or budgets are prepared by one or ten Secretaries, just so that they are prepared properly. If the machinery proposed would improve upon the present system, nobody can nor should object. But here we have another question—the change in rules—one which has nothing to do with what has been done. It is now proposed to give 35 Members absolute jurisdiction over practically all the appropriations. The resolution provides that—

No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing an appropriation be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction; that a point of order may be raised against it at any time.

That simply means that the membership of the House surrenders its jurisdiction and power over appropriations.

There can be no question about the meaning of the resolution. The question then is, Can one committee of 35 members do or accomplish more in the direction of economy, justice, and a businesslike administration of the affairs of this Government than the seven committees with a membership of 22 members each now provided for by the present rules? If it is to be admitted that the committees to be dispensed with, consisting of 154, including the great Committee on Appropriations, have failed in their effort to properly and judiciously appropriate public money, I do not believe that anyone is egotistical enough to claim that a committee with a membership of 35, in all probabilities made up largely from the membership of the Committee on Appropriations, can accomplish more than the 154 members on the seven committees at present. If the Congress is guilty of dereliction of its duty, incompetency, prejudice, or discrimination in appropriating public money, what should be done to correct it? If guilty of one or the other or all, the only remedy, of course, is at the polls. It is then for the public to elect men of the highest type of character; men with business training and experience. I for one do not subscribe to the insinuation conveyed in the resolution, for in my opinion the remedy is in providing for the adequate number of committees, thus making it possible to carefully scrutinize and pass upon every item, so that every dollar of the public funds may be properly appropriated and expended.

In my opinion we should have cooperation. Representatives of appropriating committees should confer and fix the limit of appropriations to be made by each committee. Or the steering committee should be given authority, under the rules, to do what it is doing. As you know, the steering committee during the present session gave consideration to the estimates submitted and after taking into consideration the condition of the Treasury and the heavy demands upon it recommended large decreases—I believe an average of 27 per cent in all estimates made.

A decrease of 20 per cent in the estimates for the Department of Agriculture was suggested. This was carried out by the committee and the House. Larger decreases were suggested to other committees, which I believe were carried out. As a result, a systematic, business way of handling appropriations has not only been worked out but has been effectively carried out.

In my opinion, we should have at least one appropriating committee for each of the 10 executive departments of our Government; besides, the committee having jurisdiction over pensions, whose members are naturally more familiar with the laws and administration of the laws of the Pension Bureau than any others, should be given authority to appropriate for pensions. What is true of the Committee on Pensions is also true as to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Buildings and Grounds, Claims, War Claims, the District of Columbia, and others. Under such arrangement or rules we could look forward to appropriations being dealt with intelligently and in a comprehensive manner, instead of by lump-sum appropriations which the proposed plan necessarily will force Congress to resort to. We could look for legislation which would specify how and where money was to be expended, the salaries, and the number of employees to be employed.

To illustrate, not to reflect upon any committee nor to take any credit to myself, but to point out results obtained, the Agricultural appropriation bill, which I recently reported, appropriated $33,900,211 for the current year and carried 6,033 positions on the statutory roll. Twenty-two industrious members of the Committee on Agriculture gave not only days and weeks but months in most careful consideration of that bill. Every item was carefully scrutinized and considered by the full committee, by a subcommittee, and again by the full committee. Reported to the House; considered by the Committee of the Whole; passed by the House; considered by the Senate committee, a subcommittee, the full committee; considered and passed by the Senate; considered in conference; again passed by the two Houses and finally approved by the President.

Compare it with bills reported by the Appropriations Committee. Seven bills under its jurisdiction—fortification, pension, sundry civil, second deficiency, third deficiency, railroad deficiency, war-risk insurance, and pension deficiency—appropriated $1,945,489,013.06. The total number of clerks carried on the statutory rolls in those bills was only 2,281. The amount of appropriation carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill was only 1.7 per cent of the appropriation carried in the seven bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations, yet the number of clerks carried on the statutory roll of the Agricultural bill was nearly three times the number of clerks carried on the statutory rolls of the seven bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations. We have spent weeks, yes, months, in fighting lump-sum appropriations in an effort to safeguard the Treasury, to exercise our rights and power, to specify and direct where and how the money should be expended, and to determine what salaries should be paid and the number of employees to be employed.

The failure of the Appropriations Committee is not a subject for adverse criticism. The fault is not with the committee; the fault is with Congress in overloading that committee with work. Its members have undoubtedly worked night and day. Its members possess industry, intelligence, and ability, but they are overworked. As everybody knows, it is a physical and mental impossibility for them to give due and proper consideration to all the matters that come under their jurisdiction. It is unnecessary to say that it is further imposing upon them by adding these innumerable responsibilities. The proper safeguarding of the Treasury and the wise expenditure of public moneys can not be expected under the proposed system. It will spell ruin and disaster, as it has in every country where it has been tried. I refer you to the results obtained in England, Germany, and other places where it has been tried.

The natural instinct of mankind is greed for power. True, it manifests itself more in some than in others, but as a general thing all are inflicted with the same disease; all are made out of the same clay. That unfortunate trait of character, that greed for power and usurpation of power, has caused more wars and trouble than any other thing. That was true in the days of barbarism; it is true in our day—and always will be true. It was true of the pirates of old. By the might of their sword they conquered and dethroned rulers, dictated terms to popes and emperors, they fought both for and against the liberty of man. People who had been Christianized fled in terror. England, Ireland, Scotland, France, Spain, Italy—yes, all the European nations—suffered. I need not refer to the constant warfare in Mexico, south of us, nor to the lives and property sacrificed recently in France as the result of that irresistible greed for power. Nor to Washington and his band of noble patriots who fought and died that there might be freedom of thought and action, that we might enjoy the blessings of independence and personal freedom.

Fortunately or unfortunately, I am a descendant of a people recorded in history as possessed of great love for freedom and personal independence. History tells us that to be free and independent has always been their greatest desire and ambition; that they would endure the rigid climate of the north; that they would suffer inconvenience, privation, poverty, and distress; that they would make the forest their habitation; but that they would never give up one inch of their right as freemen. Their love for personal independence amounted to passion. No king or ruler has ever been able for any length of time to be absolute master over them. No foreign nation has been powerful enough to subjugate them. They dethroned their obstinate monarchs. They dared to draw the sword against Europe and demand national independence, and it was given them. In their dispute of only a few years ago let it be said to their honor and credit that differences were amicably adjusted without drawing a sword, firing a gun, or the spilling of a drop of blood. It may be that I am too sensitive about the surrender of my personal rights and the rights of those whom I have the honor to represent, but when I think of the sacrifices made to establish and maintain a democratic form of Government, of which we all boast, the sacrifices

made to stamp out autocracy in the world; when I think of the fierce fight that took place in this Chamber some 12 years ago over autocracy; when I think of those excellent men that contended for one-man rule, who, as a result, found their political carcasses outside of the breastwork the morning after election; when I think of the universal condemnation and repudiation of autocratic rules at the polls; when I think of our good friend Uncle JOE out in the cold and Speaker CLARK ushered into the Speaker's chair, in full control, with his able lieutenant, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD; when I think of the Republican Party shorn of power eight long and lean years, all as a result of autocratic rule and concentration of one-man power, which, by the way, was insignificant with what is proposed to-day, for all the evil things committed or possible to commit under autocratic rules were, in my opinion, only a drop in the bucket as compared with the rule suggested to-day; and when I think of our sad experience as a result of the error made then, need I say that I feel justified in raising my voice in opposition, and that I am surprised and dumfounded to find that after 15 short months of Republican control of Congress it is suggested by members of my party to repeat the error? I have been told that there are Democratic Members who profited so much by the error previously made that they are contemplating aiding in the adoption of the proposed autocratic rule. Can it be that the heroic fight made by the distinguished Member from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and his associates was a mere sham?

If an autocratic rule was bad then, why should it be tolerated now? What has taken place? Why should our form of government be changed? Why should 435 Members surrender their rights, power, and prerogatives to 35 Members now? Is it for the purpose, as stated by one Member, to put the Republican Members in the hole? The fight over the rule put not only Republicans but Democrats as well in the hole before. Republicans and Democrats alike will, of course, have to answer to their constituents for this change of heart, and the voter at the polls will, as in the past, record his solemn judgment in the matter. If we judge the present by the past, personal independence and the principle for which our forefathers fought and died are as sacred to the American voter to-day as ever. He will understand that we, as representatives of the people, in surrendering our rights, surrender the rights of those whom we have the honor to represent. He will determine and insist that his Representative and every Member of this House have and exercise the right granted under our Constitution, not only in respect to appropriations but in every other matter affecting the welfare of the American people.

If this change in the rules of the House should be adopted and jurisdiction over all appropriations given to one committee with a membership of 35, what would be the result? The committee would, undoubtedly, be made up of most capable and excellent members. I assume that the committee on committees would assert its rights to make the appointments, and would follow the usual rule of reappointing at least most of the members of the present Appropriations Committee. If so, and if we judge by the past, there is danger of important matters being overlooked. Take, for instance, the Department of Agriculture. I speak of that department because I am more familiar with it than other departments. Under the present rules of the House deficiencies go to the Committee on Appropriations. According to a statement furnished me by that department, the following deficiency estimates were submitted to the Committee on Appropriations and action taken as indicated:

	Estimates.	Amount reported.
Japanese beetle	$200,000.00	(1)
Cold-storage items	253,000.00	(1)
Corn borer	500,000.00	(1)
Printing and binding	125,000.00	$75,000.00
Crop estimates, for envelopes	1,382.56	1,382.56
Fighting and preventing fires	2,500,000.00	(1)
Biological Survey, general expenses	36,271.50	(1)
States Relations Service, station at Guam	5,000.00	(1)
Relief J. W. Harrold, for building rent	111.42	111.42
Total	3,620,765.48	76,493.98

[1] Nothing.

Other departments submitted estimates. Mr. Hines asked for $700,000,000 deficit for the Railroad Administration, an amount twenty times as great as the total annual appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. Only $76,493.98 of the $3,620,765.48 asked for was granted to the Department of Agriculture, but the $700,000,000 was not only cheerfully granted the Railroad Administration but rushed through with the greatest speed, and thus $700,000,000 was extracted from the Treasury. On the other hand, we have the meager sum of $76,493.98 out of the $3,620,765.48 asked for in the interest of 6,000,000 farmers and 6,000,000 laborers tilling 6,000,000 farms, producing 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn and 5,600,000,000 bushels of cereals, which is about one-third of the production of cereals in the world, to feed not only our people but the people of the world. That was swept aside, but when it came to the item of paying profits, under the guise of compensation, to the railroads—as, for instance, to the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, more than 22 per cent; the Chicago & Erie, more than 70 per cent; the Duluth, Missabe & Northern Railway Co., more than 114 per cent; the Colorado & Wyoming Railroad Co., more than 162 per cent; and the Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad Co., more than 647 per cent—they paid in many instances annual profits, or so-called compensation, many times the railroad's capital stock and all the water added. If we are to judge by the past, it is unnecessary to prophesy what will become of the farmer, whom all profess to admire and praise just before election.

Under the proposed rule a number of committees are given jurisdiction over legislation but not over appropriations to enforce or execute legislation. Legislation is dependent upon appropriations. Without appropriations to enforce laws they are of no value. For instance, a number of years ago we enacted laws providing for meat inspection, but the committees failed to appropriate for their enforcement. As a result of this failure the small and independent packers were idle. Without the Federal inspection they were unable to operate their plants. Later a three million permanent annual appropriation was provided for, and the number of plants have since increased more than 1,000 per cent. As stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], the bonus bill carried no appropriation. Of what value will the law be unless the money is made available? The debate and vote on the bonus bill recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD sets lights on that. Thus I might go on.

Reference has been made to work of the committees. Acting upon suggestions made, I desire to refer, briefly, to the work done by the Committee on Agriculture, of which I have the honor to be chairman, not in a spirit of boasting but merely to state facts.

In addition to the two appropriation bills enacted, the committee has reported, amended, and had passed more legislation during this Congress, in a period of 13 months, than that committee has done in the preceding 13 years. The fact is it has amended in this Congress practically every bill enacted by that committee in the past 13 years.

The committee reported the Agricultural appropriation bill for 1920 which has been enacted (Public, No. 22, 66th Cong., H. R. 7413), left over from the Sixty-fifth Congress. It carried $33,900,211 appropriation and considerable new legislation, as, for instance, the following clauses: A clause amending the pure food and drugs act so as to require the marking of the net weight on wrapped hams and bacon, which guarantees full weight to the consumer and obviates much deception. A clause requiring the inspection and marking of horse meat shipped in interstate commerce, which brings horse meat under the meat-inspection law and affords protection to the consumer using it. A clause amending the United States warehouse act. A clause extending the Weeks Act by providing appropriation to purchase forest lands under that act. A clause providing for the enforcement of the Government regulations and the handling of the wool clip of 1918, under which large sums unjustly withheld have been collected by the Government and are being distributed among the producers of the wool who are justly entitled to the same. And probably the most important, the clause repealing the so-called daylight-saving law. As you will recall after a long and fierce contest the so-called daylight-saving law, which worked such an inconvenience, hardship, and injustice to the farmers and city people as well, was repealed, the repeal vetoed by the President and finally passed over the President's veto.

The committee reported the so-called food-control amendments and the District of Columbia rents act, which has been enacted (Public, No. 63, 66th Cong., H. R. 8624). The amendments, though to a temporary measure, permit collective bargaining by any cooperative association or other association of farmers, dairymen, gardeners, or other producers of farm products with respect to the farm products produced or raised by its members upon land owned, leased, or cultivated by them, which relieves farmers from persecution and unwarranted prosecution so unjustly imposed on them from coast to coast. This right to collective bargaining by farmers it is now proposed by the Volstead bill to make permanent legislation. True, the prosecution was generally instigated by State prosecuting attorneys, but in a few instances Federal authorities joined with them. Farmers have been compelled to fight lawsuits, at great expense, to justify or

defend their right to make collective sales. For instance, farmers in California engaged in making collective sales of milk were arrested and indicted. They were tried and were promptly acquitted. They were not prosecuted for profiteering, but for simply disposing of their farm products by collective sales. In the fall of 1917 the organization of farmers in Illinois that supplied the Chicago district with milk were indicted and, after being put to a large expense in defending their rights, were acquitted. We find that in instances the third degree was applied in police circles, evidently for the purpose of frightening and embarrassing the farmers hauled into court. In Ohio men of standing, occupying high positions in their localities, were taken out of their beds in the middle of the night, placed in jail, and, as stated by Mr. John Miller in his testimony, they were put into a hospital ward reeking with vermin. In the morning they had breakfast brought in that, both from its quality and from the containers in which it was brought, they could not taste or touch. In January, 1918, officers of farm organizations were indicted, though more courteously treated; they were required to give bail at a premium of $200 or $300 to the surety company. It cost them $15,000 to fight their way out of the trouble. What was true in the cases referred to was also true in others. So far as I know, in every instance all were acquitted. Evidently the prosecution was not to prevent profiteering but simply to persecute.

The amendments reported by the committee also brought wearing apparel and containers of food, feeds, and fertilizers under the provisions of the food-control act, and also attached a penalty for the violation of section 4 of the act, which makes profiteering, hoarding, and destruction of necessities unlawful. The amendments in addition carried the District of Columbia rents act, which created a rent commission to regulate rents in the District of Columbia. This commission has heard hundreds of complaints and has adjusted numerous rent controversies within the District of Columbia, thus saving the tenants from the clutches of the profiteers.

The committee has reported a bill dealing with the supply and price of sugar, which has been enacted (Public, No. 109, 66th Cong., S. 3284). As you will recall, the President had the power and money to control the price and supply of sugar through the United States Sugar Equalization Board, incorporated in the State of Delaware, with a capital stock of $5,000,000, subscribed and paid for out of the President's fund. You will also recall that the Sugar Equalization Board procured the 1919 crop at $5.50 a hundred, $1.54 added for refining, which allowed the sale of sugar on the part of the refiners at 9 cents a pound, less 38 cents per hundred pounds retained by the Sugar Equalization Board. The result of the functioning of this board brought about the staple price to the consumer of 10 cents per pound and a fairly equitable distribution of sugar. You will further recall that on July 29 the Cuban sugar producers offered to sell the Cuban crop for 1920 at a moderate price, a proposition which was given consideration by the Sugar Equalization Board; that on August 14, 1919, the board addressed the President by letter and memorandum recommending that negotiations be entered into to procure the Cuban sugar crop of 1920; that no action was taken by the President; that the board, again on September 20, addressed another communication to the Chief Executive, stating that the time was fast approaching, if it had not arrived, when we would be unable to control the Cuban crop of sugar for 1920 unless action was taken, also calling attention to the fact that a considerable tonnage of Cuban sugar had already been sold and recommending prompt action; that the communication was acknowledged September 22; that on the following day the board again transmitted a letter to the President, advising him that inasmuch as no action had been taken by him concerning these negotiations, the situation was then being called to the attention of Congress. It is needless to say that had the President availed himself of the opportunity to buy the Cuban crop at the price offered with the money and organization made available and at his command he would have saved the consumer from paying the exorbitant prices exacted, and had he purchased the Cuban crop instead of permitting the establishment of zones—one along the Atlantic coast, where the price of sugar was fixed at 9 cents to wholesalers; another in the beet-sugar district, where the price was fixed at 10½ cents a pound; and another down South in the cane-sugar district, where the price was fixed at 18 cents and where the Attorney General, on November 8, 1919, gave his official approval to the establishment of a price of 17 cents per pound for Louisiana prime yellow clarified sugar, and 18 cents per pound for Louisiana clear granulated sugar, net the plantation, which price it was held would eliminate any possibility of successful prosecution—the situation would be different. It is unnecessary to say that had the President exercised his power, what seems to have been a plain duty, and had it not been for the apparent discrimination permitted in favor of the Louisiana cane growers, we would have had not only an ample supply of sugar but sugar at half the price the consumer has been compelled to pay. But inasmuch as the President did not exercise a power which he has had all the time since July 15, 1918, nor follow the recommendations and suggestions made by the Sugar Equalization Board, and also conveyed in the bill passed, of course, no relief was obtained. Nevertheless, the legislation was timely and proper, and should have been carried out, so that the many millions in profit exacted by the profiteers would have been saved to the consumer.

The committee reported the cold-storage bill (H. R. 9521), which has been passed both by the House and Senate, which limits the time foods can be held in cold storage to one year by prohibiting the shipment in interstate commerce of any food that has been held in cold storage for a longer period. It also contains a number of admirable features, such as the one regulating the sanitary conditions of the cold-storage warehouses, and provisions requiring a report on all foods held in cold storage, which will afford accurate information as to the food supply on hand, information as to hoarding, holding, and manipulation of prices, and will permit the officials enforcing the act to secure strict compliance with its provisions.

The committee has reported a bill amending the pure food and drugs act, known as the slack package bill (H. R. 10311), so as to prohibit the use of slack-filled or other deceptive forms of packages. The bill when enacted will remove from the market the type of slack-filled packages used in the marketing of spices, cereals, and like articles which are only partly filled with food—in some instances but one-third of their true capacity. These containers mislead the consumer by exacting from him a price based on the appearance rather than the true quantity thus packaged. They also promote unfair competition, in that the trade dealing with honestly filled packages is, of course, detrimentally affected. Another type of fraudulent package or container which it will do away with is the type which gives the purchaser a false impression as to the quantity, quality, size, kind, or origin of the food contained therein, as, for instance, bottles with inverted bottoms, bottles made of thickened glass for olives or fruit, especially designed to magnify the size of the individual olive. Other forms of deception which will also be removed are the containers of canned foods which contain an excess of liquid, such as water or sirup, and types that contain foreign matter and a deficiency of food material, and also those that by means of pictures or representations printed on the outside convey a false impression to the purchaser as to their contents.

The committee has reported a bill to loan to farmers in drought and storm-stricken sections $2,000,000 for the purchase of seed (H. R. 11312). It authorizes loans through national or State banks not to exceed $300 to one farmer, the loan to be secured, as far as practicable, by a first lien on the crop planted with the seed so secured.

The committee has reported a bill authorizing the acquisition of the experiment vineyards near Fresno and Oakville, Calif. (H. R. 13402), which vineyards contain valuable plantings.

The committee has reported a resolution defining what constitutes a crop failure under the rules and regulations issued by departments of the Government in making loans of seed wheat to farmers for crop purposes (H. J. Res. 307). The contract made in making these loans by the Federal farm-loan banks shows that it was the intention of the contract, although it does not clearly state the fact, that those who produced less than 5 bushels per acre were to have their notes returned, but in the absence of specific language to that effect the farmer could not be relieved. This resolution was incorporated in the Agricultural appropriation bill for 1921, which has been enacted and is now law.

The committee reported the Agricultural appropriation bill for 1921, which has been enacted (Public, No. 234, 66th Cong., H. R. 12272). It appropriates $31,714,784 for the Department of Agriculture. The bill for 1921 eliminates and reduces many useless appropriations, while, on the other hand, it increases many items of importance under which valuable work is being done by the department. As a whole it carries a reduction of $2,185,327 under the bill for 1920. This economy is manifestly in the interest of the country's welfare and proper during this period of critical stress. The bill carries important legislation, as, for instance, the following clauses: The extension of the plant quarantine act to the District of Columbia. Amendments to the cotton-futures act, making permanent the amendments to that act reducing the number of grades deliverable on a contract which were carried in the

wheat-guaranty act, a temporary measure. The transfer to the Department of Agriculture of the reindeer work in Alaska, which is the chief source of food supply of Alaska and is fast becoming its chief industry. The transfer from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture of the duty of enforcing the tea-importation act, which properly lodges it under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, under whose jurisdiction comes the enforcement of legislation affecting all food, as well as that affecting and assisting the farmer in production. The bill also creates a short-time rural credits committee, consisting of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the two Houses, and two other members of each of said committees, to investigate and report on the practicability of establishing a system of short-time rural credits in the United States, which, it is needless to say, would be of great benefit, especially to certain sections of the country.

The committee has held hearings on the subject of meat-packing legislation, covering a period of a month and a half, and since the hearings a subcommittee has drafted a bill which proposes to regulate the meat-packing industry, as well as the stockyards, commission men, and traders, which it has reported back to the full committee. The full committee has taken action making the bill reported by the subcommittee the unfinished business of the committee, and has determined that it shall take precedence over other legislation before it until finally disposed of by the committee. In view of the action taken, the legislation should be reported to the House early in the forthcoming session.

The committee has before it a number of other important matters. I have prepared a commercial feed bill which will, if enacted into law, give to the purchaser full and accurate information as to the composition and ingredients of all commercial feed, its nutritive value, and protect him against deception and fraud. I have also prepared a fertilizer bill which will, if enacted into law, accomplish similar results in respect to fertilizers. These bills will be called up for consideration at the earliest opportunity. There are various other important measures pending, too numerous to refer to here.

The committee has held 86 days of reported hearings during the past year, and has been in session, with practically full attendance, from 9 or 10 o'clock in the morning until 6 or 7 o'clock in the evening nearly every day since the convening of the present Congress, except when it has had bills up for consideration on the floor, which accounts for the failure of any of its members to answer to all roll calls. The printed hearings on 20 different subjects before the committee up to date cover 5,891 pages.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a number of reasons presented in opposition to the adoption of this resolution. I have heard none more earnestly presented than those presented by my distinguished friend from Iowa, Mr. HAUGEN, who has just taken his seat. He seems to have worked himself into a condition of mind where he thinks this is a question which involves the absolute liberty and freedom of the membership of the House. That to me is a novel proposition. My idea is that a committee is simply the servant of the House, and the House always has jurisdiction and authority over its committees. After all, the House names the membership of its various committees, and I can not see where any question of the freedom of individual membership in this body is involved in this proposition. Your Budget Committee has presented the resolution as its final recommendation in order to carry out what it believes is the wish of the House and the wish of the people of the country, to have a complete, rounded budget system, and in the very limited time that I have I wish to call the attention of my Democratic friends to a declaration made in the national Democratic platform which was adopted at St. Louis in 1916. I may say to my Republican friends that their national convention adopted a plank in its platform very similar to it. The Democratic plank reads as follows:

> We demand careful economy in all expenditures for the support of the Government and to that end favor a return by the House of Representatives to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee chosen from its membership, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication in the public service as much as possible avoided. We favor this as a practicable first step toward a budget system.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I have not the time, I am sorry to say. This resolution simply carries out that plank in the platform adopted at St. Louis in 1916, and unless we vote for this resolution I respectfully submit to my Democratic friends that we will not be supporting the platform upon which we were elected and to which we pledged allegiance. Now, under this resolution all of these appropriation bills would be presented to the House as a part of one great budget bill. In other words, instead of having 13 regular annual supply bills brought in here from time to time, we will have one great bill proposed by whatever committee this House may select to prepare and present it, and the House will have before it in one bill and at one time all of the proposed expenditures of the Government during the next fiscal year. The House, in addition to that, under the law previously passed, will have before it a statement from the President of the United States showing just what revenues are expected to be derived during the coming fiscal year and what revenues it will be necessary to raise in order to meet those proposed expenditures, and I wish to say, gentlemen, that in my judgment you will never have real, true economy until we get all of these appropriation bills in one committee. That does not mean that every member of an appropriating committee, whether he is on the Committee on Appropriations or any other appropriating committee, believes in economy, nor does it mean that those who are not on appropriating committees do not believe in economy, but I insist that you should have one appropriating committee with no legislative power in order to bring about the greatest amount of economy—a committee which is not predisposed by association or otherwise in favor of any particular department, but with the duty of taking all the departments into consideration at one and the same time. I think you will then have that sort of a situation whereby you will have a budget that will really amount to something. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SANFORD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. We ought to have a quorum here for the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Ellsworth	Lankford	Scully
Anthony	Elston	Lehlbach	Sears
Ayres	Emerson	Lesher	Sherwood
Bacharach	Evans, Nev.	Little	Shreve
Baer	Ferris	Luhring	Sims
Booher	Freeman	McArthur	Slemp
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	McClintic	Small
Brinson	Gallivan	McCulloch	Smith, Ill.
Brooks, Ill.	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Brumbaugh	Goodall	Mason	Smithwick
Burke	Gould	Merritt	Snyder
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	Moore, Ohio	Steele
Cantrill	Greene, Mass.	Morin	Stephens, Miss.
Caraway	Hamill	Neely	Strong, Pa.
Carss	Hardy, Colo.	Newton, Minn.	Sullivan
Carter	Hardy, Tex.	Paige	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Harreld	Parker	Tillman
Classon	Hastings	Platt	Towner
Cole	Hayden	Radcliffe	Upshaw
Cooper	Hernandez	Ramseyer	Vare
Copley	Houghton	Randall, Calif.	Voigt
Costello	Hulings	Randall, Wis.	Watson
Curry, Calif.	Hutchinson	Reavis	Weaver
Dale	Ireland	Reber	Williams
Denison	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rhodes	Woodyard
Dent	Kendall	Riddick	Yates
Dewalt	Kennedy, Iowa	Robinson, N. C.	Young, N. Dak.
Drane	Kettner	Rowan	Zihlman
Dunn	Kiess	Rucker	
Echols	Kitchin	Sanders, La.	
Edmonds	Kleczka	Schall	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 297 Members have responded to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I feel every one in the House is actuated with a desire to economize in Federal expenditures and in favor of a budget system, but I think in viewing this matter, as all other matters, we should look to the practical side

as well as the theoretical side of the particular proposition submitted. Let us take one phase of the situation, and that is all I can take up in the short time allotted to me. Let me state emphatically that I favor a budget system. My difference is not with the principle involved, but in the method of accomplishing it. This rule provides for the creation of an appropriation committee consisting of 35 members. The Committee on Appropriations, as now constituted, deals with six different propositions and reports six different bills. If this rule prevails, there will be given to that appropriation committee 6 additional bills, making 12 altogether, over which they will have jurisdiction with power to consider and report to this House. If the membership of the committee is made 35 in number, then we have got two mathematical propositions before us. If each subcommitteeman is to serve on but one committee, then with 12 bills to be considered and 35 members to be divided up it is clear that the subcommittees could not have more than three members. If the subcommittees are to be larger, then each member of the Appropriation Committee will have to serve on more than one subcommittee and be conversant with more than one subject, and I respectfully submit that it will be a physical and mental impossibility for that man to consider properly the subject under advisement, with the result that the amounts will largely be directed and controlled by the departments, which already possess too much power.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. In a moment. Therefore it resolves itself into this proposition, as I see it: That each subcommittee will be composed of three members only, and we commit ourselves, if this rule prevails, to saying that three members of the Appropriations Committee are more competent and more able to determine on these great appropriation matters than are 21 members who now constitute these committees. I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, it is not practicable and is not feasible to suppose that 3 members are superior in intellect to 21 members. I doubt also the advisability of concentrating into a small body of men the great power exercised by the independent committees as they now exist, and whose membership gives its entire time to the subject with which they have long been familiar.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes; for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Is it not true if this rule is adopted that the commissioner of the budget in the Treasury Department will frame the bills so that this appropriation committee will have very little to do except simply to approve the estimates as made up by an executive officer, thus affording no opportunity for a Member to present the claims of the people of his district to a committee, as he can do at present?

Mr. HICKS. Yes, probably; and I wish to make this further observation: If I have the time, I imagine—I do not want to make that statement positively—but I imagine these subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations are now, in practice, separate and independent committees, that have very little to do with each other in making up the various bills reported from the Committee on Appropriations, and therefore do not coordinate appropriations as claimed. [Applause.]

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposed to the budget system. Let me repeat that I am heartily in favor of changing the present method in the interest of economy and efficiency, but I am opposed to the plan as suggested and think a better one can be devised. I understand that the gentleman from Minnesota will offer a motion to recommit, which embodies a proposition which I feel will accomplish the desired result without losing the advantages now possessed in having the present committee.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not belong to any committee that has the power of making appropriations. In fact, I do not belong to any important committee except the Committee on Revision of the Laws, which is performing a single task. I think, therefore, that being in a detached position, I am perhaps able to take an unprejudiced and, I hope, a somewhat judicial view of this subject.

There seem to be two arguments against the bill: First, that the proposed committee will be physically unable to perform the work assigned it. Having kept up to some extent with the business handled by the various committees that are entitled to report appropriations, I do not believe that there is any force at all in that argument. Another argument is that the Committee on Appropriations constituted as proposed will be in position to exercise autocratic authority. But it will be a mere agent of the House and within the control of the House, and it will be much easier to recall the action now contemplated, if that should hereafter be thought desirable, than it is now to pass this bill and concentrate all of the work of appropriations in the hands of a single committee. A committee of 35 will be so completely under the dominion of the House that the House can make at any time any change it may think proper.

It has seemed to me during my short service in Congress that there is great necessity for the concentration of administrative work, and while, of course, appropriations have technically a legislative character, they are in substance administrative in a large sense. The Ways and Means Committee provide for raising the revenue and appropriations simply represent the disposition of the revenue.

We have passed a budget bill which not only recognizes the necessity of consolidating but which actually consolidates. It consolidates the estimates and it consolidates the audit transactions. That is done in the interest of economy. Why should we stop and hesitate when in the interest of economy it is proposed we shall centralize the appropriation transactions? I believe if we stop short of doing that we will have an imperfect and incongruous budget system, and deviate from everything that has been done in the way of budget legislation in other bodies. Nearly all the States have adopted budget plans, and they have thrown appropriations into the hands of single committees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. DUPRÉ. And there are 48 States in the Union.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I ask for one minute further.

Mr. GOOD. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The man who gave the strongest testimony, based upon his own study and investigation, before the special budget committee was Mr. Willoughby. He has favorably commented upon the Virginia plan recently adopted. In forming that plan there was no thought whatever of centralizing as to estimates and centralizing as to audits and not centralizing as to the work of the general assembly. And I may say—this illustration may not be impressive, because the difference, of course, is very great between the House of Representatives and one of the branches of a State legislature—that some years ago I happened to serve in the Senate of Virginia, and as a member of the committee that dealt with finances and appropriations, if we had diffused instead of concentrating, we could not have gotten through the difficulties confronting us at that time. Why, it is a common-sense proposition, which, it seems to me, the man in the street will recognize, and everybody ought to recognize, that the diffusion here tends against economy and to that extravagance we all are so anxious to avoid and so constantly endeavoring to eliminate.

This is one of the important bills the House ought to pass, and if it should be found later that a mistake has been made it will be in the province of the House to go back to the old system, which almost everybody admits is a bad one. It is a bad system and here is the chance to correct it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, what is the object of a legislative budget? It is to permit a coordination of the expenditures of the Government and at the same time to enable a majority to carry out a party policy, whether that policy be one of retrenchment or expansion. Now, is it necessary, in order to carry out that general principle, to go as far as this proposition proposes to go? I am in favor of a scheme which will permit that thing to be done, but I do not believe that it is necessary in order to do it to hand to a single committee of the House the entire appropriating jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. What do we do in this House? How do we spend the most of our time? Seventy per cent of all the time you and I spend in this House is spent on appropriation bills.

If this resolution is adopted, 35 men out of 435 will be in charge of bills on the floor of this House 70 per cent of all the time that we are here. This resolution proposes to increase the Appropriations Committee from 21 members to 35 members. At present the Appropriations Committee reports about 40 per cent of the total appropriations. This resolution proposes that 14 additional men shall consider the other 60 per cent. That means that 35 men will do 50 per cent more work than 21 do now; that 35 men will do the work which is now done by 189 Members of the House. I submit that that is a centralization of authority which is both unwise and unnecessary. If this new appropriation committee is created and divided up into subcommittees, it can not very well be divided into subcommittees larger than three or five. I submit these subcommittees can not be representative either of party division or of the difference of opinion over a country as large as this, nor can it be representative of the viewpoints of 435

Members. Whenever these subcommittees report to the main committee that committee will be so large that it can not possibly give to the details of appropriation the consideration which the appropriation committees of the House now give them.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have only five minutes.

If I have an opportunity, I shall offer a motion to recommit, which I think will accomplish all that is desirable or necessary to accomplish in the way of coordination or economy. The motion which I shall offer creates a budget committee composed of the chairman and ranking majority member of each of the appropriating committees, and the ranking minority member of each of the appropriating committees. This committee is clothed with the power to consider the budget in its aggregate and to apportion the aggregate amount of expenditures among the appropriating committees. The rule prohibits any of the committees having the authority to report appropriations from reporting an amount in excess of the amount which they are authorized to report by the budget committee. That will give an opportunity for the chairman and the ranking members of each appropriating committee to get together with the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and to consider the whole situation. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. GOOD. My time is all taken.

Mr. CANNON. I was going to ask unanimous consent to ask one question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to ask a question. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. If it be good policy to make these committees recommend appropriations, why should not we equalize the 40 committees and let us have a genuine democracy?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. CANNON. I am talking about making all the committees appropriating committees.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended one hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his time one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I object.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. GOOD. I wanted to do it in behalf of men who wanted to speak in opposition. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that my time be extended 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this matter has been brought in here under a rule which might very well have provided what the gentleman now proposes, I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I shall try to condense what I have to say on this matter. I think this proposal is entirely impracticable and unworkable from the practical standpoint of legislation. I think it will lead to inefficiency instead of efficiency. I believe that it is absolutely impossible for any one committee, however able it may be, thoroughly and fully and completely to investigate all of the various appropriations from the multiplied angles that they are presented for consideration, and the result will be that the committee will be divided into a large number of subcommittees of 3, or maybe 5 members at the most. It would simply transfer the jurisdiction for the investigations and the examinations that are now being made by committees of 21 members, representatives of the country at large, seeing matters from different viewpoints, and concentrate it in the hands of 3 or 5 members, and they will conduct the investigations, and conduct them from their limited and circumscribed viewpoints. These committees that have been handling these appropriations during these years are familiar with the whole subject, and they investigate and report to the House.

Another thing that I wish to call attention to is that appropriations and legislation must be coordinated and must go together. Let me illustrate. Under this proposal the appropriation will be taken away from the Committee on Naval Affairs and be given to the Committee on Appropriations, but the legislation would remain with the Committee on Naval Affairs. The increase of the Navy, the providing of additional ships, the providing of additional guns, the providing of docks and improvements at yards, would have to be authorized by legislation before they could be appropriated for by this new committee. Under this proposed resolution the privileged status of all these committees is taken away. Suppose the Naval Committee reports a building program of ships, a program for docks, and other necessary improvements. It goes to the calendar. It has no privileged status, and the only way it could be called up would be when the call of the committee might come, perhaps once or twice in a session, or by getting a special rule. It is apparent that neither one nor the other plan is practicable or workable. But assume, for the sake of the argument, that you got your bill acted upon. It goes to the Senate. It has no privileged status there. But suppose that in the Senate it is enacted and becomes a law. In the meantime the appropriation bill has passed, and all of this matter would have to wait until the next session of Congress in order to have an appropriation made following the authorization; and the result will be, since these appropriations are effective only after the 1st of July for the ensuing fiscal year, they would not be available until after the 1st day of July, and you would have innumerable delays and inefficiency instead of efficiency. [Applause.]

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point.

Mr. BUTLER. No; you can not do it. The Speaker has made the announcement.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa moves a call of the House. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. GOOD. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa asks for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 98, noes 12.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Edmonds	Kettner	Rowan
Anthony	Ellsworth	Kiess	Rowe
Ayres	Elston	Kitchin	Rucker
Bacharach	Emerson	Langley	Sanders, La.
Baer	Evans, Nev.	Lankford	Sanders, N. Y.
Bland, Ind.	Ferris	Lehlbach	Scully
Booher	Freeman	Lesher	Sears
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	Little	Sherwood
Brinson	Godwin, N. C.	Luhring	Shreve
Britten	Goodall	McClintic	Slemp
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	McCulloch	Small
Browne	Gould	McKinley	Smith, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Smith, Mich.
Burke	Greene, Mass.	Merritt	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell, Pa.	Hamill	Moore, Ohio	Smithwick
Cantrill	Hardy, Colo.	Morin	Snyder
Caraway	Hardy, Tex.	Newton, Minn.	Steele
Carss	Harreld	Paige	Stephens, Miss.
Carter	Hastings	Parker	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Fla.	Hayden	Platt	Sullivan
Cole	Hays	Porter	Taylor, Tenn.
Cooper	Heflin	Pou	Thomas
Copley	Hernandez	Ramseyer	Tillman
Costello	Hill	Randall, Calif.	Towner
Curry, Calif.	Hoey	Randall, Wis.	Upshaw
Dale	Houghton	Reavis	Vare
Dent	Hulings	Reber	Walters
Dewalt	Hutchinson	Reed, N. Y.	Watson
Drane	Ireland	Rhodes	Woodyard
Dunn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Riddick	Yates
Dyer	Kendall	Riordan	Young, N. Dak.
Echols	Kennedy, Iowa	Robinson, N. C.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 300 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, in 1789 the Ways and Means Committee was created, with authority to report revenue and appropriation bills. This jurisdiction of one committee over revenue and expenditures continued for 76 years.

In 1865 the Committee on Appropriations was created, with authority to report all appropriation bills, and this arrangement continued without interruption until 1880, when the Committee on Agriculture was created and given authority to report appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture.

This plan continued for five years more, when jurisdiction was given to the Committee on Military Affairs to report appropriation bills for the military; jurisdiction was also given to the Committee on Naval Affairs to report appropriations for the Navy; jurisdiction was also given to the Committee on Indian Affairs to report appropriations for the Indians; and jurisdiction was likewise given to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to report appropriations for the Post Office Department.

There was a lively fight in 1865 when jurisdiction was taken from the Committee on Appropriations to report appropriations for these various branches of the Government service, and when that jurisdiction was divided among these other committees.

We have now determined in this Congress, by a vote almost unanimous, only three persons having voted in the negative, to establish a budget system. We have determined to carry on the business affairs of the Government in a businesslike way. We have decided that the Chief Executive shall make a budget which shall be an estimate of the necessary sums to carry on the Government, and we have determined upon that policy because there is a growing demand throughout the country that we must practice real economy, that we must reduce the high cost of living; that to do that we must reduce taxation; and that to do that we must reduce expenditure; and to reduce expenditure we must have a budget system.

The Select Committee on the Budget, which have reported the resolution, went very carefully into the question as to how far we should go by legislation to amend the rules of the House. The committee, I think wisely, took the position that the law creating the budget ought not to attempt to bind future Congresses, the Constitution of the United States containing, as it does, the provision that each House shall prescribe the rules for its procedure.

Inasmuch as the Constitution guarantees to the next Congress that it shall prescribe its own rules to govern its procedure, it was thought unwise for this Congress to attempt to adopt rules for the next Congress by an act of Congress, and so we determined to take two steps, first, to bring out the budget bill creating the budget, and second, this resolution, which amends the rules of the House by providing a single committee on appropriations.

Congress has taken the first steps and passed the budget and accounting act. But, vain is a budget law, all in vain the legislation demanded by the American people for budgetary reform, if we only clean the executive departments and do not correct the evils existing in this House. [Applause.]

A great deal has been said to-day about the Committee on Appropriations seeking to extend its autocratic authority. I want to say for myself, and I think for other members of that committee, that if this resolution is adopted the House will be free and unfettered to select a committee of 35 Members for the Committee on Appropriations. My resignation as chairman of the committee and as a member of the committee will be at the disposal of the committee on committees. I feel that the question is so important that it so far transcends any individual ambition, and that we must, in order to make this budget law a workable law, sacrifice our personal ambition for the public good. [Applause.] I am perfectly willing to make the sacrifice, and shall gladly accept a demotion if that is thought desirable in order that this resolution shall be adopted.

If the resolution we have reported does not stand on its merits, if it does not have the real merit that it should have to secure your support, then do not vote for it; but I beg of you to-day to vote your intelligence, your convictions, and not your prejudice toward the committee or any member of any committee, and I realize that the committee is not popular, and when it becomes popular I for one shall question the quality of its work. Again, this resolution should not suffer because it gives additional power to a committee that must produce strict economy. If you want real economy, if you want a reduction in the high cost of living, a reduction in expenditures, a reduction in taxation, if you want a real budget, you will vote for this resolution.

I want to say a word to the Democratic side of the House. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has wisely called your attention to the Democratic national platform of 1916, in which you said:

> We demand careful economy in all expenditures for the support of the Government, and to that end favor a return by the House of Representatives to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee chosen from its membership, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication in the public service as much as possible avoided.

Mr. Bryan, speaking in support of that platform, said:

> The Representative who secures office on a platform and then betrays the people who elected him is a criminal worse than he who embezzles money.

I do not say that; that is your platform and that is the measure of your responsibility upon that platform, as fixed by a man who was three times your candidate for the Presidency. You may do as you please, now that a real test has come, vote to repudiate your platform or vote to carry out its provisions. But I want to assure you that those Democrats who vote to repudiate their platform in this respect will, I believe, live to regret that action, and your deserts may come sooner than you think.

And I want to say to this side of the House that we are responsible for the legislation of the Congress. We are responsible now in this House for everything that goes through the House, and we are responsible for the things that we bring forward that fail of passage. Let us to-day assume that responsibility like true Americans, mindful of the fact that we have pledged ourselves in the last platform to a budget system. Let us remember that every man who appeared before the select committee on the budget said that a budget system was useless, that it was worse than folly to attempt it if we simply cleaned the executive household and refused to clean our own house.

An amendment will be offered in the way of a motion to recommit to provide that the Committee on Appropriations shall allot to these several committees the amounts they should appropriate and leave to those committees the determination of how much should be given to each object.

That proposition is like putting the roof on a house before you have laid the foundation or constructed the side walls. Just before we reported out the sundry civil bill the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] came to me and wanted to know what we were going to do with the appropriations. There was a billion and thirty-six million dollars of estimates. I told him there would be no appropriation for the Shipping Board, but that organization would be given authority to use balances. I want to say that no man in the House has a better knowledge of the sundry civil bill than the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. With that knowledge the gentleman gave to the press the fact that the sundry civil bill would be cut to $600,000,000. If I had been asked at that time to give an estimate, I could not have estimated much, if any, nearer, for the reason that while we had had hearings on 2,000 items or more estimated to be carried in the bill, it was not until after we had used the adding machines one night until 2 o'clock in the morning that we were gratified to learn that we had pared down the estimates of that bill to $428,000,000, or $200,000,000 less than the estimate of the gentleman from Wyoming. [Applause.]

If we had made the allotment as suggested before hearings, it would have been $600,000,000 instead of $428,000,000.

I say to you with all earnestness that it is altogether impracticable to try to fix the total of a bill until you have fixed the exact amount of every single item of the bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], who has served so ably upon the Committee on Naval Affairs, I see nods his head time and again to what I have said on that proposition. He knows it is so, and every man working on an appropriation bill knows that it is so. It is folly to contend otherwise.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I regret that I can not in the little time I have.

We sometimes hear it said that this is a Government by political parties, and, in a sense, this is true. But in a stricter and more limited sense, Congress enacts its legislation through the committees of the House and the committees of the Senate. So far as legislation is concerned, therefore, ours is a Government by legislative committees. When in 1885 this House committed the folly of decentralizing the power of the Committee on Appropriations by giving to the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads jurisdiction to report appropriation bills for their respective services, Mr. Blackburn, of Kentucky, gave the true philosophy of committee government

and the real functions of legislative and appropriating committees. He said:

They (the committees) are appointed that they may guard the interests of the particular department committed to their care. That is the theory of the construction of the committees of the House; and it is a proper theory. The Committee on Appropriations stands in a very different attitude. Because of no special relation to any department, selected as a fair and impartial arbiter, with no more concern for the Navy or the Army than for the Interior Department or the Post Office Department, it has been selected as the one grand reservoir into which all these proposed disbursements of money should pour, in order that fairly, judiciously, impartially it may make its recommendations to the House.

Mr. Blackburn was opposed to the decentralization that took place at that time, and in the words I have quoted most forcefully pointed out the folly of intrusting to a legislative committee the power of making appropriations on matters in which he was vitally and deeply interested.

To prove that his philosophy was true and his judgment sound I desire to quote somewhat at length from the article written by Dr. Harlan Updegraft, of the Bureau of Education, that appeared in the American Schoolboard Journal for May, 1912. Dr. Updegraft was pleading for a further decentralization of the power of the Committee on Appropriations, to the extent that the Committee on Education should have jurisdiction to report all appropriation bills for educational purposes. Unwittingly he admits the soundness of the logic of Mr. Blackburn and the correctness of the position which the Committee on the Budget has taken in reporting out this resolution. He said:

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURE A HINDRANCE.

If during the past 40 years the Commissioner of Education had been granted lump-sum appropriations from which he could have paid salaries fairly commensurate with those paid by local public and private agencies throughout the United States, and had it been possible for him to set aside proper amounts for traveling expenses, the bureau would have made a far greater impress upon educational policy and practice. In consequence of the higher appreciation which would have resulted it is also quite probable that the Congress would have increased its appropriations from year to year until their magnitude would have become more nearly commensurate with the high regard in which all Americans hold their public schools.

However, there is an underlying cause for this situation in the business procedure of each of the two Houses of Congress. Under this procedure the estimates for some departments are acted upon by their friends at court, while the estimates for other departments are passed on by a tribunal whose main object is economy. All appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture are prepared in the House Committee on Agriculture and are reviewed in the Senate by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This same practice also holds with the appropriations for the Diplomatic Service, the military service, the naval service, and the Postal Service. On the other hand, the appropriations for the other branches of the executive departments are prepared by the Committee on Appropriations of the House and are referred in the Senate to its committee of like name. Quite naturally the attitude of these Committees on Appropriations toward the estimates submitted by their respective branches of the executive department is distinctly different from that shown by the committees which recommend the appropriations for a single department or bureau.

Members of the latter class of committees have their attention centered on one particular set of governmental activities, which they hold in growing appreciation as their knowledge of the work increases. On the other hand, members of the Committees on Appropriations have their attention divided among several departments and independent offices and commissions, all of which are more or less desirous of increased funds. Strong attachment to the work of any branch of the Government service is not fostered by such a condition. Moreover, the numerous insistent demands that come upon them develop a controlling idea in the minds of these Appropriations Committees—not the great good that may come to the people through any branch of the service, but rather the desirability of cutting appropriations to the lowest possible limit in order that the party in power will not be held accountable for large expenditures. In brief, all the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and the principal appropriations for the War, Navy, and Post Office Departments, are in the hands of their friends, while those of the remaining Government offices must come before a tribunal the chief aim of which is to keep the total appropriations, including those framed by the special committees, within certain fixed limits. It follows from this that the liberal appropriations recommended by the special committees have a tendency to lower the appropriations for the other departments, which are drawn directly by the Appropriations Committees. Had the estimates of the Commissioner of Education during the past 40 years been referred in the House to the Committee on Education and in the Senate to the Committee on Education and Labor there would undoubtedly be to-day a far different story to tell. If such a reform in the procedure of the Houses could be carried out to-day, an increased participation of the National Government in the educational development of the country would probably result.

It is, indeed, true that a legislative committee is appointed to guard the interests of a particular department committed to its care. That committee is appointed to defend that department and to assist in every worthy ambition for the growth and development of that department, even to the extent of taking up new projects that involve additional expenditures at a time when there should be rigid economy and a retrenchment in expenditures. This is not true of the Committee on Appropriations. It has no particular department to defend, no particular project to advance. It stands as the impartial arbiter of all the legislative committees, so far as appropriations are concerned, and at a time when retrenchment is necessary can say to each that it is necessary to retrench, and can lay down the rule by which the retrenchment shall be brought about. It applies to all committees alike. It is the grand reservoir to which all these departments must come and the appropriations for each will be measured by the necessities and national importance of the service appropriated for. At present there is a competition between these various committees that have this dual function to perform to see which department can grow the most rapidly, and nowhere does any one committee of the House exercise a controlling influence over the several committees that have appropriating jurisdiction.

In the report accompanying this bill I have quoted at length from the splendid speeches made by James A. Garfield, James A. Tawney, John J. Fitzgerald, and Swagar Sherley, all former chairmen of the Committee on Appropriations, and Hon. Thomas B. Reed, Samuel J. Randall, Warren J. Kiefer, and JOSEPH G. CANNON, all former Speakers of the House, and other eminent statesmen, to prove that real economy in appropriations and Government expenditure can not be effected unless all appropriation bills originate in a single committee. No one familiar with the working of Congress, and especially the committees of Congress, seriously questions this contention. It is the almost unanimous verdict of the men who have studied the problem and who have arrived at a conclusion unaffected by their position in the House or on a committee of the House.

Let us not attempt to deceive the American people on the question of budgetary legislation. Let us not attempt to deceive ourselves by the claim that by voting for the House bill, which provides for a budget system, we have done all that is necessary to do to bring about real economy through a budget system. That bill is a great step in advance. The bill which we have passed and which has gone to the President for his signature is the vehicle for the budget. The resolution which is pending before the House to-day is to put in the power that will make that vehicle move. By voting against this resolution you may deceive yourselves into believing that you have voted for all that is necessary in budgetary legislation, but you will not be able to deceive the voter in this regard.

It is said that the Committee on Appropriations would have great power. It has great power now, and always will have great power, and, in my opinion, its usefulness will be increased in proportion to the increased power granted it, assuming always, of course, the proper exercise of that power.

I do not have the time to explain this chart which is before you. It is, in a large measure, self-explanatory. It shows the present plan and not the proposed plan. The colored lines show the items appropriated through bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations. These from the bottom show the appropriations that go to the various departments and are carried in bills reported by the other committees. Here are the executive or spending departments. For example, take the Committee on Military Affairs. It reports two bills—one the Army bill and one the Military Academy bill; but the Committee on Appropriations reports out a bill carrying all of the clerk hire for employees in the War Department in the District of Columbia, and also reports the fortifications bill, which carries not only for works of fortification but also field artillery and ammunition for field artillery.

Mr. FIELDS rose.

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield. It also reports the sundry civil bill, which carries all of the appropriations for buildings and repair and maintenance of buildings at the Government arsenals. It reports all of the deficiency bills for the War and other departments. Stop and think of it and see how ridiculous and unbusinesslike this plan is. During the Sixty-fifth Congress and the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress the Committee on Appropriations reported appropriation bills appropriating $13,313,000,000 to carry on the war, and during that same period the Committee on Military Affairs reported out bills carrying $11,000,000,000 for carrying on the war. A great part of the work, especially in time of war, must by the very nature of things be proposed in bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations, but the great trouble lies in this divided authority. One committee is working one way and another committee is working another way. The right hand does not know what the left hand doeth, and we find through all of our appropriation bills duplications in the service, we find waste and extravagance. We see great departments going to one committee for an appropriation, and if the funds are not granted they go to another, and not infrequently they succeed. How are you going to eliminate waste under this plan of divided authority? The resolution which we have offered is the solution. It creates one committee on appropriations of 35 members. That committee will be selected, not by the Committee on Appropriations but by the membership of this House. The Democratic

Members determine their personnel, and we will determine our personnel.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 14 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 30 minutes additional time. This is an important matter, and we ought to understand it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that question has been debated several times, and those who would like to express themselves to the contrary on this resolution have had no opportunity. It seems to me it would be rather rubbing it in to have the time extended only to the affirmative side. I object.

Mr. GOOD. I will take one minute more. We are right up now to the proposition of determining whether we are going to make the budget law which we have enacted, which every man believes in, a real, workable thing, or whether we shall tear the budget, when it reaches us, into eight parts and send it to eight committees of this House and let them wrangle as they have wrangled before, duplicate expenditures as they have duplicated before, waste as they have wasted before. Shall we not rather adopt a plan of conducting the biggest business in all the world along business lines, unmindful of the ambitions of men? I plead in the interest of economy, I plead in the interest of the taxpayers, that you adopt this business plan. Let us finish the work we have started, and let the chips fall as they may. Take the committee assignments and go with them. I shall ask no man for my retention on the Committee on Appropriations. I want, if possible, to eliminate personalities from this consideration; to eliminate myself, if necessary. And I know the other members on the Committee on Appropriations would eliminate themselves, if necessary, in order that we might enact and carry into execution a piece of constructive legislation that will redound to the credit of this Congress and that will lighten the burdens of the taxpayers in the United States. [Applause.]

I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] has referred to the declaration in the Democratic platform pledging the party to a budget system. I stand upon that platform; but it does not follow that the plan presented by the gentleman from Iowa is the only plan by which a budget system can be administered. There are evils in our present system, due to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations is exercising jurisdiction now that it should not exercise. If we want to cure the system, first vote down this proposition, which is not as good as the one under which we are now operating, and then let them consult with the other appropriating committees of the House and work out a budget system that will meet the requirements of the country. [Applause.]

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

Mr. FIELDS. No; I can not in five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I merely wanted to remind the gentleman of the words of the Democratic platform.

Mr. FIELDS. I am standing on the Democratic platform, and I shall not ask the gentleman from Wyoming to construe that platform for me. The gentleman from Iowa refers to the fact that during the war the Military Affairs Committee reported out bills carrying $11,000,000,000 for the support of the Army while the Committee on Appropriations reported out bills carrying $13,000,000,000 for the support of the Army. Let me tell you what happened: The War Department came to the Committee on Military Affairs with their estimates. We studied the propositions before us and allowed them what was necessary, and in many instances before one dollar of that money was expended they went before the Committee on Appropriations with a so-called deficiency and got additional funds there for the identical items for which we had appropriated.

With regard to the budget, I am for it; but the question is, Can a subcommittee of three, five, or seven members from the Committee on Appropriations better determine what the Military Establishment should have than 21 members as a military committee who have studied the legislation that makes the appropriations necessary? Can three, five, or seven members, constituting a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, better determine the needs of the Military Establishment than 21 members who devote their entire thought and energy to that proposition? If a subcommittee of five members of the Committee on Appropriations are more capable of passing upon the needs of the Military Establishment than are the 21 members of the Committee on Military Affairs, why have a military committee at all? The man who makes the contention must also contend that they are superior in mentality and business qualifications, and the man on the military committee or on any other committee who agrees with him admits by his agreement that that contention is well founded.

Now, if you want to correct this evil in regard to military appropriations to which the gentleman from Iowa has referred, vote down this proposition. Then come in with a budget system that will confine each appropriating committee within the limits prescribed by the budget committee and keep the hands of the Appropriations Committee out of all appropriations not properly under its jurisdiction. Let the Military Establishment go to the Military Committee for every dollar of their expenses, including deficiencies, and then there will be no room for duplication. Let the Navy Department go to the Naval Committee for its entire appropriation; the Post Office Department to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads for its entire appropriation; the Department of Agriculture to the Committee on Agriculture for its entire appropriations, including deficiencies. Confine each department to a specific committee for its entire appropriations. Have a budget committee cooperating with the Executive to determine the maximum amount that may be appropriated for each department and make it out of order for the committee having jurisdiction to exceed the maximum allowed by the budget committee for any department. By that method you will insure economy through the budget committee, prevent duplications by confining the appropriations of a given department to a single committee, and insure efficiency in the distribution of the amount appropriated among the various items of the bill by having it distributed by a committee that has an intimate knowledge of the department, acquired through legislative experience, which will enable it to know where reductions can be made and where they can not be made without impairing the service.

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

Mr. GOOD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, for several years there has been considerable talk among folks on the street about a budget. I hope the fact that I am on one of the big appropriating committees will not make me forget in the short time since I came here to vote for a budget. [Applause.] There is not a plainer or better understood fact in this Congress than the fact that the legislative committees should not appropriate and that the appropriation committees should not legislate. I have heard hundreds of men say that, but to-day a lot of you are going to forget it because you are on a big legislative committee that has authority now to appropriate money. I say it is beneath the dignity of a Congressman to forget his duty to his constituents simply because he is on one of these committees and to vote against our solemn pledge to the people of the United States in both platforms for the last 10 years. I shall vote for this resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED].

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I have long been in favor of the adoption of a budget system because I realize that this Congress must do business in a businesslike way if we are to reduce expenditures, and that is what we want and that is what the people want. Being in favor of the adoption of a budget system I want to see it made effective, and we all know that it can not be made effective unless we change our rules. There are two plans suggested. One is the plan of the committee that vests in a budget committee of 35 Members acting through its subcommittees all appropriative authority. The other proposition is that we allow this budget committee to allocate the money and then permit the appropriating committees of the House to make up their appropriation bills. Now, there is, it seems to me, a fatal objection to this second plan. The fatal objection is that this money can not be allocated in an arbitrary way. It must be allocated in accordance with the national need. If it is to be allocated in accordance with national need the budget committee——

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED (continuing). Will have to do all the work which is done by the separate appropriating committees of the House—I can not yield to the gentleman in the limited time—and we would thus have a duplication which economy forbids and which time will not allow. I sincerely hope that this Congress will do the patriotic thing, will do the thing that this country wants it to do, and that is to adopt this resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to correct a mistake that was made in the numbering and also to add to the provision as suggested by the Rules Committee, so as to provide that when the Senate added an amendment which would

be subject to a point of order if offered on the floor of the House, if that amendment was offered to a legislative bill and carried an appropriation, when it comes back the House should have a chance to vote. I ask for a reading of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, in line 15, strike out the figures "16" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "56."

On page 3, line 10, strike out the word "any" and insert in lieu thereof the word "no."

On page 3, line 13, after the word "House" insert "nor any amendment of the Senate providing an appropriation upon any bill other than a general appropriation bill."

In line 13, strike out the word "not."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and resolution to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question on the amendment and resolution to final passage.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ANDERSON. I desire to offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. That will come later.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion to recommit offered by Mr. ANDERSON: I move to commit the resolution to the Select Committee on the Budget, with instructions to that committee to strike out all after the resolving clause down to and including line 8 on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Rule X: By adding after clause 1a the following:

"'1b. There shall be a committee on the budget, to consist of the chairman and ranking member of the majority party and the ranking member of the minority party on the following committees: Appropriations, Ways and Means, Rivers and Harbors, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Post Office and Post Roads, Indian Affairs, Public Buildings and Grounds, and the District of Columbia. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations shall be the chairman of the budget committee.

"'It shall be the duty of the budget committee to consider the budget transmitted by the President at the beginning of each regular session of Congress, and from time to time to determine the aggregate amount of appropriations which may be reported by any committee having authority to report appropriations under the rules. No committee shall report appropriations in excess of the total amount authorized by the budget committee for such committee for the ensuing fiscal year.'"

Strike out, on page 3, all of lines 17 to 25, inclusive.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I make the point of order that the motion to recommit is not germane. It does a great deal in a different way than anything we have reported.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to say in his opening remarks that there would not be this motion. The demand for the previous question has been made without any opportunity to understand it. Surely the gentleman will not take the House unawares and press the point of order at this time when he led us to believe that we would have a vote on it.

Mr. GOOD. I have no objection to a motion to recommit that is germane and in order.

The SPEAKER. It occurs to the Chair at first blush that this resolution is a motion to amend the rules in many particulars.

Mr. GOOD. It is a motion to amend the rules in only those particulars that have to do with authority to report appropriation bills and increase the size of one committee, and under Rule XXII to provide that as to an amendment of the Senate that would not be in order if offered on the floor of the House, the conferees should bring back such amendment before agreeing to it. That is practically all that the resolution that we have offered does.

Mr. GARRETT. This creates a new committee.

Mr. GOOD. As I understood the reading of it, it creates a new committee altogether.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Iowa seeks among other things to amend Rule X of the rules of the House. Now, Rule X of the rules of the House is a very comprehensive rule. It provides that "there shall be elected by the House at the commencement of each Congress the following standing committees," and then proceeds with enumeration of the committees of the House in detail, and Rule XI provides for the jurisdiction of these committees. It is true that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] does not create a new committee. It does, however, increase the membership of the Committee on Appropriations and does increase the jurisdiction of that committee. It is a very general amendment of Rules X and XI, and it seems to me it would be a very strict construction of the rules of the House which would hold that where you amend six or seven sections of a rule of the House you can not amend the same identical rule by another provision calculated to accomplish identically the same results.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield? Is it not also a fact that if you extend the jurisdiction of a committee you have to that extent created a new committee?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. You have given it territory to occupy that another special committee might have occupied.

Mr. ANDERSON. Not only does this rule proposed by the gentleman from Iowa amend Rule X and Rule XI of the House, but it adds an additional section, Rule XX, which I preserve in the amendment which I offer. It seems to me that under the rules of the House under which it has generally been held that where a bill undertakes to amend one section or a number of sections of a law it is germane to offer to amend other sections of the law my amendment is clearly in order. If this resolution of the gentleman from Iowa were confined to Rule X, perhaps it might then be contended that it would not be germane to amend the rules in another particular, but the resolution offered by the gentleman from Iowa goes far beyond that and proposes additional rules which have no relation to Rule X, and under that resolution, in my judgment, it is in order to amend any rule of the House. Surely it is in order to further amend the same rule amended by the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman from Minnesota contend that the rule relating to a motion to recommit operates upon a proposal to change the rules of the House, which is ordinarily done by the Committee on Rules, and if this rule was brought in by the Committee on Rules you could not recommit it to the Committee on Rules? Now, it is brought in by another committee, but it pertains to changing the rules of the House. Does the gentleman think you can recommit a proposition of that sort?

Mr. ANDERSON. I submit that this proposition as it now stands before the House stands exactly on the same footing as legislative proposals. This matter as here proposed is not privileged. The Committee on Rules, if it had reported this matter, would not have reported a privileged rule, and certainly it is not privileged when reported by the Committee on the Budget. If it had been it would not have been necessary to pass the rule which we passed to consider it. And the very reason which prohibits the motion to recommit on the rule reported by the Committee on Rules is based on the proposition that that committee has the right to report at any time and its reports are privileged.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will permit, according to a precedent recently established, a report of the Committee on Rules changing the rules of the House has been held privileged under a rule which permits them to report at any time.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true, I think, as to a rule providing for the order of business. I think it is not in order in reference to an amendment to a rule brought in in this way, which, I think, must stand exactly on the same footing as a legislative proposition. It is not privileged as coming from the Committee on the Budget; it has no privileged status in the House under the rules coming from that committee; it has no other status, no different status, than a legislative proposal, when reported by the Committee on the Budget or by any other committee, except the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the adoption of the rule which was reported by the Committee on Rules give it a privileged status, just the same as if it were reported by the Committee on Rules instead of by the Budget Committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think not.

Mr. WALSH. Then what is the need of the rule?

Mr. ANDERSON. The resolution is given a privileged status by the rule, but does not otherwise have the privileged status of a rule or order of business reported by the Committee on Rules. It is not a privileged bill or a privileged rule under the general rules of the House. If it were, then clearly no rule would be necessary to provide for its consideration, because then the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] could have risen in his place at any time and moved the adoption of this resolution. He did not do that. He did not do it because it was not a privileged resolution. On the contrary, he asked for a rule to make it in order, and to provide for its consideration, and by doing that it seems to me the gentleman from Iowa himself took the position that this resolution did not have the same privilege or the same standing before the House as a rule reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether a new rule has been made does not depend on the name, but on the substance of the rule. If we adopt a rule which takes away substantially all the powers from half a dozen or more of the great committees of the House and transfers them all to the Committee on Appropriations, if that does not make a new rule, I do not know how you would make one. It utterly changes the rules in that respect. It creates a new committee, with new powers, and it deprives other committees of powers they had before, and all in the most important particulars.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not all. The question is can we amend this resolution? And what is the object and purpose of the resolution? It is to determine the manner in which appropriations shall be controlled. It is for the purpose of determining what committees shall set the limit upon appropriations. As this rule now provides, the Committee on Appropriations will fix the limit upon all appropriations. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] in his motion to recommit provides that the Budget Committee will set the limit on appropriations. Can anything be more germane or more material to the purpose and object of the resolution? I maintain clearly not, Mr. Speaker. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which we have under consideration, in so far as it seeks to amend Rule X, only amends it by increasing the size of the Committee on Appropriations from 21 members to 35 members.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the rule, in addition to what the gentleman has stated, also take away from the jurisdiction of the various committees now making appropriations the power which they now have?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is Rule XI. I am speaking now of Rule X.

Mr. ANDERSON. It takes it out of Rule X.

Mr. BARKLEY. Rule X in the rules of the House merely prescribes the number of committees that are to be elected by the House and prescribes the number of members on each committee.

Now, the resolution under consideration only changes Rule X by increasing the membership of the Committee on Appropriations from 21 members to 35 members. Therefore the motion by the gentleman from Minnesota to recommit, in which he seeks to amend Rule X by adding another committee, must be germane to Rule X or to the resolution amending Rule X, and the fact that this original resolution seeks to amend Rule XI and Rule XX and Rule XXII should have no bearing on the germaneness of the motion to recommit on the part of the resolution bearing on Rule X. Therefore it is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Rule X only applies to the number of committees, and the resolution under consideration only amends that rule as it applies to the Committee on Appropriations, it is not in order and it is not germane to the resolution as a whole to offer an amendment to Rule X which adds another committee to those already provided for in the existing rule; and the mere fact that subsequent provisions of this rule under consideration seek to take away jurisdiction from other committees and put that jurisdiction into the Committee on Appropriations that is created under Rule X does not make the motion in order to amend Rule X, which affects the provisions of the rule as it now exists. Therefore it seems to me very clear that this motion to recommit is not in order, as not being germane to the proposition contained in the resolution dealing with Rule X.

The SPEAKER. The original resolution amends the rules of the House in various ways, all applying to the one general subject. Now the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] offers his motion to recommit, and the objection is made that it is not germane. This proposition has been for years one of the alternative programs for establishing the budget system. It has been advocated as accomplishing the same result as the main resolution. It has been associated constantly with the subject and is substantially akin to it and is certainly in order unless it is technically not by precedents germane. The Chair would be disposed consequently to hold it in order unless very clearly it were out of order, inasmuch as it affords the House an opportunity to express its preference as to the different budget methods. The original resolution covers several rules, and the Chair thinks that the fact that this motion to recommit does authorize under Rule X a new committee does not make it out of order, because the Chair thinks it is germane to the whole resolution. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. CALDWELL. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused, 9 Members, not a sufficient number, seconding the demand.

Mr. CALDWELL. I withdraw the request.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has withdrawn his request for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays have been refused.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. PADGETT) there were—ayes 79, noes 121.

Accordingly the motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of no quorum present. The Chair will count.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Do not make the point now.

Mr. HAUGEN. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the point. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PADGETT. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays 117, answered "present" 1, not voting 109, as follows:

YEAS—200.

Ackerman	Fairfield	Kleczka	Rayburn
Andrews, Nebr.	Fess	Kraus	Reavis
Ashbrook	Foster	Kreider	Reed, N. Y.
Aswell	Frear	Lanham	Reed, W. Va.
Babka	French	Larsen	Ricketts
Barkley	Fuller, Ill.	Lazaro	Rogers
Bee	Gallagher	Linthicum	Romjue
Benham	Gallivan	Lonergan	Rose
Benson	Ganly	Luce	Sabath
Bland, Ind.	Gard	Luhring	Sanders, Ind.
Bland, Mo.	Garner	McAndrews	Sanford
Bland, Va.	Garrett	McFadden	Schall
Blanton	Good	McGlennon	Scott
Boies	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Siegel
Bowers	Goodykoontz	MacCrate	Sims
Box	Graham, Ill.	MacGregor	Sisson
Briggs	Green, Iowa	Madden	Snell
Browne	Hadley	Magee	Stoll
Buchanan	Hamilton	Maher	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Hays	Major	Sumners, Tex.
Burroughs	Heflin	Mann, S. C.	Sweet
Byrnes, S. C.	Hersey	Mansfield	Swope
Byrns, Tenn.	Hersman	Mapes	Taylor, Colo.
Campbell, Kans.	Hickey	Michener	Temple
Cannon	Hill	Miller	Thompson
Casey	Hoch	Minahan, N. J.	Tilson
Chindblom	Howard	Monahan, Wis.	Timberlake
Christopherson	Huddleston	Mondell	Tincher
Clark, Mo.	Tull, Tenn.	Montague	Tinkham
Classon	Humphreys	Mooney	Towner
Coady	Husted	Moore, Va.	Treadway
Connally	Igoe	Moores, Ind.	Vaile
Cramton	Jacoway	Morgan	Vestal
Crowther	James	Mott	Voigt
Currie, Mich.	Jefferis	Murphy	Volstead
Dallinger	Johnson, Ky.	Neely	Walsh
Davey	Johnson, Miss.	Nelson, Mo.	Walters
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson, Wis.	Wason
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Wash.	Ogden	Watkins
Dempsey	Johnston, N. Y.	Oldfield	Webster
Denison	Jones, Pa.	Parrish	Welling
Dickinson, Iowa	Jones, Tex.	Phelan	Wheeler
Doremus	Juul	Platt	White, Kans.
Dowell	Kearns	Porter	White, Me.
Drewry	Kelley, Mich.	Purnell	Wilson, Ill.
Dunn	Kelly, Pa.	Quin	Wilson, La.
Dyer	Kennedy, Iowa	Radcliffe	Winslow
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, H. T.	Wood, Ind.
Elliott	Kincheloe	Rainey, J. W.	Young, Tex.
Esch	Kinkaid	Ramsey	Zihlman

NAYS—117.

Almon	Butler	Dooling	Glynn
Anderson	Caldwell	Doughton	Goldfogle
Anthony	Candler	Dunbar	Greene, Vt.
Ayres	Carew	Dupré	Griest
Bankhead	Cleary	Eagle	Griffin
Barbour	Collier	Edmonds	Harrison
Begg	Crago	Evans, Nebr.	Haugen
Bell	Crisp	Fields	Hawley
Black	Cullen	Fisher	Hicks
Blackmon	Darrow	Flood	Hoey
Brand	Dent	Focht	Holland
Britten	Dominick	Fordney	Hudspeth
Brooks, Pa.	Donovan	Gandy	Hull, Iowa

Kahn	Mead	Pou	Stephens, Ohio
Keller	Milligan	Rainey, Ala.	Stevenson
King	Moon	Raker	Summers, Wash.
Knutson	Mudd	Riordan	Tague
Langley	Newton, Mo.	Robinson, N. C.	Taylor, Ark.
Layton	Nicholls	Robsion, Ky.	Thomas
Lea, Calif.	Nolan	Rouse	Venable
Lee, Ga.	O'Connell	Rowe	Vinson
Little	O'Connor	Rubey	Weaver
Lufkin	Oliver	Sells	Welty
McDuffie	Olney	Sinclair	Whaley
McKeown	Osborne	Sinnott	Wise
McKinlry	Overstreet	Smith, Idaho	Woods, Va.
McLaughlin, Mich.	Padgett	Smith, N. Y.	Wright
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Park	Steagall	
Mann, Ill.	Pell	Stedman	
Martin	Peters	Steenerson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Wingo

NOT VOTING—109.

Andrews, Md.	Evans, Nev.	Lesher	Sears
Bacharach	Ferris	Longworth	Sherwood
Baer	Freeman	McArthur	Shreve
Booher	Fuller, Mass.	McClintic	Slemp
Brinson	Garland	McCulloch	Small
Brooks, Ill.	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Smith, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Goodall	McLane	Smith, Mich.
Burke	Gould	McPherson	Smithwick
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	Mason	Snyder
Cantrill	Greene, Mass.	Mays	Steele
Caraway	Hamill	Merritt	Stephens, Miss.
Carss	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Ohio	Stiness
Carter	Hardy, Tex.	Morin	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Fla.	Harreld	Newton, Minn.	Sullivan
Cole	Hastings	Paige	Taylor, Tenn.
Cooper	Hayden	Parker	Tillman
Copley	Hernandez	Ramseyer	Upshaw
Costello	Houghton	Randall, Calif.	Vare
Curry, Calif.	Hulings	Randall, Wis.	Ward
Dale	Hutchinson	Reber	Watson
Dewalt	Ireland	Rhodes	Williams
Dickinson, Mo.	Kendall	Riddick	Wilson, Pa.
Drane	Kettner	Rodenberg	Woodyard
Echols	Kiess	Rowan	Yates
Ellsworth	Kitchin	Rucker	Young, N. Dak.
Elston	Lampert	Sanders, La.	
Emerson	Lankford	Sanders, N. Y.	
Evans, Mont.	Lehlbach	Scully	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. STINESS with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. COOPER with Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri.

Mr. MASON with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. YATES with Mr. BRINSON.

Mr. REBER with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. LESHER.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. CARAWAY.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado with Mr. CARTER.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. MAYS.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. EVANS of Montana.

Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

On this vote:

Mr. LONGWORTH (for) with Mr. WINGO (against).

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts (for) with Mr. GOODALL (against).

Mr. WILLIAMS (for) with Mr. MCPHERSON (against).

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts (for) with Mr. HARDY of Texas (against).

Mr. MOORE of Ohio (for) with Mr. ROWAN (against).

Mr. KENDALL (for) with Mr. SULLIVAN (against).

Mr. SNYDER (for) with Mr. MCARTHUR (against).

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota (for) with Mr. HASTINGS (against).

Mr. SLEMP (for) with Mr. RANDALL of California (against).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, am I here in time to vote?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is too late. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] informs me that he intends to call up the deficiency bill and begin general debate on that bill. It is not anticipated that there will be anything further than general debate this evening. I announced on yesterday that I expected to-day to ask for a recess from 6 until 8 o'clock, but it has occurred to me that in view of the fact that there will be no roll call this evening, no vote, it will be quite as well to continue the session and continue as long as gentlemen may desire and consider it profitable to address the House. Gentlemen are invited to remain to an evening of unrestrained and delightful oratory, and I trust that no one will be so ungracious as to make the point of no quorum during the procedure. If this is done we must adjourn, for I shall not call for a quorum. Just how long we will continue in session will be determined by events as they transpire, but in any event there will be no roll call.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. How long will the general debate last?

Mr. MONDELL. That can not be decided now, but if there is something of an attendance here and gentlemen desire to go on, we might be here as late as 10 o'clock. But there will be no vote, there will be no record made. So if gentlemen can not be here they can have no reasonable objection to the session continuing.

Mr. BLACKMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BLACKMON. Under what rule will we proceed this evening?

Mr. MONDELL. Under the rule of the House governing general debate.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, is it desired that the House shall first act on the gentleman's request for unanimous consent?

Mr. MONDELL. I made no unanimous-consent request; I made a statement of the business that will be taken up. Of course, it is for the House to determine how long it will continue this evening.

Mr. GARD. What is the purpose of the gentleman's request? What is the legislative program to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. There are a number of matters that will come up to-morrow.

Mr. BLACKMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BLACKMON. I want to know if this evening, under the the discussion, there will be any procedure that may be open for the people to nail the last tack in the State rights coffin?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to dispense with the business of Calendar Wednesday to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman was asked what might be the business for to-morrow and he was interrupted and did not state. May I ask whether the gentleman is in a position to tell us what business will come up to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. That will depend upon whether a conference report is filed on the shipping bill to-night. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] informs me that he desires to take up a bill relative to the taking of the census on leather and hides. Matters that would have the right of way to-morrow are conference reports.

Mr. SISSON. I suppose we will go on with the deficiency bill?

Mr. MONDELL. We will finish the deficiency bill to-morrow.

Mr. SISSON. And there will be nothing but general debate on that to-night?

Mr. GOOD. We will have general debate to-night.

Mr. PELL. How long does the gentleman think the deficiency bill will take.

Mr. MONDELL. I could not tell.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know what the gentleman intends to bring up to-morrow.

Mr. MONDELL. The measure now before the House, the deficiency appropriation bill, has to be disposed of, and there are a number of conference reports that will have to be considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, what is the advantage in doing away with Calendar Wednesday when the whole calendar is subject to suspension of the rules? I object.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PELL. Reserving the right to object, how much does the deficiency appropriation bill carry?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know.

Mr. GOOD. About $52,000,000.

Mr. PELL. At the rate we worked the other day on the bonus bill, for a billion and a half, I should say the deficiency bill should occupy about 10 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Perhaps so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks in the RECORD upon the budget.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon war risk insurance legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] at Arlington National Cemetery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD made yesterday concerning the agricultural bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LAYING CERTAIN BILLS ON THE TABLE.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike from the calendar the bill (H. R. 12721) to abolish the Subtreasuries and to provide for the transfer of the coins, currency, and bullion, and for other purposes, as an exactly similar bill has been passed as a part of the legislative appropriation act and signed by the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to lay on the table the bill H. R. 13908, in respect to the farm-loan act, an identical Senate bill having been passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT—SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report for printing under the rule on the bill (H. R. 13870) making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14335) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes. Pending that I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided, to be controlled one-half by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate be equally divided, to be controlled one half by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the other half by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, in American history never has there been such scandal and incompetence as has been displayed by the present administration in relation to the sugar problem of the United States for 1920.

Never has there been an addition to the cost of living to the American people of a billion to a billion and a half dollars per annum, without excuse, without reason, and without apology, directly traceable to the gross neglect of any other administration.

Never have officials of the Government sought with such audacity and mendacity to mislead the American people by false and grossly misleading statements whose very utterance is their own refutation than in relation to the present price of sugar and its scarcity in the United States.

The Attorney General has twice stated that the President and he himself are not responsible for the increase of 100 to 150 per cent for 1920 in the cost of sugar at retail to the American people, that being an addition in the price of sugar per annum of a billion to a billion and a half dollars.

The first of these statements was made by the Attorney General April 29 before the committee investigating the Louisiana sugar action of the Attorney General. The second statement was made by the Attorney General to the public press shortly thereafter. These statements by the Attorney General are false and grossly misleading.

Sugar was sold during most of 1919 throughout the United States for 10 to 11 cents per pound at retail. This result was obtained through the action of the Sugar Equalization Board, a Government corporation, in purchasing the Cuban crop for 1919 with the assent of the President.

The Sugar Equalization Board is, has been, and can be in legal existence until 1923 under its charter. All laws in force in relation to the control of sugar in 1918 were in force through 1919, and are in force to-day and under them the same control over sugar could be exercised. This would be a short answer to the Attorney General's contention that Congress and not the President was responsible for the present sugar situation.

But assuming that some legislation was in fact necessary, it is obvious that Congress could in no wise be held responsible, if, as was the fact, the purchase of the 1920 crop was first a matter for presidential decision, and not only was that decision never made but Congress was never informed by the President of the facts involved.

The record has been made up and the record is very clear.

Mr. Herbert Hoover testified before the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives that as early as last July in Paris he had made a world survey of the food situation and had cabled to the President that there would be a sugar shortage in 1920 in the United States, with attendant speculation and profiteering, unless action was taken. The cable, as shown by the Sugar Equalization Board records, pressed for an immediate decision by the President as to the purchase of the 1920 Cuban crop and recommended a council with the members of the Sugar Equalization Board, stating that "determination of the sugar policies requires immediate consideration."

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I can not in my short time.

With this information in his possession, the President on August 8 addressed Congress in relation to the high cost of living, but made no mention whatever of sugar, although he did mention fresh eggs, frozen fowls, creamery butter, salted beef, canned corn, canned tomatoes, leather, coal, lumber, and textiles. In this message the President urged that the present food-control act should be extended both as to time and as to commodities to which it should apply, but not only was this recommendation made without any reference to the sugar situation, but as elaborated by him related to a wholly different subject.

It is the usual practice for the heads of departments to prepare and present to Congress bills to carry out recommendations of the President. Following this practice the Attorney General himself prepared and presented in August a bill to Congress amending the food-control act. In this bill there was no mention of sugar nor any provision for its control beyond 1919. In all of the hearings upon this bill at which the Attorney General appeared there was no mention made of the Cuban crop of 1920 nor any intimation that the food-control act should be extended so as to provide for its control. His later statement of November 7 to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives that he had in August recommended the extension of the Lever Act is, as shown by the printed hearings, wholly false.

August 20, before the Agricultural Committee of the House, the Attorney General said:

> The draft which I sent to the committee makes only two changes in the food-control act, the first including wearing apparel and certain containers in the meaning of the word "necessaries," and the second was to put a penalty of $5,000 fine and two years' imprisonment upon all of the acts prohibited by section 4.

The Attorney General at all of these hearings opposed as impracticable the use or the extension of the licensing system for

food control, which, as it afterwards appeared, was the one point insisted upon by the Sugar Equalization Board if the Cuban crop was to be purchased. This bill was passed by Congress substantially as drawn by the Attorney General.

In the meantime, on August 14, the Sugar Equalization Board privately sent to the President the Cuban Government's offer to sell the 1920 crop, accompanied by a detailed memorandum of the situation. This memorandum again called attention to the probability that the world sugar shortage for 1920 would be more acute than for 1919.

Even Prof. Taussig, who dissented as to the policy of buying the Cuban crop, concurred in the fact that indications pointed to a sugar shortage in 1920. These facts and these recommendations were never laid before Congress by the President. No answer whatever was vouchsafed even to the Sugar Equalization Board, except that the President had the matter under consideration. Thus not only was the Sugar Equalization Board prevented from taking any steps toward the acquisition of the 1920 Cuban crop but the American refiners were kept out of the market pending the decision, which was never made. Meanwhile, however, other countries began to contract for the coming crop, until by the latter part of September one-third of it had already been bought by foreign nations.

In all this matter the distinction between the then current 1919 crop and the prospective crop of 1920 must be kept in mind. The 1919 crop was under control, and while, as early as July, it was apparent that there were some difficulties in the sugar situation for that year, and there had been some resolutions introduced upon this subject, the situation was wholly independent of the prospect for 1920, which, so far as Congress had been informed, might indicate complete restoration of normal conditions. It was this situation for 1920 that remained in the keeping of those who had reported it as in duty bound to the President only to have it secreted and withheld from Congress.

On September 22 the Cuban offer was withdrawn, and the Sugar Equalization Board sent privately the following letter to the President:

SEPTEMBER 23, 1919.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The inclosed copy of a letter from Messrs. Hawley and Rionda, representing the sugar producers of Cuba, is self-explanatory, and in view of the fact that about one-third of the Cuban crop of next year has since been disposed of for export to countries other than the United States, we believe that the situation is out of hand.

Therefore, in order to protect the interests of the American consumer, we have advised American refiners as to conditions, so that they may purchase raw sugar as per prewar times.

Very respectfully,

GEORGE A. ZABRISKIE,
President United States Sugar Equalization Board (Inc.).

On September 27 Congress, on its own initiative, began an inquiry into the sugar question, and on October 3 the subcommittee of the Agricultural Committee of the Senate summoned the Sugar Equalization Board before it.

During the Senate hearings on that day for the first time the information was given to Congress that the Sugar Equalization Board had sent, in August and September, communications to the President concerning the coming shortage in sugar for 1920 and its recommendation that an offer of sale of the Cuban crop had been made by the Cuban Government, and finally that that offer had been withdrawn. All of these facts, with great reluctance, were testified to by the Sugar Equalization Board. Upon that same day the attorney for the Sugar Equalization Board was asked what legislation should be enacted, if any, and he replied, "I have not figured that out."

The legislation which, at the request of the Senate committee, he prepared the latter part of October as necessary was quite elaborate and very different from a simple extension of the Lever Act. Though isolated sentences may be wrenched from their context, the whole record shows that all concerned considered the President's decision to purchase the crop to be the first requisite step, and pending that decision, which was never made, even the Sugar Equalization Board itself had not considered the details of the legislation which it testified would be necessary to enable it adequately to control the distribution.

On October 30 the Attorney General first sent a communication to Congress that he desired an extension of the food-control act, and in his testimony on the bill he submitted on November 7 sugar or its control still was never mentioned. At this time it was absolutely impossible to purchase the Cuban crop; there was no offer pending from anyone in Cuba; the situation had been officially reported out of hand for over a month; the coming scarcity was manifest, and a large portion of the new crop had been purchased on private account. The opportunity had gone, never to return.

This shameful record places where it belongs the responsibility for the most unbridled extortion, unrestrained profiteering, and the wildest speculation in foodstuffs that has ever occurred upon the American continent. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The real explanation of the present sugar situation is too much League of Nations. It is the answer to the American consumers' sugar burden to-day. If the President had counted "America first" last July, August, and September, as he has since been compelled to do by the United States Senate, the sugar bill of the American people would have been less by hundreds of millions.

What, if anything, can still be done? This question was asked Mr. Hoover, whose recommendations of last July would, if followed, have averted the entire catastrophe. Mr. Hoover was of the opinion that two measures might even now greatly ameliorate the situation. The first of these as outlined to the House committee consisted of an international agreement regulating the purchase and distribution of sugar, thereby preventing the present excessive competition in neutral countries. The second was the rationing of nonessential manufacturers of sugar products. These suggestions were made on May 14. What will the President and the Attorney General do with these suggestions? The Attorney General will continue, as heretofore, with investigations and prosecutions which, however commendable, will have little effect whatever on the price of sugar. The President—I shall say no more. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, by unanimous consent, I desire to incorporate in the RECORD as an extension the cablegram received from Mr. Hoover July 23, 1919.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to incorporate in his remarks the cablegram described by him. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The cablegram referred to is as follows:

PARIS, *July 23, 1919.*

Fruit 354 for Barnes, July 23. Please transmit the following to the President as a cable from me:

"It is necessary to take important decisions as to the sugar control in the United States in order to anticipate the marketing of a new beet harvest and to settle policy with Cuba for the next year. You will recollect that last July I presented to you the view that either in event of continued war and the consequent shipping isolation of the East Indies sugar, or in the event of peace and the opening of new demands, there would be a world shortage in the year nineteen. I recommended that we inform the Sugar Equalization Board to purchase the Cuban sugar crop jointly with the Allies and to arrange for equalization in marketing with the domestic sugar in order to assure American supplies at reasonable prices and to eliminate speculation and profiteering, and that the board should secure a small margin in handling Cuban sugar to cover losses in the event of reverse on Atlantic shipping and to equalize freight and distribution costs. These things were done, and to-day the United States is the only large Nation possessing liberal supplies for the entire year and at a saving of 4 cents per pound under the world price, or equal to about $25,000,000 per month saving to the consumer. These courses of action grew out of war disruption of supply and distribution. Decision must now be made as to whether Congress should be recommended to legislate authority for the continuation of these measures over the year 1920, providing again for the purchase of the Cuban crop and the control of domestic production, stabilization of price, and distribution. The intrinsic situation is by no means clear as to the prospect of supplies, and it is argued by many that there will be a continued shortage over the year 1920, with attendant speculation and profiteering, unless action is taken.

"The matters to be considered are (a) the crop prospects of the world, in which there is undoubtedly an increase over prewar in the Western Hemisphere and East Indies, but the European beet production (outside Russia) will be apparently 25 per cent short of prewar average, and although the Russian situation is unknown there are no exports likely; (b) the probable consumption of the world, as to which there is an undoubted increase in Europe, especially in the United States, but with regard to Europe the limited buying power during the next year (unless there is very rapid economic recovery) will tend to restrain the nonessential use of sugar.

"The problem is also affected by (a) whether European Governments will continue their national buying with national finance and be in position to contract for national supplies for long periods in advance to the prejudice of a free market and the ability of normal commerce to purchase on the same terms. This will probably depend upon whether the United States will allow credits to foreign countries to be used for such form of purchase; (b) whether in the long view the adjustment of production to world necessity will not be more rapid under free operation of supply and demand, although there may be great fluctuations in the process of readjustment; (c) whether, from a social point of view, it is desirable to perpetuate a great governmental control in commerce now that the war interference of supply through short shipping, the necessity of control of cargoes, etc., has largely disappeared, even though speculation and profiteering may result. Any continuation of control will require action by Congress, and it must embrace appropriations, the continuation of power and embargo, control of speculation, profiteering, and distribution. The alternative course to any action of the above character is for the Sugar Equalization Board to announce its cessation of control at an early date prior to the marketing season of domestic beet and cane sugars and to dispose of the remaining stocks from the old crop purchased by them at the market prices from day to day until they are exhausted. Owing to the delays in the Austrian treaty, it seems impossible for me to withdraw American control of railways, coal mines, and transport of food in central Europe before the middle of September, without producing absolute chaos in that area, and therefore I will not be able to arrive home before that date. The

determination of the sugar policies requires immediate consideration, and my lack of intimate knowledge of American situation after eight months' absence, and my inability to leave here, renders it impossible for me to be of useful service in the matter. I therefore suggest you request Prof. Taussig, Mr. Zabriskie, and the other members of the Sugar Equalization Board to present you their recommendations in the matter independent of myself. If, as a result of your councils, you should decide to propose to Congress that the control be continued, it is imperative that a new chairman should be chosen in my place at once, in order that he may be of assistance to Congress in legislation, and that he should be in charge from the beginning, as I must, in any event, retire this autumn. If it be decided that there should be no extension of control, I would be glad to be relieved anyway, as I wish a rest, but if this should be inconvenient to you I would, of course, continue until the board is wound up this fall."

HOOVER.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts yields back five minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on March 4, 1919, as a result of the preceding election in November, the control of both Houses of Congress passed to the Republican Party. In the last session of the preceding Congress a Republican filibuster in the Senate prevented the passage of the following annual supply bills: Sundry civil expenses, District of Columbia, the Army, the Navy, Agriculture, the Indian, and the deficiency appropriation bill pending at the time. The Republican Senators who conducted the filibuster during the closing days of that session frankly stated that it was their purpose to defeat a number of the supply bills so that the President would be compelled to call an extra session of the present, or Sixty-sixth, Congress early in the spring of 1919, in order to provide the necessary appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1919. They insisted that an early extra session was important because of the great need for the immediate consideration of reconstruction legislation which it was impossible to consider during the short session of the preceding Congress. Republican leaders of both branches of Congress solemnly assured the public that as soon as the new Republican Congress was assembled it would speedily get to work and pass necessary and important measures of relief.

Accordingly, on May 19, 1919, Congress was assembled in special session on the call of the President, and in a strong, earnest message he directed its attention not only to the necessity of the passage of the remaining supply bills before the following July 1, but to various other important measures which should be immediately passed in the interest of the country. He also gave notice that not later than January 1, 1920, he would direct the return of the railroads to their owners, and asked that necessary legislation be passed in order to enable him to do this. He urged "an early reconsideration of Federal taxes, in order to make our system of taxation more simple and easy of administration and the taxes themselves as little burdensome as they can be made and yet suffice to support the Government and meet all its obligations," calling particular attention to needed changes in the income and excess-profits tax to the end that there might be relief from certain inequalities and unequal burdens, existing on account of having been imposed during the stress and exigencies of war needs. He urged the enactment of a budget system, which has become vitally important on account of the enormous expenditures growing out of the war, and he and the Attorney General repeatedly requested Congress to pass certain amendments to the Lever Food Control Act, in order that profiteers might be proceeded against criminally and in aid of the efforts of the administration to reduce the high cost of living. The importance of these and other recommendations were strongly emphasized.

In what spirit did this Congress meet these wise recommendations of the President? Was it in a spirit of mutual service to the country? The record has been made and speaks for itself. From the very moment it convened in extraordinary session it began to play politics in the interest of the presidential election in 1920. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Instead of promptly devoting itself to the passing of wholesome laws it forthwith provided for a great number of investigating committees, which have spent their whole time in investigating Army expenditures during the war and every phase of its conduct. It is estimated that these investigations will cost the Government more than $1,000,000 for high-salaried employees, travel, and other expenses and the time of Government clerks and employees consumed in supplying data and information. And as a result these committees have discovered that an enormous amount of money was spent during the war, which everyone knew and approved at the time, and that the war was brought to a triumphant and successful conclusion earlier than was anticipated and with a minimum loss of life and expenditure, under a Democratic administration. Although Congress convened on May 19, it failed to pass the legislation necessary to enable the President to return the railroads on January 1, as he had announced, and on account of this delay he was compelled to postpone their return until March 1, 1920. Of this delay Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Leffingwell said in a recent address:

While Congress deliberated the Government held control of the railroad systems of the country for a year and a quarter after fighting stopped, and furnished transportation at less than cost. Then Congress ordered the railroads returned to their owners, with a new expenditure of $1,000,000,000 by the Government for their account and the deferment for years of $1,000,000,000 the railroads owe the Government.

It was not until a few days ago that the Senate passed the House bill which has for its object the establishment of a permanent shipping policy, which was also urged by the President in the interest of a permanent American merchant marine. In referring to this, and the expenditures of the United States Shipping Board, Mr. Leffingwell in the address referred to said:

The actual cash expenditures since armistice day amounted to approximately $1,600,000,000, while Congress deliberated as to our shipping policy. Notwithstanding the fact that it has been engaged in commercial shipping at a time when it is exceptionally profitable, the Shipping Board has made as yet no net return to the Treasury, its expenditures still exceeding its receipts.

It was more than four months before an amendment to the Lever Food Control Act was adopted, and only after repeated requests from the Attorney General. Congress has given no consideration to a revision of Federal taxes. It was nearly six months before the House passed the act creating the budget system, and another six months elapsed before the Senate passed it with amendments, and it is only now in process of finally becoming law. Estimates for the ensuing fiscal year must be prepared in September and October, and it is now too late for an organization to be fully perfected under this law and to obtain the greatest measure of benefit from it in so far as the appropriations for the next fiscal year are concerned, inasmuch as these appropriations must be made at the short session, which ends on March 4 next. It is impossible to estimate the loss which will accrue to the Treasury on account of this delay, but it will amount to many millions of dollars if the claims which are made by its advocates of savings as a result of the budget system are true. The Congress has failed to repeal any of the war-time legislation, much of which has become burdensome and oppressive to the people, since the war has come to an end.

What has been the record of this Congress as to retrenchment in expenditures? As I have said, it was necessary at the extra session to make appropriations for sundry civil expenses, Agriculture, the Army, the Navy, the District of Columbia, and the Indian. All of these bills had been passed by a Democratic House at the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, but had failed of passage in the Senate on account of the filibuster referred to. At the extra session the appropriations for the Army and the Navy and the Shipping Board were greatly reduced from what they were when they passed the House, due solely to the fact that in the interim, as a result of Democratic efficiency, the Army and Navy had been more speedily demobilized than it was originally thought could be done, and on account of the reduction in the shipbuilding program and the beginning of the process of liquidation. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP], in his remarks which appear in the RECORD of May 31, claims credit for a reduction of $940,000,000 of the estimates submitted for these appropriations, but he fails to state that these reductions appear entirely in the estimates for the Army, the Navy, and the United States Shipping Board. The facts are that at the time the Army bill passed the House in the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress there were a million and a half men in the Army in France and a half million or more men here. These men had to be brought back to this country and then demobilized, and everyone, both Republicans and Democrats, in committee and in the House concluded that by as rapid a demobilization as then seemed possible the Army would average during the ensuing fiscal year 500,000 men.

But four months later, when the new Army bill was passed, Congress found that owing to the diligent and efficient administration by the War Department and the Navy Department in bringing back the boys from Europe and demobilizing the Army so much more rapidly than was anticipated at the preceding session, the average Army, instead of being 500,000 for the ensuing fiscal year, would be only 300,000, and hence the amount of the appropriation was reduced to provide for this size of an Army instead of the 500,000 men as it appeared to the committee and House was necessary in the preceding session. That was the cause of the difference in the appropriation figures, and Mr. KAHN, the Republican chairman of the Commit-

tee on Military Affairs, stated on the floor that the work of demobilization had progressed faster than was anticipated by the War Department, and that—

The committee was justified at that time in appropriating for that number because it seemed to the committee that it would not be possible to demobilize our forces as rapidly as they have been demobilized.

This is a splendid tribute from a high Republican source to Democratic efficiency. The same is true of the reductions made in the estimates for the Navy. Mr. BUTLER, the Republican chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, stated that these reductions were caused by "conditions, plans, or events occurring subsequent to the adjournment of Congress." These reductions were made possible solely by reason of Democratic efficiency in demobilizing the Navy more rapidly than had been anticipated at the preceding session, and deferring certain construction until a later appropriation bill. And yet in the face of this record the gentleman from Virginia claims that the Republican House reduced these particular estimates in the sum of $940,000,000 and fails to give credit to the War and Navy Departments, who alone made it possible. The Republican members of these two committees will not sustain him in that contention.

Leaving out, therefore, the appropriations made for these three purposes it will be found that the appropriations made in the bills referred to exceeded by more than $62,000,000 the amount previously appropriated by a Democratic House for the same fiscal year and for the same purpose. That is a part of what the Republican filibuster in the Senate and this Republican Congress cost the Treasury in the first six weeks of its first or extraordinary session. In view of this record is it any wonder that the Republican majority leader in his numerous statements on the floor and in the press carefully refrained from referring to the record of retrenchment made by this Congress at the extra session? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It should be stated, Mr. Chairman, that in addition to the appropriations previously made for the fiscal year, there has been passed at this session of Congress a railroad deficiency bill carrying the sum of $309,717,285.79, representing only in part the loss accruing to the Government in the operation and control of the railroads during the war, and also three deficiency bills carrying appropriations aggregating the sum of about $176,771,889. The third deficiency bill also carries for the next fiscal year in appropriations and authority to settle certain claims the amount of $80,271,810.63. This additional sum was in very large part made necessary by obligations growing out of the war, and I have referred to it for the purpose of showing the great demand which has been made on the Treasury during this fiscal year, and to emphasize the importance of the most rigid economy in future appropriations.

Excessive expenditures by the Government means necessarily high taxes, and it must be remembered that these taxes are not only passed on to the consumer in the price of what he has to buy, but that they are multiplied many times in the process. Governmental extravagance is one of the great factors which contributes to the high cost of living by reason of the high taxes imposed, and it is highly pertinent to inquire as to just what this Congress has done toward reducing the expenditures of the next fiscal year, bearing in mind that the true test of economy is not a mere reduction of such estimates as may be submitted by the department, but that it must be determined by a comparison of the appropriations made with those heretofore made for like purposes and under similar conditions, and also whether or not Congress has refrained from creating new activities and imposing new obligations for which there was no pressing and immediate necessity. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The total appropriations carried in the 13 supply bills for the next fiscal year amount to $2,212,126,298.78. This is exclusive of the permanent appropriations amounting to $1,363,768,980.29 and also of the amounts carried in special acts passed at this and the previous session to which I shall refer hereafter. Neither does it include the amount necessary to provide for the bonus which has been provided for employees whose salaries are less than $2,500, and which it is estimated will amount to something like $35,000,000. The appropriations carried in the annual or regular supply bills are $1,384,917,650.39 less than the estimates which were originally submitted by the various departments.

However, it should be said just here, Mr. Chairman, that some of these estimates were voluntarily withdrawn and for which credit should be given in the reductions above referred to, but to which neither the majority leader nor the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations have referred in the statements which they have made. For instance, there was withdrawn by the departments from the estimates for the sundry civil bill sums amounting to more than $225,000,000. Eighty-five million dollars was withdrawn from the naval estimates and $51,000,000 from the estimates for fortifications, and there were similar withdrawals from estimates considered in other appropriation bills, but in less amounts.

The reductions made are principally in the estimates submitted for the Army, the Navy, and the United States Shipping Board. Congress has the authority and must establish the policy as to the size of the Army and Navy to be maintained, and the reduction in the Army estimates is due to fewer men and correspondingly less supplies than was originally estimated for. The reorganization bill which has just been adopted provides for an Army to be maintained in peace time of a maximum strength of 300,000 men and 18,000 officers, and which if enlisted to full strength will cost the Government $650,000,000 annually to maintain in times of peace. The Army appropriations for the next fiscal year provide for 175,000 men and 17,000 officers, resulting in the reduction of the estimates in the sum of $590,563,755. Just why this appropriation was increased to make provision for over 90 per cent of the maximum officer personnel, when provision is made for less than 60 per cent of the maximum enlisted personnel, has not been explained. The appropriation for the Navy is $433,279,574, which is a reduction of $149,351,680.80 in the estimates, but this reduction has also been brought about entirely by fewer men, fewer ships, and a liberal draft on unexpended balances and reserve supplies.

There is also a reduction in the estimates for the emergency ship fund of $446,270,652, which was voluntarily reduced by the Shipping Board to $261,000,000 on account of developments subsequent to the time when the original estimates were submitted. This great reduction was made on paper by making no direct appropriation for this purpose but reappropriating the unexpended balance on hand and authorizing the Shipping Board to draw on its receipts for sales of ships, surplus material, operations, and so forth, to an amount of at least $225,000,000 in the aggregate.

Too much can not be said, Mr. Chairman, in condemnation of such a policy. It misleads the public as to just how much money has been appropriated for governmental needs, inasmuch as these sums do not appear as a part of the sum total appropriated in the statements which have been made. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Good business and sound economical administration and policy requires that all receipts for Government operations shall be covered into the Treasury and direct appropriations made, in order that there may be no uncertainty as to just what amounts have been made available for Government expenditures. There has been reappropriated large unexpended balances which do not appear in the stated sum totals of appropriations, but which nevertheless constitute a direct charge on the Treasury for the next fiscal year.

It is impossible at this time to accurately determine the exact amount of these reappropriations, but it can be safely said that they will amount to more than $350,000,000, and the very fact that one can not pick up an appropriation bill and quickly ascertain the full amount of appropriations carried is a strong and compelling argument against this method of making appropriations. It has, however, no doubt served its purpose in that it has made possible an apparent reduction of the estimates in these sums and thus enable gentlemen on the other side to boast of a reduction which appears on the surface but which in reality does not exist. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the reductions made in the estimates for the Army, the Navy, and the Shipping Board are excluded, and the amount of reappropriations and expenditures authorized out of governmental receipts are taken into consideration, it will be observed that there have been very slight, if any, actual reductions made in the sum total of the estimates.

Gentlemen on the majority side of the Chamber have referred to these reductions as savings and as showing great economy on the part of Congress. With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, to those gentlemen who have made this claim, such an insistence is nothing short of ridiculous. It is sheer nonsense. If that is to be the rule by which the economy and the saving of a Congress is to be determined let me call their attention to the fact that for the fiscal year 1918 a Democratic Congress reduced the estimates in the sum of $5,554,161,598.31, and that during the eight years while the Democrats were in the majority on the Appropriations Committee estimates for the bills over which it had jurisdiction were reduced in the sum of $9,275,684,891.55. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the facts are that Congress invariably reduces the estimates submitted by the departments. The record during all previous administrations demonstrates this fact, and no one heretofore has ever claimed that such reductions of themselves constituted an evidence of economy on the part

of Congress. A comparison of the estimates submitted with the appropriations made in order to establish a record for retrenchment is clearly a false basis of computation and comparison, for real legislative economy or retrenchment consists in cutting down the amount of fixed or normal expenditures as made during previous years. The only correct way by which to determine whether a Congress has practiced economy and retrenched expenditures is to compare its appropriations with those made by preceding Congresses for similar services to be performed under like conditions. When judged by this standard the present Congress has not reduced but has actually increased expenses. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is entirely proper to compare the appropriations made for the fiscal year 1921, two years after the signing of the armistice, with appropriations made for the fiscal year 1916, the last full fiscal year preceding the war. I will append a comparative statement showing the amounts carried in the various appropriation bills for these two fiscal years. It will be observed that *these bills* carry appropriations for 1921 amounting to $2,212,126,298.78, while the same bills for the fiscal year 1916 carry $978,722,857.78. In addition there was carried permanent and miscellaneous appropriations for each year, making the total sum appropriated for the year 1921, $4,859,690,327.30, as compared with $1,114,937,012.02 for 1916, or an increase of $3,744,753,315.28. It is true that there are certain large obligations and activities growing out of the war and which may be called war hang overs which have to be taken care of during the next fiscal year, and for which there were, of course, no appropriations made in 1916, but these additional obligations and activities are principally provided for in the Army, Navy, and sundry civil bills, and also in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which carries appropriations, among other things, for the pay of Government employees in the District of Columbia.

That bill carries for 1921, $104,735,726.11, as compared with $36,904,799.75 for the year 1916. I submit that these figures do not indicate any very great tendency toward reducing the number of employees necessary during the war and returning to a normal basis. If you deduct from the appropriations in the sundry civil bill for 1921 the amounts carried for compensation, hospital treatment, and training of soldiers and other services growing out of the war it will be found that it carries $154,866,881.92, as compared with $126,922,750.79 which was carried in 1916 for the same purpose. An analysis of the appropriations made in the other bills which can not be said to have any connection with obligations arising out of the war and which appear in the table which will be appended shows that there have been like increases made in those bills for these strictly prewar activities. Thus it will be noted that there was appropriated for pensions for military service rendered prior to the World War the sum of $279,150,000 for 1921, as compared with $164,100,000 for 1916; for the Postal Service, $462,575,190 for 1921, as compared with $313,364,667 for 1916; for the Indian Service, $10,040,655.27 for 1921, as compared with $9,771,902.76 for 1916; for Agriculture, $31,712,784 for 1921, as compared with $22,971,782 for 1916; for the Diplomatic and Consular Service, $9,218,537.91 for 1921, as compared with $4,061,280.01 for 1916; for fortifications, $18,833,442 for 1921, as compared with $6,060,216.90 for 1916; for the Military Academy, $2,142,212.70 for 1921, as compared with $1,069,813.37 for 1916; and for District of Columbia, $18,373,004.87 for 1921, as compared with $11,859,584.45 for 1916, an increase of $326,730,701.49 for 1921 over the amount appropriated in 1916 in these nine regular appropriation bills, or more than one-third of the total amount appropriated in the 13 regular annual supply bills for 1916.

And let me say again that it can not be claimed that these increases have been brought about as the result of activities growing out of the war, or "war hang overs." And this does not take into consideration the increased drafts on the Treasury made by special acts passed at this and the extra session, and to which I will refer hereafter. The record clearly refutes the claim that this Congress has reduced and retrenched expenditures or that it has given consideration to the condition of the Treasury and the burdens of an already heavily taxed people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In addition, Mr. Chairman, this Congress has enacted a great number of laws carrying appropriations in varying amounts and which were not asked for by the administration and do not appear either in the estimates or the amounts carried in the various appropriation bills. It is not my purpose in the time allowed me to discuss the wisdom of these measures, nor can I refer to them all specifically. Perhaps the greater number of them are highly deserving measures; but desirable as some of them may be, it may be said that a number of them could and should have been postponed until the people have been relieved of at least a portion of the burdens under which they are now staggering. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A law has been passed providing for industrial rehabilitation and imposing during the future years an annual charge upon the Treasury of $75,000 for administration expenses and $1,000,000 to be used in cooperation with the States. Everyone knows that this is just a starter, and that this sum must be increased to many millions of dollars each year if all of our industrial cripples are to be given like treatment.

There is a matter of sentiment about such a law which must and does appeal very strongly to everyone, but such a law was never proposed in the years that have passed when our revenue was plentiful, and, to say the least, it is significant that it should have been passed at this session, under present revenue conditions, but in time to continue and perpetuate the existence of the Vocational Board and its large administrative force, which was created primarily and solely to train the gallant soldiers and sailors and marines of the late war who have disabilities growing out of their service, and for whom a grateful Government and people are willing to provide every dollar necessary for their comfort and future happiness and prosperity. The people are now being taxed to a degree never before dreamed of to meet the enormous expenses of the Government, and to take care of interest charges and obligations growing out of the war, and in addition thereto we are told that $8,000,000,000 will have to be raised in the next three years to meet outstanding obligations which will fall due. Why, therefore, was not this service left to the industries or to the States for at least a few years longer? It was in this spirit and with this idea that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. GOOD], who, it must be said, has endeavored to bring about real economy, remarked in the course of the debate on the bill:

> We are going to talk about economy, but no man—I care not which side of the aisle he sits on—can in the next election say anything about economy or criticize the lack of economy if he votes for a bill of this kind, which absolutely requires annual appropriations.

This is a severe indictment by one of the Republican leaders of the chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee, who proposed and fathered the bill, and of the Republican majority leader, who championed it on the floor of the House, and of the chairman of the Republican national committee, who, it was charged by a prominent and veteran Republican Member and leader, intervened in favor of its passage—presumably for political purposes—and of the Republican majority in this Congress, which placed the law upon the statute books.

Laws have been passed increasing the pension of those who were in the military service prior to the late war. These laws will add at least $77,500,000 to the present pension appropriation, and as a result there has been appropriated for the next fiscal year the sum of $279,150,000, which is nearly $56,000,000 more than has ever been paid in any one year and $123,714,708.97 more than was paid eight years ago. Lest I be misunderstood, let me say, as one coming from the South, that I do not begrudge one dollar that is necessary to provide for the dependent Civil War veterans. [Applause.] The Union which he fought so bravely to preserve owes him that; but I do insist that particularly at this time there should not have been included those who have comfortable and, in many cases, large private fortunes and incomes, nor those who years ago left our country and who during all these years have lived in foreign lands, holding allegiance to other flags, but who are now drawing pensions from our Government. It would have been far better and more in keeping with the debt which the Government owes to the dependent Union soldier to have applied the increased sums which will be paid to these two classes to still further increase the pension of the brave Civil War veteran who in the evening of his life finds himself dependent upon his pension for a living.

The railroad transportation act recently passed carries an appropriation of $200,000,000 to wind up claims and $300,000,000 as a revolving fund for loans to railroads. While these sums will eventually be returned, nevertheless they constitute a present charge on the Treasury and are not included in the regular appropriation bills. This act also provides for an indefinite appropriation to take care of the six months' guaranty of income to the railroads, which it is stated will amount to at least $200,000,000, and an indefinite appropriation for the short-line railroads, which it is estimated will amount to $25,000,000. These sums do not appear in the act creating this liability of the Government, but they nevertheless constitute a direct charge upon the Treasury. In addition, this act increases the membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission from 9 to 11 and raises their salaries from $10,000 to $12,000 and the salary of the secretary from $5,000 to $7,500 per annum. It also provides

for nine members of a labor board, at a salary of $10,000 each, and $50,000 for expenses.

A number of other laws have been passed carrying appropriations to which I have not the time to refer. It may be said, however, that they add many millions of dollars to the annual expenses of the Government which were not included in any request of estimate submitted by the administration.

It should be stated that none of the appropriation bills carry the appropriations necessary to cover the increased pay of officers in the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service and which were authorized at this session. These increases will amount to $25,000,000, and will have to be provided for in a deficiency bill at the December session. The same is true of the additional sum required for the increase of the pensions of Spanish-American War soldiers under an act recently passed, and which it is stated will amount to $12,500,000. This is in line with the policy of this Congress to defer appropriations for undisputed obligations of the Government and to provide for them in deficiency bills for the plain purpose of bolstering up a spurious claim for economy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It will be observed that despite assurances of the most rigid economy this Congress has imposed financial obligations and charges on the Treasury for the next fiscal year amounting to more than $4,800,000,000. This is a startling fact when it is remembered that these appropriations are made for a period two years after the signing of the armistice, and when we should at least be approaching prewar conditions in governmental expenditures.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] in the remarks referred to states that the total of the obligations imposed upon the Treasury by this Congress for the next fiscal year amounts to $4,094,100,897. An examination of the figures submitted by him clearly shows the error of his statement. For instance, he states that the total amount of the appropriations carried in the annual appropriation measures is $1,753,340,897, whereas the facts are that these appropriations amount to $2,212,126,298.78. In addition to this he has failed to take into account more than $350,000,000 which is carried in reappropriations for the next fiscal year and which are as much a part of the charges upon the Treasury as the direct appropriations made. In addition to this he has totally failed to even refer to the millions of dollars which have been appropriated in special acts at this session and the preceding session of Congress. It will thus be seen that, taking Mr. SLEMP's figures and adding thereto these items which he has omitted, the total charges upon the Treasury for the next fiscal year will amount to more than $4,800,000,000. Mr. SLEMP is one of the ablest Members in Congress, and, of course, knew better, and his failure to include these very large sums as a part of the sum total of appropriations for the next fiscal year is an evidence of what is in his mind and in the minds of the Republican leaders as to what will be said by the American people when they learn that this Congress has placed upon their shoulders such a staggering burden of expenditures for the next fiscal year. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Such, in part, is the record made by this Congress. A lamentable record of broken promises, false claims of economy, and failure of performance. This Congress can truly make the confession, "We have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and we have done those things which we ought not to have done." It is not strange that there is criticism throughout the country on account of its failure to retrench, as was so often promised by its leaders, and that the Washington Post, a paper of well-known Republican sympathies and strongly antiadministration in its policy, should have said in an editorial published on Saturday, May 15:

> Do the Republicans of Congress suppose that the people approve of the record made since March 4, 1919? Why are not the taxes reduced? Or, if there must be heavy taxes, why have not the Republicans readjusted the burden according to the tested Republican tax policy, which seeks to protect both American industry and American labor, instead of sweating it for purposes of governmental extravagance? * * * The chief offender against economy and cheaper living is the Government, and the Republicans are responsible for the failure to retrench. They have only a little time left in which to make good.

And yet in a few short days we are to abandon the work of this session with this duty and service unperformed. In conclusion, let me say to my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle, that when the record of this Congress is laid before the American people, and when it has been fully examined and understood by them, they will at the November election write for you what was written by the specter hand for Belshazzar, the Babylonian king, high on the wall of his magnificent and costly palace, built and maintained by an overburdened people, "Mene mene, tekel, upharsin," "Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Comparison of amounts carried in the 13 regular annual appropriation bills for 1916 and 1921.

	1916	1921
Agriculture	$22,971,782.00	$31,712,784.00
Army	101,974,195.87	392,558,365.00
Diplomatic and Consular	4,061,280.01	9,218,537.91
District of Columbia	11,859,584.45	18,373,004.87
Fortifications	6,080,216.90	18,833,442.00
Indian	9,771,902.76	10,040,655.27
Legislative, executive, and judicial	36,904,799.75	104,735,726.11
Military Academy	1,069,813.37	2,142,212.70
Navy	149,661,864.88	433,279,574.00
Pension	164,100,000.00	279,150,000.00
Post Office	313,364,667.00	462,575,190.00
River and harbor	30,000,000.00	12,400,000.00
Sundry civil	126,922,750.79	437,106,806.92
Total, regular appropriation bills	978,722,857.78	2,212,126,298.78
Permanent annual appropriations	121,567,207.00	1,363,768,980.29
Miscellaneous	2,330,603.34	797,500,000.00
Deficiencies	12,316,343.90	486,495,048.23
Total, permanent annual, miscellaneous, and deficiency appropriations	136,214,154.24	2,647,764,028.52
Grand total	1,114,937,012.02	4,859,890,327.30

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave at this time to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I think I shall finish the remarks I have prepared within the 15 minutes allotted me.

"LEST WE FORGET."

The Sixty-sixth Congress, elected in November, 1918, would, under the law, have met December 1, 1919; however, by reason of the failure of the Sixty-fifth Congress to pass the greater part of the supply bills for 1920, the President convened the Congress May 19, 1919, with only the time from then until July 1 to complete the work left over from the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Now, the Sixty-fifth Congress had the experience of meeting in December, 1918, after the election, and after the signing of the armistice which ended the war, and after a lot of the Members had been defeated for reelection. Many of these Members did not work at all; some very little; and the work in the committees progressed very slowly. So while the House passed all of the regular supply bills, it did not do so until just at the end of the Congress; that left the Senate only the choice of taking the bills as they came to them or letting them fail of passage through that body. The Senate allowed most of them to fail, as there was no time to properly consider them. Thus, it is easy to see that the Sixty-sixth Congress has had two years of regular routine work to do in one year.

The Sixty-fifth Congress was Democratic; the Sixty-sixth Republican, so far as the House is concerned; the Senate being practically a tie. The Democrats criticized the Republican Members of the Senate for the failure of the supply bills in the spring of 1919, and called that failure a filibuster. It was not a party filibuster; however, some Senators did filibuster at the end, claiming there was no time to consider these important bills. We have heard nothing of this filibuster for more than a year now. Why? I will tell you. The Congress convening May 19, 1919, passed these supply bills before July 1, reducing them in amount more than $1,000,000,000. It was not intended that we should be called together in time to do anything but pass the bills just as the departments wanted them, but every Member of the new Congress came here in February, 1919, got his committee assignment, got copies of the supply bills and went to work. So, when we were called here on the 19th of May we knew something of the work ahead.

The members of the important committees worked day and night for those first few weeks. I want to say to you that it looked to a new Member as if law-making was the hardest work in the world.

I had been insistent on getting a place on one of the large committees, and had told the leaders in the House that I wanted to work. They took me at my word and I am proud to be able to state that I have helped shape some of the legislation passed by this House. To be able to have these bills passed by July 1 and have them carry a billion dollars less than the ones passed by the old Congress was worth while. That is the reason why

you have not lately heard, and will never again hear, much about that filibuster of 1919.

Now, remember this, we have only claimed credit for saving a billion dollars over the old bills when, as a matter of fact, as we passed the bills, the saving was one and one-half billion. The reason I say one billion is that the departments have made us appropriate one-half billion since; so that the real saving on the first year was only a little over one billion. You ask how can the departments make Congress appropriate money, and I want to explain that. Let us take two examples: One in the Department of Agriculture and one in the Department of the Treasury. First, say we give the Bureau of Animal Industry one and one-half million dollars to fight tuberculosis in cattle; providing one-half million for administration and one million to be used to pay for cattle destroyed. That looks as if Congress had guarded that appropriation fairly well. Now, under the law any man in any department can be punished for creating a deficiency. So they will not create any, but here is what they will do: They will hire enough men to spend this one-half million dollars in eight months. Then, at the end of seven months they will serve notice that all work in that department will stop at the end of the eighth month unless Congress gives them additional money. Now, this is an important work; if you stop it you lose the money already spent; the people want the disease wiped out in that portion of the country where the population is congested, and it is necessary to keep the milk cows up all the year round, as we call it in the West. It is important to human life that this work be continued; and Congress is practically forced to give this executive officer of the department more money. We can not even remove him for abuse of discretion. He has his office by appointment of the President, who was elected by the people; and no matter how strong a Member of Congress may believe he has absolutely wasted one-half of this money, no matter how strong he may believe that he has three men doing one man's work, he will have to acquiesce in the deficiency appropriation. We can not waste all that former Congresses have spent in the work, so his demands must be met; all we do is to pare them down as low as we can and go ahead.

Second, say Congress gives the Bureau of War Risk Insurance only enough money to keep 7,500 clerks employed. They come before the committee and agree to do the work with about that number. The appropriation is made for only that number. The law is that they can not create a deficiency; but they are not in sympathy with Congress, and while probably not over 5,000 of them actually work, they keep 10,000 on the pay roll, and claim they all work. Then at the end of seven months, the executive officer in charge goes to the Appropriations Committee and says: We will have to close the bureau on the first of next month if you don't give us more money. Now, no matter how much you may know concerning the fact that they are not trying to help, but are, on the other hand, trying to show that you can't save, Congress can not let them shut down. Let me call your attention to this, the department heads never pick an unimportant thing to shut down. So I say, in a way, the executive departments of the Government can force the legislative branch to some extent. I am sure it is best to have both branches of Government, but right now I am just as sure that it is unfortunate, indeed, that the executive branch is not in sympathy with the legislative in matters of economy as well as policy. Take the veto of the President on the administrative bill that provided that the Joint Committee of the House and Senate should decide about Government publications; the President says we are encroaching on the executive powers; we could not pass that over his veto, as the vote was nearly a straight party vote. That veto simply said to Congress you have got to let my departments waste more than a million dollars; if you don't we will cut out the necessary printing and blame you for it. In my judgment he made a sad mistake in this; nearly every one is now familiar with the printing waste in his departments. So I say we are extremely fortunate in keeping them down $1,000,000,000.

Now, while I am talking of the appropriations, let me discuss the appropriations for the year 1921, which we have just passed. These bills carry about one and one-half billion dollars less than demanded by the departments; and they carry sufficient to run the Government in such times as these. However, let me call your attention to the statement of the chairman of the Democratic national committee, in which he says we can not save that amount "as there will be deficiencies." He surely doesn't mean that, as that would be criminal, and carry some of them to jail.

Now, the heads of the several departments have agreed to get along with these appropriations. Of course I was suspicious they would not try it, even before the national chairman spoke, but for him as the selected leader of his party to openly boast that they are not going to get along, but will force more, seems to me to be audacious, to say the least.

This Congress has tried to get the country back to normal. Let me show you how this year's appropriations are made up. They total $3,500,000,000, of which $1,000,000,000 is to pay interest on the national debt caused by the war; $278,000,000 is for a sinking fund to retire the national debt, as provided for by law when the same was created; $450,000,000 of it is to pay obligations such as war-risk insurance and obligations to soldiers occasioned by the war. Congress has no choice in these matters; they must be paid. Now, on the running expenses of the Government we have $1,772,000,000. If you deduct from this the finishing of some ships and the payment for some lands and hospitals occasioned by the war you have a prewar basis.

So far I have only mentioned this regular routine work of the Congress, and while this is just twice the amount of work confronting an ordinary Congress, this one has had some other things to do.

I want to enumerate some of these things. First, one of the very first things this Congress did was to extend suffrage to the women. Kansas women have had this right a long time, and I was glad to get here in time to help a Republican Congress give all the women the same right. Remember, the ranking minority—Democratic—member of the Committee on Suffrage fought this measure on the floor of the House. Second, remember when this Congress convened we were not even going on God's time; the sun no longer ruled the day; the moon had no control over the night; we had a new deal called McAdoodle, or some other kind of a donkey time. We have changed this and now have God's time. Please do not forget we secured this return to normal over the objection of the Executive, and over his second veto, and after our friends across the aisle had heard from home after the first veto. Third, Burleson had, for some reason known only to himself and his boss, after the signing of the armistice and before the famous Creel trip to France—where we paid so much rent and also damages to the buildings—taken over and was operating the cables, telephones, and telegraph. I repeat, no one knows why this was done, unless it was to prevent the American people from knowing what was going on in France. At any rate, it was done, and rates had been raised and service was getting bad. We returned them to their owners by a law, and I was glad to help in this. This adventure cost the Government $15,000,000.

When this Congress convened, the War Department had on hand a food supply for 3,000,000 more men than were in the Army for one year. They tried to get out of selling this food to hungry people, because some of the high-up officials had agreed with canneries and packers not to do so. We finally made them sell some of this before it spoiled, and this was no easy task, as they were the most determined bunch on letting this spoil I had ever encountered. They refused a long time to obey the law we passed making them sell it. I am proud to have voted for that resolution, which saved the Government more than the total cost of the whole congressional investigation.

Now, while I am on the subject of food I want to give you a fair, square statement on sugar. At the beginning of the war Congress appropriated money and authorized the organization of the Sugar Equalization Board. This was a corporation. The President of the United States was its president and held all the stock; there were eight directors. The President appointed all of them in 1918. They bought all the raw sugar, and, I must say, controlled the price, so that perhaps no one has ever complained to speak of. Now, in July, 1919, the Cuban raw sugar was for sale at 6¼ cents per pound. This corporation had the money belonging to our Government with which to buy it. They had a meeting, and seven of the directors wrote the President advising its purchase. One man wrote and advised against it. Now, the individuals and corporations engaged in this business would take no steps until the board decided what it wanted to do. The President ignored that letter; the board later wrote again; no answer. Do not misunderstand me. I do not think it was important which way he answered the letter. "Yes" would have been all right; "no" would have been just as good. "Yes," the board would have gone ahead; "no," and regular dealers would have bought it. Still up to this time no answer. Some one says the President was sick, but he was not sick then. He made his famous western trip after this. Now, what happened? Louisiana produces a little sugar. Their crop was poor; so we must get our sugar from Cuba. The so-called Department of Justice, intrusted with the duty of prosecuting profiteers, without any suit being brought, without any moral or legal right to do so, issued its now famous order that no Louisianian would be prosecuted for profiteering if he

did not charge over 18 cents per pound for sugar. Result of failure of the Executive, with our money and the power to act, to make any move whatever, the department, his law-enforcing arm, nullifying the antiprofiteering law for all the people just to help a few friends in Louisiana.

Every householder in America is to-day paying as much as 10 cents a pound more than he should pay for every pound of sugar consumed by his family. Blame the Cubans? No. They held their raw sugar for four months on a reasonable price. Of course, when the head of our Government decided that 18 cents was not profiteering, they simply raised their price. This transaction will be known and designated by future generations as the sugar outrage.

This Congress has passed an Army reorganization bill, made necessary by the war. Now, the President, the Secretary of War, and the General Staff demanded that we have compulsory military training and compulsory military service of all boys between the ages of 19 and 21—three months' training and service for two years, subject to the call of the President. This bill, prepared by the executive officers, was introduced in both the Senate and House just as the President started West on the League of Nations speaking trip. It has as much to do with the defeat of the League of Nations as anything that happened. Congressmen and Senators who had not studied that feature of the league began to study. As a result, most all agreed, first, the President should not have power to send our troops abroad without Congress declaring war; that while a few Congressmen and some Senators favored compulsory military training, no one favored compulsory military service. So the Lodge reservations were agreed to by a large majority in the Senate; and the President, not then willing to have the treaty Americanized, had his trusted lieutenants in the Senate defeat it, though a majority voted for it, and he was able only to prevent its getting a two-thirds vote.

The House passed an Army reorganization bill; cut out both compulsory training and compulsory service; provided for an American Army; refused to adopt the Prussian system; kept intact the teaching of our forefathers; and left this a civil government, and not a military government; also, reduced the amount of money this bill would call for by more than $1,000,000,000 per year.

I want to be fair in this. Not only did the Republicans turn this down; the Democratic Members of the House had a caucus, and though they had a letter from the President begging them to take no action, they passed a resolution condemning the proposition. I congratulated them on it the next day. Mr. MONDELL had condemned it in public statements for weeks; I had written a letter, which was printed in most every paper in the seventh district, condemning it; this was within a week after the bill was sent down to this end of Pennsylvania Avenue. I congratulated the Democrats on the proposition that they had decided to follow Mr. MONDELL. Some of my good friends on the Democratic side said they had not voted to follow MONDELL but just refused to follow President Wilson's letter. However, the result was the same; it showed that a large majority, regardless of politics, were good Americans.

Mr. PARRISH. They did not follow some of the recommendations made at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. TINCHER. No. There were three or four Republicans in the Senate and half a dozen in this House who are willing to follow President Wilson and Secretary Baker and the other fellows. It is outrageous. I have no apologies for them. I have the greatest confidence that a good friend of mine, like the gentleman from Texas, stood by the people and helped us pass a reorganization bill that did not have any Prussianism in it, and left our Government a civil Government. I do not think the gentleman from Tennessee should overlook a measure of this kind in discussing what Congress has or has not done.

The first message this Congress had from the Chief Executive asked us to repeal the then war-time prohibition on wine and beer. This in the face of the fact that a sufficient number of States had adopted the eighteenth amendment, which clearly made it our duty to pass a permanent national prohibition law instead of repealing any of the then existing laws. Congress's answer to that message was "No." But, on the other hand, we passed the Volstead law, a permanent national bone-dry prohibition law. True, the President vetoed this law, and, true, Congress had to pass it over his veto, but this is as it should be. The President has always been against prohibition; the Republican Party has been for it; and the record is now correct. It shows the truth, and future generations should know the truth.

I can not refrain here from telling you a true joke that I know will sound like a fairy story. The Democratic State convention which met last month in my home State, at Wichita, Kans., in their resolutions pointed "with pride to the fact that under a Democratic President we had obtained national prohibition." These resolutions said nothing of its being a law over the protest and veto of the President. These same resolutions did, however, indorse the succession of the son-in-law to the throne.

This Congress found the railroads operated by the Government, the rates as high or higher than ever known in history, many, many men drawing from $15,000 to $25,000 a year in the Railroad Administration. Most of these men had no qualifications, except that they were deserving Democrats. Half of them would not know a switch frog from a bull frog. [Laughter.] Some were, no doubt, there to keep from going to war. Some had been defeated for Congress. Many were distantly related by blood or marriage to some of the high-ups; but they were all getting pay for their part in demoralizing the railroads and business. One of the first things I did was to try to get a harvest rate for the farmers. One of these golf-playing high brows made a statement to me of one-half hour that according to his view of economics this would not do. The next morning I saw in the papers where he had put in a one-half rate to points such as Atlantic City. I was angry. I went to see him again. I will not repeat what I said; he ordered me out. [Laughter.] Now he is out, but he and his kind stayed long enough to cost this Government $1,500,000,000. This at a time when every privately managed industry in the United States was worrying over excess profits. [Laughter.]

I never complained of the fact that these high brows didn't work but about one hour each day. What in the world would have happened if they had indulged in their mismanagement for a reasonable number of hours? [Laughter.] We have turned the roads back to their owners. I will not take time to go into detail on that law, but it is a good one, and in time under it we will get back to normal. It would take a week to enumerate the outrages this crowd committed while they held the roads. Every man knows enough to keep any man talking a whole day.

Gompers, who misrepresents labor on all occasions, says we are a "No Congress"; and I admit we have had to say no to the old gentleman several times. The first time I ever heard him was on the Capitol steps talking to the crowd of mostly foreigners who demanded that we nullify the eighteenth amendment instead of passing a prohibition law. I heard him say that day that if we did not repeal prohibition his followers would ignore the law. Of course, Congress said "No." [Applause.] Then I heard him advocate the Plumb plan, and again we had to say "No"; but while I could spend a day on the things we have had to say "No" to Gompers on, we have said "Yes" where justice spoke. [Applause.] I must not discuss here in detail all the things we have said "Yes" to, but let me mention a few in passing, any one of which one could make a whole speech about.

First, the American people asked for a reduction in appropriations. We gave them economy. This Congress passed the budget law, the most forward step for economic government in a century. The leasing bill, one of the most constructive pieces of legislation passed by any Congress. The water-power bill, important in its section. The cold-storage bill. The Sweet bill for soldiers of the late war. The Fuller pension bill for the benefit of the soldiers of the Civil War. The Sells pension bill for the relief of the soldiers of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition.

I know that some good business men are wondering why this Congress does not repeal more tax laws—and I notice Mr. McAdoo is advocating something of that kind. Some of us can remember how in 1916 the Congress repealed some revenue measures on the eve of a presidential election, right in the face of a deficiency. That was a Democratic, demagogue Congress; that act was a political one. Now, everyone knows we have to have money to pay expenses, and to cover Democratic deficiencies. True, Republicans and Democrats do now and always have disagreed as to how to raise that money. We have not a two-thirds majority even in the House. We have a free trader for an Executive, and more than one-third of the House is made up of free traders. To repeal tax laws and not arrange for the revenue by other laws would be hypocrisy of the worst type. The revenue laws Republicans believe in would be fought hard in both branches of Congress, and vetoed at the White House.

Everyone in Congress, regardless of politics, admits we would be wasting our time in trying to pass these laws over the veto. The Republican Party was successful in keeping down Government expenses and taxes in the past; wait until that party has a chance to pass a good, old-fashioned Republican protective tariff law, and you will see not only a change in our present unfair, unwieldy, unjust tax laws, but then, and not until then, will there be rest in labor circles, equity in the cost of living.

A return to normal government with the Republican Party in charge of the executive and legislative branches of our Government is normal government. It is the kind under which we have made all our progress.

Congress can pass laws, but there is an executive department of our Government to execute laws. The Sixty-fifth Congress passed a law that was supposed to curb profiteers, and that created what is known as the Grain Corporation. I do not know of anything wrong with that law, but it is an open secret that the law enforcers and administrators have used it to make it the most unpopular, and unworthy, and unjust law that was perhaps ever put on the statute books. Instead of prosecuting profiteers, they have encouraged them. The Grain Corporation has actually tried to show big millers how to fix up their statements and avoid taxes; and I have made the statement in committee, I have made it on the floor of the House, and made it before coming to Congress, and I now want to repeat it, that the only mills they have prosecuted have been those which, first, paid the farmer too much for his wheat, and, second, sold the flour too cheap to the consumer. Long before coming here I went with a miller before the Grain Corporation's representatives at Wichita, Kans. They were about to close his mill, and that was the only charge they had against him. Right to-day a mill in my district is closed because this man refused to be a liar, and a profiteer, and a crook. He insisted on paying the farmer more for wheat than other millers were, and insisted on selling his flour for less than it was being sold by other millers. And still this great Grain Corporation singles him out and have closed his mill.

I do not know this man personally. There may be some things wrong with him, but this is certainly a glaring example of how a law, no matter how meritorious, needs the just and fair enforcement by the enforcing officers. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, the tadpole is an ugly little wiggletail, but it is the beginning of the bullfrog, the loudest croaker and the greatest long-distance jumper ever developed in the gymnasium of nature.

A dignified inquisitorial committee of this House, directed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], has for more than a year been engaged in investigating the tadpole profiteers who developed during the war, and it has been chasing the tadpoles that secured "cost-plus" contracts all over the country from Maine to California and then to Washington. All this, mark you, in total disregard of the commonest fact in natural history—that the tadpoles long ago developed into bullfrogs that have spread their spawn to produce millions more of tadpoles to grow into millions more of bullfrogs until, like the plague of Egypt, these bullfrogs have spread over the whole land "into the houses, the bedchambers, the beds, and even the kneading troughs" of the people to wring their profits from everything we use from the cradle to the grave, including the staff of life.

The curse of profiteering has become standardized until it not only robs the people but boasts of it. The war profiteers were confined to war contracts, were circumscribed by the needs of the Government in munitions and supplies; the profiteers of peace have no limitations on their genius and gall. They rob the people from dawn to dark and spend the night in jumping up prices to give us new sensations of indigestion at breakfast. Peace profiteering is confined to no section and to no class, but opportunity is the gauge of robbery, and he that has the best opportunity for profiteering makes the most of it and the most money.

When will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and his inquisitorial colleagues catch up with the procession of bullfrog profiteers which is not simply marching on the bellies of the people, but is jumping from pinnacle to pinnacle of high prices while the committee is still digging into the records of war contracts where the tadpole profiteers were fattening off the Government? [Applause.] The waste of Government money was criminal and should be punished. I have no defense of any Government agent or any contractor who might participate in any revel of robbery, and I will support the committee in any recommendation it may make backed up by competent evidence; but I do not want to dwell in that alleged wallow of Government contracts while the peace profiteers are spreading their spawn over everything in this country and taking unrighteous toll from every necessity of the people. [Applause.]

The war ended nearly two years ago and so ended the opportunity of the war profiteers; but the prices of necessities of life have doubled those of the war time, but we are still digging into the war contracts to find the tadpoles of profiteering. The profiteers are nearly two years ahead of Congress and they are planning new methods for robbing the whole people. What are we going to do about it? Continue to trail behind the profiteers and only encourage them to greater effort to get while the getting is good, and outdistance the Government and the people?

One Senator complains of the Wall Street melon patch, but that is not the only melon patch in the country. There are others, and they take in the farms of the West and the cotton plantations of the South, where the hardy-handed tillers of the soil are demanding and securing big profits from the necessities of the dwellers in the cities of the East.

Have you followed the play of the Sugar Trust? Do you know that the Sugar Trust is the oldest, the most experienced, and probably the most unscrupulous profiteer we have, and its advances in prices are so fantastic as to suggest that Get Rich Quick Wallingford is the director of the operations, which will, it is said, net the trust a billion dollars in profits this year? The Sugar Trust has no limitations on its profiteering, because it controls the sugar production of Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and has its tentacles on other places that produce a surplus of sugar; and it has already made a cut-loaf cube of sugar for your coffee look like the pearl that Cleopatra dissolved in the glass of wine for her lover. [Laughter.] Can anyone here tell when the Sugar Trust was only a tadpole? I doubt it. Why, Uncle JOE CANNON, the Nestor of this House, was doing battle with this giant bullfrog nearly half a century ago, and I fancy that Uncle JOE could give us some interesting reminiscences of his early experiences if he would review the tariff fights of 30 and 40 years ago. I once saw a cartoon of Uncle JOE as St. George choking the dragon, and it seemed to me that it ought to represent his contest with the Sugar Trust at the time when he secured the adoption of an amendment to the celebrated McKinley bill placing sugar on the free list and giving a bounty to the domestic product. The trust did not want sugar made free, because it controlled the sugar market here and the production in Hawaii, from which islands sugar was free under a reciprocity agreement, and in Cuba, which was near enough to make the freight of little importance in holding the market against the beet sugar of Germany and Russia. There was little beet sugar made in this country at that time. But notwithstanding the opposition of the trust, Uncle JOE secured the adoption of his amendment after a battle like that between St. George and the dragon; and, incidentally, Uncle JOE was defeated for reelection that year, and I wonder how much the Sugar Trust contributed to that defeat. But sugar began to tumble in price from the enactment of that law, and within a year we could buy 20 pounds of sugar for a dollar, and as Uncle JOE's constituents carried home a dollar's worth of sugar and told the tale their wives declared that Uncle JOE should come back, and he did, to fight more dragons, as he has been doing for 30 years. [Applause.]

Twenty pounds of sugar for a dollar! To-day the price of sugar to the ultimate consumer is 30 cents a pound, more than double the price last January, and it is still advancing each week because the Sugar Trust has so long practiced profiteering that it has grown confident that it is bigger than the Government and can rob the people at will to swell its profits.

When sugar sold for 5 cents a pound we produced only one-sixth of our consumption, but when sugar is selling at 30 cents a pound we produce one-half of our total consumption. The tentacles of the trust appear to have entwined not only Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines, and Hawaii, but the cane sugar of the South and the beet sugar of the West, and to-day the cost of sugar to the American people is estimated at nearly $3,000,000,000 a year and one billion of it goes to the profiteers in sugar. In other words, the Sugar Trust is permitted to tax the American people more than the Federal Government taxed them for all its activities and expenditures before the war with Germany.

The sugar profiteers glibly tell us that the increased price of sugar is due to the laws of supply and demand; to the decreased production and the enormous increase in consumption by the people of the United States, and they indulge in that old, familiar puzzle of per capita consumption; that the per capita consumption has increased from 40 pounds in 1880 to 89 pounds in 1914 and to 93 pounds last year. Now, who of you is conscious of having consumed 93 pounds of sugar last year, or used 16 pounds more than in 1918, when the per

capita consumption was 77 pounds, or 15 pounds more than in 1916, the year before the war, when the retail price of sugar was 8 cents a pound?

The sugar profiteers would have us believe that we consume more sugar when we have to beg, bribe, and almost steal enough to sweeten our coffee at breakfast time than we did before the war, when the price was about one-fourth what it is now, or double the amount we consumed in 1890, when we could buy 20 pounds of sugar for a dollar.

But, gentlemen, these figures of per capita consumption of sugar represent the consumption of the candy makers and the sugar-water makers, who are more than suspected of close affiliation with the Sugar Trust and are adding to the profits of both ends of the combination. The experts of the Department of Labor nearly 20 years ago estimated that one-third of the sugar consumed in this country went into confectionery and soft drinks, and other estimates later increased this consumption of the manufacturers to one-half and two-thirds.

The collector of internal revenue in one district in New York City collected nearly a million dollars of taxes on candy and soft drinks in the months of February and March of this year, and estimated that these taxes represented sales of these luxuries amounting to $10,000,000. This was in one collection district and for two months—two months in which the people were trying in every way to secure enough sugar at any price to sweeten their breakfast coffee. Why, Barnum himself did not so presume on faking the whole people as have the affiliated industries of the Sugar Trust in fooling the Congress.

The gall of the profiteer is well illustrated by our master baker of the National Capital, Mr. Corby, who frankly admits that he made profits of $225,000 on bread last year after taking out $30,000 as his own salary; that he has not only several times advanced the price of bread this year but has indulged in short-weight practices in defiance of law to increase his profits. His only defense of his illegal practices is that he has the approval of a fair price committee composed of his fellow profiteers here in the District of Columbia. If I am not mistaken, this is the same Corby who financed and promoted the campaign against a referendum on the Sheppard bill to enable the people of Washington to vote their sentiments on prohibition. His recent developments explain his opposition to popular government by the vote of the people most concerned about their police regulations and local law for their government and control. When the Sheppard bill was finally enacted and the referendum defeated, Mr. Corby was given a monopoly in the manufacture of alcohol in the District of Columbia, probably in recognition of his valuable services in suppressing the American aspiration for self-government.

Mr. Corby is an excellent example of the self-righteous benefactor who casts his bread upon the waters of life to reap a profit for himself and proclaim it as a humanitarian plan for the benefit and elevation of the moral standards of the people. It pays to advertise even your roguery and defiance of the law.

It is an old saying that it costs as much to sell an article as to produce it. Ten years ago the Tariff Board analyzed the cost of producing and selling a suit of clothes. The wool grower received $2.32 for his product; the woolen manufacturer received $4.78 for the cloth; the cost of all materials entering into the suit, except the labor, was $7.55; the cost of making the clothes, $3.74; and the entire cost, from the woolgrower to and through the factory and the tailor shop, was $12.41. The suit sold for $25 to $30; and the profits of the jobber, the wholesaler, and retailer amounted to more than the entire cost of producing the suit of clothes.

That condition has been aggravated since the war with Germany; and to-day, apparently, it costs from two to three times as much to sell things as to produce them. President Wood of the American Woolen Co. protests that while his company earned big profits last year and is still earning big profits it has added only 75 cents to the cost of the cloth for a suit of clothes; but the $25 suit of five years ago has become a $75 suit now; and if Mr. Wood is correct, somebody else has absorbed $49.25 in getting the cloth into the suit and then to the ultimate consumer, and it would be interesting to find out who got the profits and who was the real profiteer. But the big combinations in the game protest that they are not profiteers, even though they admit to earning dividends ranging from 30 to 100 per cent and more. The retailers deny that they are profiteering, and we are left to puzzle over where the extra cost goes.

Mr. B. F. Yoakum, the celebrated railroad man, some years ago estimated that in the year 1911 the farmers received $6,000,000,000 for their products and that the consumers paid $13,000,000,000 for the same products. The railroads received $495,000,000 for transportation, and the entire cost of producing and transporting those products to market was less than half the cost to the consumer. That was in normal times. How much does the middleman get now?

A side light may be thrown on the situation by the increased danger to the ordinary citizen on the streets and roads from automobiles. We are told that the automobiles sold last year brought more money to the manufacturers than the entire cost of clothing the people, or furnishing the whole population with boots and shoes, or more than the cost of all the newspapers and magazines, or more than the entire cost of all the breadstuffs in the country. The passenger cars sold last year were double the number sold in 1918 and cost a billion and a half dollars. The profiteers were all riding in limousines or touring cars or electrics or Fords, according to their share of the profits; and while there were enough motor cars in the country to make 1 for every 14 of the population, out in Iowa and Nebraska, South Dakota and Kansas there was 1 automobile to each 6 of the population, while in Massachusetts there was 1 car to each 16 of population. So, measuring profits by joy riding, our farmer population in the West, where the Nonpartisan League flourishes, had a greater share of the profiteering than the industrial States of the East, which, by the way, contributed the largest part of the revenues of the Federal Government to pay the cost of the war, the cost of building good roads all over the country, killing off the chinch bugs, tobacco beetles, boll weevils, and teach the farmers how to make cottage cheese. New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois contributed last year more than one-half of all the revenues of the Government, or $2,196,139,071.65 out of the $3,839,950,612.05 which the Government collected in internal revenue.

So, while I admit there has been profiteering in the old Commonwealth which I, in part, represent, as I see the evidence of joy riding out on the prairies and plains among the hardy-handed farmers and see how little they contribute to the common welfare named in the Constitution, my heart does not respond to all the wails that come from the farming sections of the country as it did before I looked into the statistics of food cost and the meager revenues they contributed to Uncle Sam last year.

The tadpole has grown into a bullfrog all over the country in every line of endeavor and every class of citizen, and the question still is how to catch up with the bullfrog. [Applause.]

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

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is frequently assumed that after the declaration of war Congress, by legislative enactment, directed the President to take over the operation of the railroads. This is an error. In pursuance of a provision in the national defense act of 1916 the President on the 1st day of January, 1918, without legislative direction took over the railroads, and it was not until March 21, 1918, almost three months thereafter, that the act of Congress was approved, which is commonly known as the Federal-control act. This act recited the fact that the President had taken over the operation of railroads, made provision for the compensation for their use, and appropriated $500,000,000 as a revolving fund to pay the expenses of Federal control.

The question is often raised as to the advisability of the act of the President in taking over the railroads. It is urged with much force that the same or better results so far as war service was concerned could have easily been brought about by providing by law that transportation for war purposes should have preference and by suspending such restrictive laws as hindered unified action by the carriers.

All the inherent evils of Government ownership and paternalistic legislation accompanied governmental operation of railroads, and these evils not only crippled the railroad service

but reached out into every other governmental activity. The vast additional expense of Government operation is frequently cited as proof of the error in taking over the roads. It must be remembered, however, that the real purpose of taking over the transportation facilities was to permit their unhindered and unrestricted use as a part of the machinery of war, and if this purpose was better served than it could have been under private operation without accompanying evils that outweighed the benefits the course was, of course, justified. A discussion of this controverted question would now be academic. One should form his opinion on the subject from a study of the facts.

It is unfortunate, however, that there has been such an extensive organized propaganda to create the impression that Government operation of railroads was a financial success and that it had no attending evils. It is much more in keeping with sound statesmanship to frankly acknowledge the faults so that the actual virtues, if any, may not also be discredited.

Power was conferred by Congress upon the President to disregard *all laws* which he might find in the way of the efficient and economical operation of the railroads. He was given power to increase rates without limit. He was given power to disregard the antitrust laws; to disregard the directions of shippers as to the routing of traffic; to pool facilities; to coordinate and unify operations; and, generally, without regard to existing laws or legislative policies, to do all the things which were, in his judgment, necessary to the most efficient and economical operation.

He promptly, through the agencies he had created, proceeded to the exercise of these powers. He increased wages and he increased rates.

The Director General stated to the House Committee on Appropriations on June 3, 1919, that employees' wages per hour had increased 50 or 52 per cent since 1917, the year before Federal control, and unit costs of materials and supplies from 20 to 35 per cent. Yet the operating expenses for the first six months of 1919 showed an increase over the corresponding months of 1917 amounting to $735,000,000, or nearly 55 per cent.

The Railroad Administration reports that the total ton-miles of roads in class 1 during the first six months of 1917 were 207,631 millions, while during the first six months of 1919 there were only 178,083 millions, a decrease of 29,548 millions, or 14.2 per cent. Passenger traffic statistics for the same periods are not available, but it is beyond doubt that any increase in passenger traffic was not sufficient to offset the decline in freight traffic. Thus, with a reduced traffic in the first six months of 1919 as compared with the same period of 1917, increases in unit costs of 20, 35, and 51 to 52 per cent produced an increase in total cost amounting to 55 per cent.

Similarly, ton-miles for the whole of the year 1919 were 394,804 millions, as compared with 427,342 millions in 1917, which was a decrease of 32,538 millions, or 7.6 per cent. Passenger miles increased from 39,361 millions in 1917 to 46,145 millions in 1919, the increase being 6,784 millions, or 17.2 per cent. This increase of 6,784 millions passenger miles was not sufficient to offset the decline of 32,538 millions ton-miles in freight traffic. Yet with a smaller traffic in 1919 than in 1917, and with unit costs of labor and material showing lower rates of increases than the increase in operating expenses, the latter was greater in 1919 than in 1917 by $1,519,000,000, or nearly 54 per cent.

The conclusion seems to be inevitable that the Government plant was operated less efficiently and less economically than was the same plant in private hands.

This doubtless is to a large degree explained by the weakness in organization and the comparatively small output of labor and wastage in materials, all of which are inseparable from the transaction of all business of whatever kind by governmental agencies.

Large amounts paid out to appointees of the administration dispel the expectation that operation by the Government would end large salaries. The report of the Director General containing a list of all officers and employees as of date, January 1, 1919, shows, among thousands of others under $10,000, that the following salaries were paid, ranging from $10,000 to $50,000 per year:

General office:	
Assistant Director General	25,000
Assistant to Assistant Director General	12,000
Finance and purchases treasurer	10,000
Finance and purchases treasurer	10,000
Capital expenditures director	25,000
Capital expenditures assistant to director	10,600
Division of operation (proper) director	25,000
Division of operation assistant director	15,000
Division of operation assistant director	14,000
Division of operation assistant director	12,000
Division of operation (2) assistant directors (each)	10,000
Division of operation (car service), manager	10,000
Division of traffic, director	25,000
Division of traffic:	
Assistant director	$15,000
Assistant director	12,500
Manager Food Administration	20,000
Manager War Industry Board	18,500
Manager inland traffic, War Department	18,000
Manager Fuel Administration	13,200
Manager express and mail	12,000
Division of labor, director	25,000
Division of assistant directors (2), each	10,000
Division of law, general counsel	25,000
Division of law, assistant general counsel (3), each	10,000
Division of inland waterways, director	25,000
Board of railroad wages and working conditions, 6 members of board (each)	10,000
Eastern region:	
Regional director	50,000
Assistant regional director	35,000
District director	35,000
District director	30,000
Chairman budget committee	25,000
Traffic assistant	20,000
Mechanical assistant	20,000
Resident traffic assistant	15,000
Marine director	15,000
Assistant mail and express	10,000
Allegheny region:	
Regional director	50,000
Assistant regional director	20,000
Traffic assistant	20,000
Operating assistant	20,000
Mechanical assistant	10,000
Transportation assistant	10,000
Engineering assistant	10,000
Terminal manager (3), each	10,000
Pocahontas Region:	
Regional director	40,000
Traffic assistant	17,500
Transportation assistant	10,800
Chairman regional purchasing committee	10,000
Southern Region:	
Regional director	40,000
Traffic assistant	15,000
Operating assistant	10,000
Northwestern Region:	
Regional director	50,000
Assistant regional director	20,000
District director	25,000
Traffic assistant	20,000
District manager	10,000
Terminal manager	10,000
Central Western Region:	
Regional director	50,000
Assistant regional director	20,000
District director	35,000
Traffic assistant	20,000
Engineering assistant	12,000
Southwestern Region:	
Regional director	50,000
Assistant regional director	15,000
District director	30,000
Traffic assistant	20,000
Engineering assistant	12,000

In February, 1919, the Director General submitted a statement to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce (Hearings, pt. 12, p. 1719) showing that the total number of railroad employees had increased from 1,703,684 in December, 1917, to 1,843,530 in January, 1919, an increase of 139,846. A recent report issued by the Director General gives the number of employees in January, 1920, as 1,953,571, a further increase of 110,000 employees, or a total increase of approximately 250,000 during the period of Government operation.

The traffic handled was only slightly greater in January, 1920, than in December, 1917, the freight traffic being greater by 8.8 per cent and the passenger traffic smaller by 6.5 per cent. Yet Government operation in the latter month utilized 250,000 more employees than did private operation in the former month.

Notwithstanding these facts, this was a period of poorest service from the standpoint of the public—shippers could not get cars, people were suffering for lack of coal because it could not be shipped, and many industrial plants had been closed because of lack of transportation service.

Reference has been made to increases of wages made by the Government; these increases aggregated about one thousand millions of dollars per annum. It is also claimed that the railroads under private operation would have been obliged to have put this same charge on the public. This latter statement has something in it of conjecture, but there is one feature of the situation that may be emphasized without fear of successful contradiction.

To-day the railway employee in Maine or in Florida or in California is given the same rate of wages as the employee doing the same class of work in New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, or Indiana, regardless of the differences in the levels of living costs in different localities, in rural or urban communities, or in conditions of labor as between different railways.

This standardization of wages without regard to differences in conditions between different communities, and without regard to the scale of wages in other industries in these communities, has tended to unsettle the industrial equilibrium.

It has also been a distressing thing to the employees to witness the great injustice in the payment of wages. The amount of wages paid has not been governed by the nature of the work, the difficulty and responsibility of the task, and the skill required in its performance. Workers of great skill and experience, performing work for which they were thus peculiarly fitted and which could not have been done except for such skill and experience, have seen untrained and unskilled men working near them rewarded by higher wages. Such discrimination had a very depressing effect upon the employees and furnished no incentive to the employee to excel in order that he might be given more important duties.

If any student of political economy had been asked prior to Government operation of the railroads what danger he considered the most likely, he probably would have given this answer: "The Executive of the Nation as the head of a political party will probably be ready to make vast expenditures and deal generously in paying out money, but because of the political effect of the unpleasant task he may fail to collect sufficient money in rates to pay the bill."

This administration failed at this point of greatest danger, failed completely and miserably. Knowing that it was running behind over $1,000,000 a day, the administration lacked the courage to put on the necessary freight and passenger rates to pay the bill. When this point is made against the administration they at once hurl back the answer, "Do you want to increase freight rates?" There is but one answer to this question. The railroad business should pay its own way and no part of the freight rate should be paid by taxation. If a milliner in Kansas City wants Parisian hats that have been shipped to the New York ports, she and her customers should pay the freight and no part of it should be taxed upon the farmer in Indiana and the cotton grower of Alabama. If a jockey club in Maryland wants to ship race horses from Kentucky, those interested in that transfer should pay the freight and the grape growers of California and the sheep growers of Montana should not be taxed to help pay the bill. It is an easy and pleasant task to advance wages, and I am glad to know that needed advances were made; but if this made it necessary to initiate greater freight rates and greater passenger rates, the mere fact that the task was unpleasant should not have deterred the administration.

This weakness of the administration accounts for our great money loss. The cost in money of Government operation has mounted higher and higher until the total stupendous sum has gone far beyond the highest predictions from any source. The grand total of the Government's obligations during the period of operations reached the sum of $2,275,000,000, as estimated by the Railroad Administration. Of this sum it is expected that the Government will in time be made whole for sums advanced, investments made, and loans to the railroads to the amount of $1,146,000,000. In detail the items are as follows:

Total expenditures and obligations of Railroad Administration		$2,275,000,000
Indebtedness of railroads and other properties, including express companies, to Government at termination of Federal control, estimated by Director General	$861,963,932	
Investment of Railroad Administration in additions and betterments to inland waterways	14,581,126	
New loans to railroads for period of 26 months following Federal control	270,000,000	
Total		1,146,000,000
Net loss to the Government		1,129,000,000

It is estimated by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in his report accompanying the deficiency appropriation bill that there is a loss of something like $250,000,000 in decreased value of railroad and Government securities which the Railroad Administration took over. This amount can at best be only an estimate, but if it is an accurate estimate the irretrievable loss for 26 months' operation is brought up to $1,379,000,000.

One could speak for hours and point out specific concrete instances of great and unnecessary waste by this Railroad Administration. For instance, everyone is familiar with the course of personal publicity industriously pursued by Director General McAdoo from the time he was made Director General until he resigned. He sought in every conceivable way almost regardless of cost to bring his own name before the public. Rubber stamps for office use throughout the country were first issued, marked "United States Railroad Administration." When Mr. McAdoo got in full swing he had those rubber stamps piled in the waste baskets, and new ones marked "United States Railroad Administration, W. G. McAdoo, Director General," were provided. He posted up conspicuously in railroad cars, in stations, in shops, and other public places large placards frequently containing information of little value, but always at the top in bold letters was "W. G. McAdoo, Director General"; and then, to make assurance doubly sure, you would find at the bottom "W. G. McAdoo, Director General of Railroads." I hold in my hand a sample of one of many dozens of bulletins printed and sent out. It contains but one page and but a very small amount of reading matter. Nevertheless the name "W. G. McAdoo, Director General," is near the top, and again near the bottom I find "W. G. McAdoo, Director General of Railroads." When the advance in wages was made by Director General McAdoo he issued thousands upon thousands of useless bulletins calling the attention of the employees to the total amount of additional wages paid them by the Railroad Administration. These announcements were usually coupled with some other incidental appeal to furnish the body and excuse for the advertisements, but to any observing man the whole plan was a transparent publicity scheme. The total loss of the Railroad Administration in operating the railroads was approximately $50,000,000 per month during 26 months.

"Where ignorance is bliss 'tis folly to be wise." The hundred millions of our people during this squandering period were lulled, Creeled, and McAdooed into a false sense of security and trust. They watched with great contentment the glowing sun as it set in the west day after day. They did not know that every time the golden disk went down in the western horizon this profligate Railroad Administration had taken from their already flattened purses the enormous sum of $1,666,666.66. It would not have added to their comfort to know that part of this enormous sum was used as personal propaganda to advance the personal political ambitions of the Director General of Railroads, over whose head came the voice from the White House saying, "This is my beloved son-in-law, in whom I am well pleased." [Laughter.]

It is claimed in defense of the enormous amount of the deficit that the amount paid to the railroads as compensation amounted to a great sum, and that the Railroad Administration had no responsibility, so far as the payment of rent to the railroads was concerned, and that this was fixed by Congress. Without meaning in the least to assert that the amount paid the railroads for rental compensation was excessive, I want to dispel the illusion that the amount was fixed by Congress.

The Federal control act passed by Congress contained this unequivocal provision:

> The President * * * is hereby authorized to agree with and to guarantee to any such carrier making operating returns to the Interstate Commerce Commission, that during the period of such Federal control it shall receive as just compensation an annual sum, payable from time to time in reasonable installments for each year and pro rata for any fractional year of such Federal control, not exceeding a sum equivalent as nearly as may be to its average annual railway operating income for the three years ended June 30, 1917.

The amount fixed by Congress was merely the maximum over which the President could not go, and he went the full limit allowed by Congress. I am merely calling attention to this law so that it may be known that the entire responsibility for the amount of the rental lies with the President and with the Railroad Administration.

It is also claimed that a considerable part of the transportation service was for the War and Navy Departments of the Government, and hence that this furnished an excuse for the deficit. The fallacy of that argument lies in the false assumption that this was performed without cost. As a matter of fact this was paid for by these departments and was a most profitable source of revenue. The carriage of immense numbers of soldiers riding second class was done at great profit. The Treasury Department's statement from January 1, 1919, to March 31, 1920, contains these illuminating items:

Transportation charges collected:	
War Department	$183,536,691.92
Navy Department	10,031,241.66

This is in addition to the immense amounts paid directly for transportation by the soldiers and sailors themselves and takes no account of the amounts received during 1918.

The freight and passenger rates were increased, and the first schedule of freight rates, because of its great inequalities and lack of notice, wrought havoc with the industries of the country. In some cases there was a percentage increase of a little over 25 per cent, and in other cases there was a flat increase of so much per ton, which reached as high as 200 per cent. The power over freight rates was used to prevent the movement of certain commodities. For instance, rates on gravel and sand were increased, and the reason given was that it was hoped to cut down the amount of the shipment. Important differentials for different shipping localities established on an equitable basis, after careful hearings and in force for many years, were destroyed almost without notice and the industries of important

industrial centers were completely shut down, and in some instances monopolies were thus permitted. The Illinois Traffic League in a letter to me, dated July 30, referring to these rates, said:

At the time of the passage of the Federal control act, in March, 1918, the power was given to the President of the United States to initiate rates on all railroads under Federal control, and the Interstate Commerce Commission was by the same act deprived of its powers to pass upon such rates, except in the way of review, after the rate should become effective. For 30 years the shippers of this country had striven to establish the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to review, suspend, and otherwise pass upon the establishment of transportation rates before such rates became effective, this being necessary for the protection of the shipping interests of this country, and their efforts were finally rewarded.

It was understood and clearly so stated at the time this power was taken away from the commission and placed in the hands of the President, that it would only be used in case of extreme emergency and as a matter of war necessity, but as soon as the Railroad Administration took hold of the situation these promises were disregarded and the power thus given to the President was used indiscriminately by the Director General of Railroads to change any and every rate he saw fit, at his own pleasure, anywhere in the United States, sometimes on one day's *notice*, thus leaving the shipping interests of the country entirely at the mercy of the Railroad Administration and without adequate recourse of any character. It is true that traffic committees were formed and consideration given to many rate changes, but in the majority of cases this consideration was only perfunctory and very little real benefit to the shippers.

The Illinois Sand & Gravel Co., in a resolution passed August 23, 1919, stated:

The general effect of this arbitrary action of the Director General has been more or less disastrous, former rate relationships having been destroyed in many instances and undue burdens having been forced upon many commodities, particularly basic materials used in building and construction.

Instance after instance could be cited to show how the rate-making power was so abused and disadvantageously used that the shippers were placed in desperate straits to carry on their business.

As to the maintenance of railroad property, provided for by the railroad-control act and by the standard contract with each railway corporation, it is conceded by everyone who is familiar with the situation that the facilities and equipment of the railroads were permitted to deteriorate to an alarming extent and that numerous replacements imperatively required were not authorized; even toward the end of Federal control, when arrangements to do so could have been made with considerably less difficulty than during the war, practically no extensions or new tracks were constructed; only sufficient maintenance to enable continued operation was performed; less than 50 per cent of the normal average wastage in freight cars and locomotives was replaced, and practically no passenger cars were purchased by the Government, although the railroads require approximately 2,000 new units of such equipment each year in order to render adequate service. To the argument that perhaps the railroad corporations could not have done better, the reply is that prior to 1918 most of them gave maintenance and replacements preferred attention and turned over to the Government plants in comparatively up-to-date operating condition; and the difficulties encountered by the Government during the period of Federal control that followed the armistice, which covered 16 of the 26 months that the railroads were operated by the Government, are fairly comparable to those that had to be contended with by the railroads when they had charge of their properties, most of the differences being due to causes resulting from the policies of the Government. The great body of splendid Americans composing the railroad employees are not resopnsible for the disastrous results of Government operation.

But, Mr. Chairman, these great disadvantages and these great financial losses pale into insignificance when compared with the disastrous effect upon the political life of our Republic. Politics was not adjourned during the war nor after its close. It was found that some 2,000,000 voters were directly and pecuniarily interested in every important step taken by the Railroad Administration. I have illustrated how the Director General advertised and emphasized the increases in wages by numerous unnecessary bulletins; but it must be remembered that he had been an active politician before securing this political plum, and he soon saw in the dependency of this great class of voters upon his every action the golden opportunity to capitalize for political purposes the policies he pursued. He early issued his statement that the policy under private operation had been "The public be damned," by which he sought to stir up sentiment against private operation. He followed up his policy of undertaking to take personal and political credit for advances in railroad wages. I quote the following newspaper report of a speech made by Director General McAdoo in El Paso, Tex., on April 17, 1918.

He asked the men not to become impatient because of the delay of the fixing of the new wage schedule, adding that if a raise was granted to the railroad men it would be retroactive, and they would then be able to buy Liberty bonds. "You are all my boys, and I don't intend to let anyone kick you around, for I will defend you to the limit when you are right, and you won't go wrong, I am sure," he said.

After the war a drive was determined upon to create sentiment in favor of retaining the railroads, and the administration forces were prime movers in this drive. The first objective was to secure an extension of the period of Government operation for an additional five years, and, once agreed upon, a propaganda was started through railroad labor circles such as the country has rarely ever before witnessed, and this was the signal for renewing exaggerated claims of efficiency and economy in the railroad administration and for new efforts to convince the railroad employees that Government operation had been to their benefit. This extension, of course, would have kept the railroads beyond the presidential campaign.

On January 3, 1919, after the signing of the armistice and when every consideration should have been looking toward the ending of Government control, Mr. McAdoo appeared before the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate and urged the passage of a law continuing the Government control for five years longer. In his speech, which was given wide publicity, he made great claims concerning economies and reforms under Government control. He then laid the basis for an extension of five years in the following language:

In view of the far-reaching importance of any solution of the railroad question which may be adopted, the public is entitled to have, before the present Federal control shall be terminated, a reasonably fair test under peace conditions of the advantages to be derived from these reforms. * * * This is why I have urged that Federal control be extended until January 1, 1924.

Mr. McAdoo's successor, Director General Hines, an estimable gentleman and able executive, also similarly urged Government control of the railroads for a period of five years, and his argument was so nearly like that of Mr. McAdoo that it suggested a meeting of minds on the question. On February 3, 1919, before the Senate committee, Director General Hines very strongly urged the five-year extension. He said:

But I believe the five-year extension would be much better, because it would give added stability. Of course, there can be no guaranty that there will be a permanent solution in the three-year period, and the additional two years will give a margin of safety which will remove the uncertainty which would arise if the end of the three-year period approached and there appeared danger that no legislation would be accomplished. * * * We know that a large body of the people of this country has a settled conviction that this question can not be successfully disposed of except through Government ownership. The arguments of the Government ownership advocates are temporarily at a discount by reason of a reaction from all forms of Government control, this being a perfectly natural aftermath of the war. Now, is it the part of statesmanship for anyone to recommend a hasty settlement of this question in a period when the permanent convictions of a large part of the public are for the time being suffering a partial eclipse by reason of a purely temporary state of mind? (Hearings, pp. 893–895.)

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. No; I decline to yield.

It is inconceivable that both of these gentlemen made these urgent recommendations without the approval of the appointing power. The end of the war, however, marked the beginning of the time when the public was heard. The people had patriotically and very patiently borne what were thought to be necessary evils during war time, but in peace times, through the press over the country, through resolutions of thousands of organizations, the public demanded that Government operation should cease. After the Republican organization in Congress had gone on record in favor of their speedy return, the President, reading his ouija board aright, yielded to this insistent public demand and in a message stated that the railroads should be returned. However, there had been set in motion an organization among the railroad employees for the retention of the railroads which did not terminate when the President changed his mind. The amiable gentleman from Tennessee, ranking Democratic member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, which had charge of railroad legislation, had caught the fever, and it never abated with him. On May 19, 1919, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] introduced a bill in this House to continue the Federal control of railroads until January 1, 1924. On November 5, 1919, he introduced a bill to continue Government control and operation of railroads until December 31, 1921. On December 2, 1919, he introduced an additional bill to continue Government operation of railroads until December 31, 1921, and on August 2, 1919, by request, he introduced another bill, known as the Plumb plan, which would require the Government to purchase the railroads for all time to come and turn them over to a corporation to be run on the soviet plan for 100 years.

And, Mr. Chairman, all of this clamor for extension of Government operation of the railroads and for the Plumb plan can be traced directly to the political effect of Government operation of railroads, and the exaggerated claims that were drummed into the employees' ears during that time that they

were receiving special favors from the administration in power. The effect on our body politic of Government operation of railroads was to accentuate the studied effort by the radicals of to-day to bring about class consciousness.

Mr. Chairman, the claim that this Government is for one class and against another is an infamous falsehood and an imposition. Our Government is seeking to promote the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

But if class shall be arrayed against class we may well tremble for the future.

A republic differs essentially from other forms of government. The character of the government depends not alone upon the high average of intelligence of the individual, but upon the manner in which that intelligence is crystallized through popular representation into the laws of the country. If there shall develop strong conscious jealous classes, then the member of the classes will more and more be guided by selfish purposes. The part which he takes in shaping the affairs of the nation will be to carry out his selfish ends, and the Government shall no longer reflect the sum total of intelligent statesmanship of its people, but there will be reflected in the country's government, in the turn of their respective ascendancies, the sum total of their efforts for class advancement. [Applause.]

Let us hold to the fundamental truths that have made us great. This is the day for steady, unbiased, thoughtful action. We must not indorse every fanciful scheme nor embrace every novel proposal, but rather cling to those things which are tried and true and march steadily on in our progress to the high destiny which is within our reach.

The Republic at war and the Republic in peace require the same sort of patriotism, but that does not mean that the governmental policy shall be the same. In fact, that policy should just be reversed. The distinctive feature of the Government of these United States has been freedom of action for the individual; freedom of action, to be sure, in an orderly way with careful recognition of the rights of others. The great industries of the country, the vast business of the Nation, the phenomenal prosperity of our people, the wonderful happiness in our land have all been brought about because of the recognition of this principle. Whereas other countries united business and the State, it has been the purpose of our statesmanship to separate the two. We have been most happy and contented during the times when the Government least touched business affairs. Take our transportation system, for instance. The Republic of the United States, because of its vast contiguous territory and its diversified industries, has become a great transportation country. We have one-third of the railroads of the entire world. We give the best rates and the best service of any transportation system in the wide world, and it has all been built up and developed by private initiative, by private capital, by private ingenuity, and private genius. Our great network of electric railways, our other great public utilities, have all been developed in the same way.

During that time of great development the Government has dealt with distinctly governmental affairs. It has not undertaken to carry on the business of the country. By legislation it prevented evil practices in business, but that is a governmental function. It provided proper rules of conduct and stayed the hand of the transgressor, but that was a governmental function.

Now, when the war came on it required the united strength of the Nation against a foreign foe and hence required an entirely different governmental policy. The interest of industry as industry, the interest of business as business, the interest of the railroads as such, all became secondary to the necessary use of all these elements of strength in assembling the might of the Nation to strike effective blows against our foe. The freedom of action of the individual had to give way to the all-absorbing demand for the force of the individual's action as a unit in our national force which we applied against the enemy.

The marvelous way in which the American people submitted to this change in governmental policy and the phenomenal result of that achievement have taught the world that individual freedom in peace time does not prevent the mastery of the Nation in war time.

But now we have another problem. Having made this radical change in governmental policy during war time, will the genius of our statesmanship be able to shift the gears and return us to our normal status? The problem is a simple one so far as rules are concerned. No deep study is required to know that the Government must once more return to purely governmental functions. Rapid strides have been made toward this end. We have returned the telegraph and telephone wires to private operation; we have returned the cables to their private owners. Some of our commissions and bureaus have been disbanded and all others which are unnecessary should be abolished. Private operation of railroads has been restored. We must continue this course until there is a complete divorcement of business and Government. [Applause.] And in keeping with this policy the Congress passed the Esch-Cummins railroad bill, which the President said, in signing, "marked a new era."

The one man who is entitled more than anyone else to the credit for this great constructive measure is the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH]. [Applause.] He recognized the drafting of this railroad bill as a big task. He brought to the accomplishment of the task his many years of experience in legislation affecting transportation. He devoted practically his entire time for many months to the work on the railroad bill. His rich knowledge of railroad affairs did not hinder him in the least from studying ideas suggested by others. He recognized, as every practical legislator recognizes, that no important bill can meet the entire approval of all of the legislators who must necessarily take part in its passage. Ready to yield to convincing argument of others, yet firm in his own convictions, he easily became the master mind in the drafting of the bill. He is entitled to the congratulations of his colleagues in the House upon the passage of this bill which bears his name. [Applause.]

Let us examine the provisions of this act. After the enactment of certain provisions made necessary by Government control, it so amends the former act to regulate commerce as to give complete Federal regulation in every respect where the public may have an interest and provides the machinery for the voluntary adjustment of railway disputes. It then provides a rule of rate making so arranged as to provide sufficient revenue to adequately sustain transportation and yet not produce unconscionable returns to the strong roads.

The act proceeds upon the assumption that transportation is a necessity; that it is a public function; that it is the duty of the Government to see that it does properly function; that this duty not only requires restrictive provisions by which the public is protected from any imposition on the part of the carriers but also requires provisions which shall foster and encourage the business of transportation by the quasi public corporations.

The restrictive features fix the rates that may be charged, control the practices and regulations that may be made effective, prescribe in great detail and with minute exaction how the roads must be financed, the manner in which securities may be issued, and the way in which the capital shall be expended so that watering stock is made impossible. Consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission must be obtained to construct new lines of railroad, to extend the old lines, or to acquire or operate any line. No line or part of line can be abandoned without the consent of the commission. The railroad may be required to furnish facilities for transportation, including cars, locomotives, and other necessary equipment, and, if it does not possess them, to provide itself with adequate facilities to properly serve the public. It must distribute cars in the manner prescribed by the commission. It must permit other roads to use its terminals, under proper terms including reasonable compensation, when directed by the commission to do so. These instances are merely illustrative of the restrictive regulations by which complete control is given to the Government over the instruments of transportation.

Having given to the Interstate Commerce Commission the fullest authority to supervise the charges that shall be made and to determine the manner in which capital may be secured, and having granted to the commission the power to fix rates, we have determined as a legislative policy that the roads in any given rate group, considered as a whole, which are honestly, efficiently, and economically managed, shall have such rates as will yield a fair return on the aggregate property value. For a period of two years this return is to be fixed by the commission as nearly as may be at 5½ per cent, and with permission for an additional one-half of 1 per cent under certain specified conditions.

This function of the commission does not differ materially from the function already exercised by the commission, except that the bill adopts the 5½ per cent for two years as a matter of legislative policy rather than leaving it to the commission. This is based upon property value and not one cent is to be paid on "watered" stock. The story that the bill authorizes freight rates upon $8,000,000,000 of watered stock is made out of the whole cloth; the rates must be based upon the actual value of the property and the amount of the stock does not enter into it.

The charge that the rule of rate making is a 6 per cent guaranty is just as untrue. The Government does not make good

if the property does not yield 6 per cent. The loss is borne entirely by the railroads.

The clearest illustration of meeting the railroad problem in a constructive way is found in the provision for a recapture by the Government, to be used for transportation purposes, of one-half the amount earned by any road above 6 per cent. Where you have two competing roads between two shipping points these roads of necessity must charge the same rate, otherwise the road charging the lesser rate would get all the traffic. Yet a rate fixed for the carriage of freight and passengers between those points might yield an unconscionably large return to one road which by reason of a better route, roadbed, or other similar causes was able to operate at less cost; and yet the yield for the other road under this rate might not be large enough to even approach a fair return. This is the problem of the strong and the weak road, and that has been called by many students of the subject the real railroad problem.

The greatest confusion has arisen over the labor provisions of the act. The Senate bill contained an antistrike clause; the House bill contained provisions for the voluntary adjustment of railway disputes. The bill as it passed rejected the antistrike features entirely and left merely the machinery for the voluntary settlement of railway disputes, although with some modifications of the original provisions of the House bill. Many railroad men and other union-labor men had written Members to vote against the bill when it was thought it would contain the antistrike provision, but since the bill has passed and a clear study has been afforded the labor provisions have been highly commended in many labor circles.

Title III embraces the labor provisions. It provides first that the railroad companies and their officers on the one hand and the employees and agents on the other hand shall hold conferences and try to make an amicable adjustment of their disputes. This is a most wise provision. For many years these hundreds of thousands of employees have been able, through negotiations in most cases, to effect satisfactory settlements with their employers. Very seldom have they reached a deadlock. When they sit down at a table together and frankly discuss their differences the solution frequently can be easily found. And this bill does not undertake to compel the men to litigate their troubles before the boards; in fact, it is hoped and expected that the majority of the disputes will be settled between the parties themselves.

It is recognized, however, that it is extremely important to avoid any interruption of our transportation system, and hence there are to be organized "railroad boards of labor adjustment," known as "adjustment boards," made up wholly of the representatives of the railroads interested and the employees interested, in order that a dispute assuming discomforting proportions may be submitted in an orderly way to a tribunal ready for its consideration. This board will decide disputes involving only "grievances, rules, or working conditions."

There is also established what is known as the "labor board," composed of nine members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Three members representing the employees and subordinate officials are appointed from a list of not less than six named by the employees.

Three representing the management group are appointed from a list of not less than six named by the railroads.

Three representing the public are named by the President upon his own initiative. Vacancies are filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

The members hold office for a term of five years, except that shorter terms of varying length are provided in the first organization, so that only one-third of the board will leave in one year.

This labor board has two functions. One is to hear disputes involving grievances, rules, or working conditions, where a decision can not be reached by the adjustment board. The other function is the original consideration of "all disputes with respect to the wages or salaries of employees or subordinate officials of carriers" not amicably decided between the parties themselves. Five of the nine members must concur, and this must include at least one of the public group in order for their deliberation to amount to a decision.

The employees are not compelled to submit their grievances to the board, and there is no compulsory arbitration, and there is nothing in the law making a strike unlawful.

In reaching their determination the board shall consider:

(1) The scales of wages paid for similar kinds of work in other industries;

(2) The relation between wages and the cost of living;

(3) The hazards of the employment;

(4) The training and skill required;

(5) The degree of responsibility;

(6) The character and regularity of the employment; and

(7) Inequalities of increases in wages or of treatment, the result of previous wage orders or adjustments.

The main office of the labor board is in Chicago, but, if necessary, it may meet at other places. The board is given the usual powers granted to commissions for the issuance of subpœnas and securing the attendance of witnesses.

The act does not provide for the enforcement of the decisions, but ample provision is made for giving notice to the parties and publishing the decisions to acquaint the public with the result.

Thus the Congress rejected the antistrike provision and substituted in its place the machinery for the amicable adjustment of disputes and a Government tribunal in which those interested, the employees, the railroads, and the public, have representation. No one claims that the millennium has come in the matter of railroad labor disputes, but it is the firm belief of those who have studied this perplexing problem that this will reduce friction to the very minimum and assure to all interested the "even-handed justice" and square deal to which every American is entitled.

The act is now effective. The Labor Board has been created, consisting of the following personnel:

FOR THE PUBLIC.

R. M. Barton, of Tennessee, for many years a member of the Tennessee Court of Appeals.

G. W. W. Hanger, of the District of Columbia, Assistant Commissioner of the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation.

Henry Hunt, formerly mayor of Cincinnati, Ohio.

FOR THE RAILWAY EXECUTIVES.

Horace Baker, of Ohio, former general manager of the Queen & Crescent Lines.

J. H. Elliott, of Texas, former general manager of the Texas & Pacific.

William L. Park, of Illinois, former vice president of the Chicago Great Western.

FOR THE EMPLOYEES.

Albert Phillips, of Ohio, vice president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

A. C. Wharton, of Missouri, president of the railroad employees' department of the American Federation of Labor.

J. J. Forrester, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.

The board in an orderly way is now considering the railroad-wage question, involving practically every employee of the railroads and a stupendous sum of money, and practically everyone now agrees that the amount of money involved and the importance of the question was too great to be settled in any way except by the Government tribunal.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has provided the necessary groups, and is now holding hearings on the rate schedule. The beneficent provisions of the bill, which gives complete control by the commission in any emergency created by congestion, have been invoked.

It will take many years, Mr. Chairman, for our transportation system to return to normal, but this great measure has marked the pathway to take us out of chaos into the realm of order, and the menace to our well-ordered Government has been removed. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WALSH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following Senate concurrent resolution:

Senate concurrent resolution 27.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby respectfully declines to grant to the Executive the power to accept a mandate over Armenia as requested in the message of the President dated May 24, 1920.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate expresses its profound sorrow on account of the death of the Hon. ALBERT ESTOPINAL, late a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Louisiana.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended in order that fitting tribute may be made to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN].

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address delivered by our colleague, Hon. EDWARD T. LITTLE, in the city of Pittsburgh yesterday, Memorial Day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE]. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, is this distinctly a Memorial Day address?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes; delivered in the city of Pittsburgh yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the land and water power legislation of this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the budget bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a short extract from a speech delivered by ex-President Taft to the Ohio Society of this city.

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

There was no objection.

The extract referred to is as follows:

VALUE OF LONG SERVICE IN CONGRESS—SPEECH OF PRESIDENT TAFT BEFORE THE OHIO SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON.

There is a truth as profound as political experience can make it in the following passage from the speech of President Taft before the Ohio Society of Washington:

"Why is it that the small States of the East exercise so much power in Congress? It isn't because an eastern man has any more capacity in the matter of legislation than a western man—certainly not more than an Ohio man. It is because when they get a good Representative they keep him as long as he 'lives,' and then he has the influence that vastly exceeds the more numerical representation of pupulation."

Though a man were Hazlitt and Macaulay combined, he would not be a great writer unless he had been of the guild a while. We are told by Edmund Burke himself that it was by slow degrees and constant discussion that Charles James Fox became the greatest parliamentary debater the world ever saw. Fox entered the British Commons before he was 20 years old. He remained a member of that body until his death, at the age of 57. In opposition he did as much to advance the cause of good government as Pitt did in power, for he kept Pitt not only on the alert but on his good behavior.

Had Fox been an American and a Member of our Congress, he would have been fortunate if he had been chosen to and served in 10 Congresses—20 years. Sam Randall was not bred a statesman, but he became one of four great parliamentary leaders by reason of his long service. Had John G. Carlisle been English born, he would have served in the House of Commons at the least 50 years. Gladstone was in the Commons 60 years. Had he been an American, it is doubtful if the whim of a single constituency would have allowed him 12 Congresses.

Matt Carpenter was a more powerful intellect than William B. Allison, but Allison exercised an infinitely more powerful influence on our parliamentary policies than Carpenter. One served less than 12 years, the other more than 30.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. LEA of California. Concerning the legislation of this session.

Mr. WALSH. Any particular legislation, or generally?

Mr. LEA of California. I did not want to confine it to one subject, but the high cost of living is the subject on which I desire to extend my remarks.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman intend to devote any portion of it to the bonus legislation?

Mr. LEA of California. No.

Mr. WALSH. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 1024) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to John Zimmerman for certain lands in the Colorado National Forest upon the surrender of other lands of an equal acreage also located in the Colorado National Forest, Colorado.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 7158) to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. JONES of Washington, and Mr. KING as the conferrees on the part of the Senate.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to my good friend from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] that the people of the United States just now are less concerned about the manner in which William G. McAdoo signed railroad orders when he was Director General than they are with regard to the kind of service they are going to get out of the railroads from now on. In other words, they are more concerned about railroad service in the future than they are with regard to water which has passed over the wheel already.

Do you know that in a large measure we are responsible for the poor railroad service now given the people? Do you know that there is not a single railroad in this land that can to-morrow discharge a shiftless, lazy, careless, inefficient employee and get away with it? A strike would occur tying up every railroad in the land. They have got to take just exactly what the railroad employees give them, and the people have to put up with it. Why, the expectation of a business man making a railroad connection is a dream of the past. Buy your ticket to St. Louis for connections out of there. Take the fast 4.50 Pennsylvania train that used to get you in there on the minute years ago or pay you back your money, and you will get into St. Louis to-morrow from three to six hours late, missing every connection. Who is to blame? The railroad crews who handle the trains are almost solely to blame. Do you know that trains get in and out of a station just as is willed by the crew in charge of the train?

Do you know that the Adamson law which you permitted to go on the statute books and which you on the other side of the aisle have still permitted to rest there ever since you have been in power in this House, places a premium on bad service, rewarding every member of the crew, fireman, engineer, mail clerk, conductor, and brakeman for getting in late and running the trains late? If they get into their destination 31 minutes late they get paid for a whole extra hour and they know it.

I was going to Texas last December. I was very much interested in this vital movement of the open shop because the open shop means the only kind of policy on God's green earth that gives every man a fair, square deal in this country. I was trying to get some of our Texas cities waked up on the open shop, cities like Houston, San Antonio, Austin, Fort Worth, Dallas, and Beaumont, and other cities, nearly every one of them now having live open-shop associations, to which cities they invite the laboring men of the United States to come, and it makes no difference whether they belong to an organization or not, they say "Come to our city and we will give you a fair, square deal."

I wanted to get to San Antonio on time, because I had every moment of my time mapped out to use to best advantage. I bought my reservations at Washington by the way of St. Louis, intending to catch one of the fast Texas trains, and in order to be sure I ordered reservations on three different trains out of St. Louis. I got in four and a half hours late and missed every one of them. [Laughter.] I finally got out of there on a slow train at 12 o'clock at night. I got down to Texarkana and I had a whole hour and a half there, waiting for them to make up the train.

Mr. WALSH. Did the train crew know that the gentleman was aboard? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I waited an hour and a half for them to make up the train. The time came for the train to leave, but not a single move had been made to start the train. I waited three-quarters of an hour past the train time. I then hunted the conductor up and said, "Look a here, what is the matter with this train? Why don't you get out? You are three-quarters of an hour late." He looked at me and said, "Oh, what is the hurry?" I said, "I want to get to San Antonio." And he said, "We have got to throw all that mail and baggage on." I said, "Why haven't you been doing that for the last hour and a half?" He said, "Oh, what is the hurry?" And I then winked at him and I called him to one side. You know you can do a whole lot with a wink, the same as a woman can. [Laughter.] I said, "Look a here. I want to be frank with you. I am from Washington and I am going to have to report on this very service when I get back to Washington and the kind of service you furnished with this train to San Antonio. The porter and the conductor back there in the sleeping car told me that for three months this train has never reached San Antonio on time. That it has been from four to five hours late every trip. I said I know it is all with you boys whether it gets in on time or not. I said I am going to tell Mr. Hines about this service when I

get back and I am going to report on it." I did not tell him I was an inspector, because I was not, but he thought I was an inspector and I wanted him to think so [laughter], and he thought it. I said, "Now, what kind of a report are you going to cause me to make when I go back?" He said, "You go back and rest easy; we will get you in all right." He passed it down the line from division to division that there was a Washington inspector on board of that train. Every new crew that came aboard at every division knew that some one was on there looking out for the service, and the conductor worried the life out of me and my boy by coming back to the sleeper and reporting every little while on how he was making up time. [Laughter.]

Well, we got into San Antonio right on the dot. [Laughter.]

It demonstrated that it all depends on the train crew whether you get good service. Now, instead of you Republicans here bellyaching about Mr. McAdoo signing his name to orders, you get busy and let the superintendents of the Baltimore & Ohio, the Pennsylvania system, the New York Central, and other railroad systems of this country know that you are going to demand service of them, and if their train crews do not give good service we want them to discharge them, and we will back them up.

You had a chance to pass an antistrike measure that would have protected the country, but what did you do? You let our good friend from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] introduce what was known as the Anderson amendment, which was written and framed by the railroad brotherhoods of this country, every word of it, and you passed it without giving us a chance to debate it. When our good and great Democratic leader in this House, CLAUDE KITCHIN, asked you for a little time to debate it you would hardly let him open his mouth. You made us take it without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." That is the kind of service you fellows have given the American people; and it does not behoove you to get up here and talk about William G. McAdoo signing his name twice to a railroad order. Every one of you bankers in this House have signed your names to bank notes. I can probably find Brother FORDNEY's name on more bank notes than anything else he has signed. Have not you signed them when you were in the banking business? Why, the bank cashiers have got their names on every little dollar bill and two dollar bill and five or ten or twenty dollar bill that comes out of the bank. It had to have Mr. McAdoo's name on it to make the railroad orders good. The people would not have paid attention to it if it had not had the Director General's name upon it. Now, what are you going to do? You can give good service to the country. Let us wake up, and when we get back here after the recess, after you have gone home and talked with your people and find out that they have been thinking and talking just about as you have heard BLANTON talk here on the floor of this House—after you come back let us pass an antistrike law, and the railroads will be all right and they will give us good service again.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to yield me three minutes more.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. KELLER. Is this speech made for campaign purposes, for campaign funds?

Mr. BLANTON. No; it is not a speech for campaign funds. But let me tell the gentleman something. I have had campaign funds offered me from Tampa, Fla., to Seattle, Wash., and do you know why? It is because I have been giving some service worth while to all the people of the United States, while you have been at home attending to private business. You can not get the campaign funds that I get because you have not been doing anything for the people of the country. I never used a dollar of campaign funds in my whole life until this campaign, but I am taking some now, and why? Because your labor unions are spending money in my district like water, and I want to tell you this: When I get through with my campaign and I get 15,000 majority, which I am going to get, all told I will not have expended $2,000 in my campaign. Now, do you want to ask me any more questions about campaign funds? [Laughter.] Maybe there is somebody else here who would like to bob up and ask me a question? Getting back to the question of the railroad service, let us come back here after the recess and protect this country from New York to the Gulf of Mexico with an antistrike clause that will prevent women and little children from being starved to death. Take the great southern port of Galveston. It is almost ruined to-day with a longshoremen's strike. Ships of the Mallory Line and of the Margan Line are changing their courses and are going to other ports to unload and take on cargo. A little bunch of longshoremen, just as there are here in the East, are absolutely ruining that port, and we sit here like a bunch of ninnies and have not the courage and the manhood to protect the business interests of this country. You vote with me when we get back here and we will stop this foolishness——

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Why do not those good folks down there protect those people?

Mr. BLANTON. With shotguns?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what it would take. It would take shotguns and pitchforks and trench knives and bombs to protect themselves against these striking thugs, who will not work themselves and will not let anybody else work. That is what it would take. Why does not the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] give them a law that will protect them? This is a law-abiding country. The gentleman is the chief lawmaker of this country. He has the lawmaking power in the hollow of his hand. Why do not you do something for the people of this country, instead of coming here almost daily and talking about how you are getting us out of debt at the rate of from $500,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 a week on savings on estimates? [Laughter.]

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD].

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think scarcely two weeks had elapsed after the assembling of this Congress before the Democratic papers throughout the country began to say that we had done nothing, and in a month, again and again from gentlemen on the Democratic side, not infrequently one would hear that we had done absolutely nothing. I do not question at all the veracity of the gentlemen who have again and again thus expressed themselves, for they are most estimable gentlemen.

But to one who has been unaccustomed to hear men in responsible positions talk that way, naturally the question arises as to whether it is a matter of crass ignorance or purposeful political capital. One is inclined, of course, to believe that we have not done everything that you gentlemen on the other side have asked us to do, many of those things, perhaps, that you did not really want us to do; but, after all, there has been a creditable showing, and one's mind naturally goes back over the political situation, and as a member of the Republican Party very naturally the thought came to me: Well, after all, what can you say and say truthfully in connection with the legislation of this Congress? I am one of those Republicans who as a part of the Republican Party believe still in the Constitution. The Republican Party believes in the Constitution. It still thinks that we have not outgrown the wisdom of the fathers. The three departments of the Government—legislative, executive, and judicial—ought to function. For several years the executive department has been dominating the legislative. The exigencies of war made necessary the further extension of executive power. This extension made the President of the United States the most autocratic ruler on the face of the earth. Congress gave evidence of its good faith in supporting the President by the granting of every power that he asked, by the appropriation of money without stint, and by the calling of the young manhood of the Nation without limit. There was no effort to interfere in any way with the direction or the use of materials and men for the winning of the war. The Congress reserved to itself only the constitutional right to impeach.

The levying of taxes to carry on these expenditures was in the hands of a Democratic administration. They controlled the Senate and the House and had the President and officers subordinate to him for the execution of these laws. The Democratic Party levied the war taxes for the fiscal years of 1918, 1919, and 1920. Notwithstanding the excessive levying, the expenditures have been far in excess of the income. Three billions of dollars in short-time loans, maturing with deadly certainty, only to be reissued, has been the policy by which the Democratic administration has pushed forward what it has expended in excess of what it has collected. So that to-day we face a current expenditure of six billions and a hang-over of three billions. Now, our Democratic friends are crying out: "Reduce the taxes in order that the people may be satisfied and pay the obligations in order that the Nation's honor may be protected."

By verdict of the people, on November 7, 1918, the Republican Party was given absolute control in the lower House and nominal control only in the Senate. The Democratic Congress continued until the 4th of March, 1919. Up to that day, March 4,

1919, every department of the Government was in absolute control of the Democratic Party. In early December, 1919, the President left for Europe. He knew, and all public men and most private citizens in this country knew, that the Constitution gave the Senate equal power in the making of treaties. It expressly says that the President "shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senate present concur." He did not take the advice of the Senate, not even of the Senators of his own party. Senator HITCHCOCK, of Nebraska, was at that time chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and a Democrat. In an address in Omaha, Nebr., April 19 of this year, he said:

> I became chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate when the Democrats controlled the Senate. Before the President left the United States to go to Paris he did not call me into consultation any more than he did any other Senator, although I was still chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and had not been superseded by Senator LODGE.

In the same address he said:

> Of course, Woodrow Wilson made mistakes. He made a mistake when he proceeded to negotiate a treaty of peace without taking a few leading Members of the Senate into his confidence.

Just before the President left he had asked for a vote of confidence in him personally, and the American people had replied by voting a want of confidence and returning a large Republican majority to the lower House.

Just before sailing and after the war was over, after the fighting was done, when there was no reason save a political one, through his Postmaster General he seized the cables to every country in the world and kept Europe uninformed as to the situation in America, and kept us ignorant of what was common knowledge on the Continent of Europe, by such a censorship of news concerning the progress of the Paris conference as has never been exercised by any autocrat in the world. Thus he went upon his self-appointed mission.

The men whom he chose to go with him in no sense fully represented the people of this great country. They were very excellent gentlemen, willing to subordinate themselves, however, to whatever the President might propose. He held them so utterly incapable that the one man among them fitted above all others for taking a useful part in the negotiations stated upon the witness stand before a congressional committee that he was kept in utter ignorance of all the essential features until they had been passed upon. He further stated upon the witness stand that if the American people knew what was in the treaty they would never ratify it.

The President was in Europe for eight months. The Democratic Congress, which ended March 4, 1919, had failed to make the appropriations necessary to conduct the Government for the fiscal year 1920. The Republican Congress could not constitutionally meet until December 1920. The President, therefore, was under the necessity of calling an extra session. This extra session began May 19. This new Congress was Republican. Its first work was to provide the means for carrying on the ordinary work of the Government. The fiscal year expired June 30. It had but six weeks to review all the appropriation bills that had failed of passage through the incapacity of the preceding Democratic Congress. Yet in that six weeks it made a reduction in those bills of $800,000,000.

It addressed itself immediately to finding out how the money collected for the war had been expended. There was, of course, necessary waste and extravagance in the prosecution of a war, but such appalling waste and such appalling extravagance has never been equaled in any country or in any age. There was waste and extravagance and hoarding in vast quantities of foodstuffs. And that was still going on six months after the armistice had been signed. There was vast waste and extravagance in the building of the cantonments, fully known to every carpenter and plumber and water boy that worked upon them. There was vast waste and extravagance in the buying of materials, from safety razors to limousines for the officers through all the list of trucks and Fords. The airplane industry alone netted a loss of a billion dollars.

The Government found itself at the time the armistice was declared in the possession of a great quantity of material which it has not wisely conserved. I do not question the constitutional right of President Wilson going in person to Paris, but that at the time when the country needed an Executive to salvage what might be possible out of the waste of war, it was nothing short of the highest unwisdom for the Chief Executive to be absent from this country eight months.

There have been three distinct attitudes of mind among the people on this League of Nations; first, for the league before they knew what was in it; second, in doubt when the mandates were understood; third, for it with safe-guarding reservations. It was heralded as a panacea for all wars. There was to be ushered in the golden age of peace on earth, good will toward men; but, unlike that golden age which the Master would bring to the world, it was to be secured not by putting into the minds and hearts of men everywhere the principles of righteousness, justice, and mercy, but it was to come down by dictation by a few great powers that undertook to settle the distribution of territory among themselves and then to force all the nations of the world into a league of nations to preserve forevermore that distribution. So Africa was to be divided among three nations—Italy, England, and France. Asia was to be parceled out to Great Britain and Japan. The islands of the seas were assigned to their respective masters. The world was to be placed in a strait-jacket and all movements toward liberty by any people anywhere were to be determined by the imperial government to whom their people had been assigned. No other interpretation of the League of Nations is possible when it is remembered that under article 10 the high contracting powers agree to most solemnly protect the territorial integrity of every nation signatory to the league.

At first thought the whole American people were favorable to a league of nations, and, without knowledge, assuming that the league born of the deliberations at Paris would meet their approval. This attitude of mind grew out of a sincere desire of every humane man that reason and conscience might control the destinies of the world. So long as the masses were not thinking as to what was in the treaty and the league, but intent only on what its authors insisted it would do for them, they were for it. A closer view revealed, however, that in the making of the treaty the secret conferences entered into between Italy, Japan, England, and France had displaced the 14 points advocated by President Wilson, and that the league had its birth in the nations given to secret diplomacy. It is clear to any thoughtful man that the terms of the treaty were determined by lust of power and extension of territory; that hate and avarice and malice and unholy ambition and cold, calculating diplomacy of the old school sought to give to the victors all the spoils of war and assigned the mandatories to the nations which could exploit them best in their own interest.

When the subject of mandatories was examined it was found that the United States was expected to take over Armenia and Turkey. In harmony with that plan, the administration, through its pacifist Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, recommended the organizing of a standing Army of 576,000 men, four times as big as our standing Army was before the war. One of the leading generals of the Army, when questioned as to the need of an Army of that size, said very frankly that it would require 200,000 men in Europe to take care of our obligations under the treaty. When it is remembered that the President of the United States under the Constitution is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and can order them anywhere at any time when he thinks it necessary for the preservation of the rights of the American people, it begins to be understood by the American people that should we ratify the treaty without reservations the American Army could be ordered to Turkey, Armenia, Russia, or any part of the Balkans, to Asia or Africa, to any place on the face of the earth where the President thought we were morally obligated to send them. This is not an unusual interpretation of his power. President Wilson himself has sent the Army into Haiti, into Santo Domingo. He landed troops at Vera Cruz and made war on Mexico, with whom we were at peace. He sent the Army after Villa. He sent a contingent against Russia. I am not now discussing the wisdom or unwisdom of these acts of the President, but only call attention to the fact that he has the power and exercises it.

I doubt not that the effort of this administration to secure a standing Army of 576,000 men had for its purpose a large contingent to be used in the settlement of the difficulties in Europe, Asia, and Africa. The Congress of the United States believes that in matters concerning the territorial integrity of the nations, the dissensions and squabbles and insurrections and revolutions of the Balkans and other peoples, there should be some limits placed on the power of the President if we should enter the League of Nations.

That is the only contention between the Senate and the President concerning article 10. He wants the power on his own mere motion to determine when and how and where the Army and Navy of the United States shall be used in the maintaining of world peace by force of arms, and not by a moral power. There can be no other interpretation of his statement that the reservation to article 10 which expressly provides that the Army and Navy shall not be used in foreign wars or in foreign countries under the League of Nations except by the express approval of Congress will take the heart out of the treaty.

This Nation is too big to be run by one man, however great or good he may be. The Diety alone possesses such all wisdom,

all power, and all goodness. The President is not yet all wise, for he did not see that the gulf current of events was inevitably bearing us on toward war in 1916. He is not all good, for he refuses to receive any advice from a coordinate power of the Government whose constitutional rights are as sacred as his own. He is not all powerful, for a majority of the Senate will not consent that he usurp the powers of that body and take the destinies of the Nation into his own hands.

The President was in Europe eight months. He returned to find that the Senate still held to the Constitution and insisted on its constitutional rights; that the people still believed that the Declaration of Independence was intended to secure the people of this country their own freedom from force both within and without. He found that the Senate still believed that the wisdom of the fathers has not been outgrown. Obsessed by the idea of his own greatness, intoxicated by the air of sycophancy and subserviency which he breathes from his own satellites who are themselves obsessed by the idea that the king can do no wrong, he appealed to the people to compel the Senate to surrender its reason, its conscience, its constitutional duties to his autocratic will.

Unfortunately for him, and grieviously unfortunate for the country at large, he broke in health and since then has been unable to perform his duties under the Constitution.

For seven months the Government of the United States has had no efficient Executive. I speak advisedly. Senator HITCHCOCK, leader for President Wilson, in his effort to ratify the treaty, speaking at Omaha, Nebr., April 19, 1920, says:

> To-day the President is an invalid, broken in health, depressed in spirit, and bitterly disappointed at the failure of the United States Senate to permit the United States to enter the League of Nations. Since last September, when he broke down, he has known nothing but weakness and weariness and pain.

No man having the common instincts of humanity can but deplore this unofrtunate condition physically and mentally to which the President has been brought. But so vast, so important, so vital to the Republic are these mighty issues that the facts in all their glaring inconsistency must be placed before the people of this great country. When this has been done fully, I have no doubt that the American people will thank God again that through the wise restraint put upon the President by the framers of the Constitution the Republic has been saved from unreservedly placing its stamp of approval upon all the iniquities that may be in the treaty of peace.

It would seem that at the close of the Great War the Executive of a hundred and ten millions of people might have found it within the province of his duties to look after the interests of his own people in those things which he alone under the Constitution has the power to direct. And while thus looking after the needs of the Republic he might have been able to find some man, at least in his own party, to whom he could have intrusted the diplomatic mission that kept him away from his duties at a critical time for months, and when we add to this fact that on his return he gave his whole attention to the same subject until he broke in health in September, and that since that time he has known only "weakness and weariness and pain," then we can begin to understand that the Government of the United States has been without a Chief Executive since December, 1919, when he sailed away and transplanted the seat of government to Paris, France.

Domestic questions have arisen, questions of finance, of industry, of taxes, of immigration, of social unrest, repeal of wartime legislation, of the return of the railroads to their owners, of the return of the wires and the telephones and cables to private control. The Republican Congress addressed itself first to the cutting down of appropriations in the sum of $800,000,000 for 1920. It has reduced the demands of the executive departments for appropriations in 1921, $1,200,000,000. Thus already it has refused appropriations to the Government in the amount of $2,000,000,000 that a Democratic Congress would have appropriated. The reduction of the clerical force of the Government has been undertaken and great numbers have been taken off the pay rolls. However, the President is the head of the executive departments. It was his duty to see to it that there was as rapid reductions in the number of clerks in each department as was consistent with the efficient conduct of the business of the Government. He has lent no assistance in this matter. The heads of every department and bureau and extra organization taken on during the war have fought every attempt to reduce the clerical force. The Republicans at times have had to cut blindly, and yet they have been anxious to do the right thing and give the Government the money that is absolutely needed to clean up its war work and run the necessary departments with efficiency.

The Republican Party has revealed extravagance and waste, and discovered evidences of fraud that further savings might be secured. Its committees have put into the hands of the Department of Justice facts upon which prosecutions may be entered and convictions secured connected with the building of the cantonments, shipbuilding, and vast expenditures in many lines. The Department of Justice has had ample funds allotted to it for the enforcement of the laws against profiteering and hoarding. Congress has done all that it could do, but it was discovered that the Government itself was the principal hoarder of foodstuffs and various manufactured articles, and that the Government itself had entered into an agreement with manufacturers and wholesalers of foodstuffs not to place the Government surplus upon the market; the Government itself is a party and has been continuously a party to the continued high cost of living.

There is a storm in finance, in industry, in social unrest. Its center is in Europe. Its causes are foreign. Many of them can not be reached by legislation; work, and more work, alone can reduce the high cost of living. Production and greater production alone will relieve the necessities of the poor.

The Congress is not an executive. It can not enforce the laws; it can only make them. The President, and he alone, through the various executive departments, is the one who can reduce the high cost of living, if it can be reduced by governmental action. I do not say that it can so be reduced, but at any rate the responsibility is with the Executive and not with Congress. There is ample power to do all that may be done already granted to the President and his subordinates.

"Why does not Congress do something?" many ask. This is a pertinent question. Just as pertinent is the question, "What more can it do than has been done?" Congress is not responsible for the causes of economic, social, or industrial unrest. These causes are the natural laws, social and economic, laws of supply and demand, which legislation can not control and which every effort to control has resulted in failure. It is the function of Congress, which is the crew of the ship of state, to steer the ship and keep it off the rocks. It is the province of Congress to see to it that the ship keeps true to her course. It is not the province of Congress to quell the storm. It is not within the province of Congress to say, "Peace, be still," when the elements are at war. It is the function of those who have in charge the ship freighted with a hundred and ten millions of people to see to it that she does not founder in the sea of socialism; that she does not go to pieces upon the rocks of anarchy and bolshevism or enter into an unknown sea without chart and no signal lights along the shore. We have a captain who has been attempting to sail the ship by the light of his own genius and not by the fixed stars. The chief mate, the Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, did not agree with him. The captain has been sick for seven months and confined to his stateroom. His chief mate took the liberty to hold a council. The captain dismissed him.

The Government was losing a million dollars a day by Government operation of the railroads. This was not due to the increase in wages for the railway employees, for their wages were not increased unduly or in the same proportion as the wages in other industries. It was due to the inefficiency in Government management. The new railroad legislation for the first time in the history of this country fully recognizes the rights of labor, of the people, and of the railroad owners by giving each of the three interested parties equal representation on a permanent board for the adjustment of grievances. That legislation will receive the approval of the people of this country and will be finally recognized by the railroad workers themselves as eminently fair and for their own best interests.

Ample provision has been made for the rehabilitation of our wounded soldiers. Congress has done its full duty in their interest. If there is cause for complaint the responsibility is with the department organized under the direction of the President for carrying out the law of Congress. Adequate provision is being made for compensation to all the soldiers of the late war. This measure is not partisan in any sense, for Democrats and Republicans alike are anxious to do the right thing by the boys.

The Constitution of the United States was adopted 133 years ago for a people three and one-half millions in number and occupying only a narrow fringe along the Atlantic seaboard. It is now the basic law for one hundred and ten millions of people, covering a continent in area. This Government is unique in development. There has come to be known in the world the term "Americanism." It was essentially a new government, differing in character from any then known in the world. Our fathers presented their grievances against usurpation, their protests against tyranny, and their basic form of government in such a wise, efficient, and practical way that their state papers are the classics of the ages on free government and the hope

of every people struggling toward liberty. By following the course which they followed, by heeding the admonitions of those who fought for our liberty, who framed our Constitution, and who set up our form of government, this country has had an unparalleled career of happiness and prosperity.

The Republican Party came into being to preserve the Union that had been handed down to us from the fathers. For 50 years it controlled the destiny of this Nation by a wise adherence to those sane and conservative and proved principles that had given birth to the Nation. The Republican Party believes in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution of the United States, in the wisdom of the judicial decisions of John Marshall, in the wise argumentation of Webster, and in the wisdom and patience and self-sacrifice of the immortal Lincoln.

Following this course through the years, this country has become not only the mightiest physical power in the world but its greatest moral power. We have been great by example, not by dictation to other people. We are willing to take our just share in the responsibility of the world, but we are not willing to try to be the arbiter of the destiny of every other nation. Asking neither glory nor honor nor fame nor indemnity nor territorial expansion, we entered the Great War in defense of our own rights that had been violated by reason of causes for which we were not responsible. The Republican Party wants no great standing Army of 576,000 men that at the will of the President may be projected into any European quarrel. The Republican Party will provide for an Army of 175,000 men, which will adequately answer all domestic problems and take care of any sudden emergency that may arise.

The program of the Republican Party is saving wherever possible, constructive legislation in harmony with the Constitution to take care of all new and vital questions that may arise, the restoration of the ordinary functions of government by the repeal of war-time legislation. That can not be fully accomplished until the Republican Party has been given complete control of the Government. With a sick President, bent on having his own way, contrary to the judgment of a majority of the people of this country, it is impossible to realize the full measure of that program thus outlined until after March 4, 1921. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, a few weeks ago I received a letter from one of my constituents, who asked, "What is the matter with the present Congress? Is it going to put the farmer out of business?"

I might merely have replied to the effect that the Republican Party is in absolute control of this Congress. The Republican majority in the House of Representatives is almost 50. In the Senate the Republican majority, while small, was made safe through the purchase of one seat. I might have stated this and stopped. But, actuated by a desire to get at all the facts in the case, and knowing my correspondent to be a farmer and stockman who has carefully followed the proceedings of this and other Congresses, his questions were counted worthy of more than cursory consideration. Other letters along similar lines further influenced me, in this day of investigations, to begin a one-man investigation. This investigation, differing greatly from many authorized by Congress, inasmuch as it was conducted without cost to the country, has been concluded. To-day in the time allotted me and having replied to my constituent, I wish now to report to the Congress.

Permit me first to state, if you please, that having been born and reared on a farm, having come of an unbroken—but sometimes "near broke"—line of farmers, and having devoted my life thus far to the cause of agriculture, I can in truth say that I know the American farmer. I know him as one knows the members of his own family. My knowledge of him is such as comes of sympathy and understanding. His problems are my problems and the problems of my people.

The farmer is no fool. While looking for results he will not be satisfied with rhetoric. He is a judge of measures and of men, and next November, I suspect, many a politician will learn that the telephone girl is not the only human who has "got his number." Busy in the field, the farmer has not devoted much time to the forum, yet as his hands have been employed so has his head. He has watched while he worked. He has been doing his own thinking in his own way. With a mind that is clear and living a life that is clean, he is capable of arriving at conclusions that are correct. Seldom does he mistake the shadow for the substance or confuse promises with performances. He distinguishes between friend and foe and between politics and patriotism.

So to-day when from farmers in every section of the country there come appeals and prayers, when men who throughout our Nation's history have quietly and unassumingly rendered signal and unselfish service while the more garrulous, and frequently the more greedy, have secured recognition, ask "What is the matter with Congress?" well may we pause to answer. Dare we do less? Dare we fail to do more?

Legislation may have a more direct effect upon farm profits and losses than does the use of clover, stable manure, or lime upon the land. So the farmer is concerned with what Congress does for him—or, sometimes, to him. Conscious of this truth, I have given considerable time to searching out those congressional acts which have a direct bearing upon agriculture. The result of my labors has served to call to mind one of the most interesting stories contained in the Bible, the greatest agricultural textbook ever written, and to further stress the significance of the numeral 7 as it appears in history, profane and sacred.

In the forty-first chapter of Genesis we read of Pharaoh's dream and its interpretation, of the "seven kine, well favored and fat fleshed that fed in the meadow," and of "seven ears of corn upon one stalk, rank and good." "And behold there came seven years of great plenty throughout all the land."

Mr. Chairman, in considering agricultural legislation my attention has been directed to another seven-year period of great plenty. Having in mind this period, Secretary of Agriculture Edwin T. Meredith recently said, "More has been accomplished in aid of American agriculture during the past seven years than in all the previous history of the Government." That is a broad statement, but it is true. The greater part of all the legislation now on the statute books of the United States which has for its purpose the development and aid of agriculture has been enacted within the past seven years.

Now, it is interesting to note that these seven good legislative years, years of the well-favored kine and the seven ears of corn upon one stalk, years of farm fatness, were also Democratic years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Eight years ago a Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, was elected President. Until one year ago he had cooperating with him a Democratic Congress. Under these conditions it is not surprising to note the passage of many acts favorable to the farmer and incidentally to all. I say all, for when ill fares the producer, the worker in the field, soon must suffer the consumer, the toiler in the factory. I repeat that it is not a matter of surprise to find the Democratic Party actively engaged in promoting a great constructive program in the cause of agriculture. It is no more to be marveled at than that good seed falling in good soil should bring forth a bountiful harvest.

The Democratic Party, true to tradition and to the principle that parties like plants must draw their strength from below rather than from above, has throughout its history fought the battles of the farmer. It was under a Democratic administration, that of Grover Cleveland, that the farmers of the United States were first given representation in the President's Cabinet, the first Secretary of Agriculture being Norman J. Colman, of Missouri. The creation of this place in the Cabinet, while proving Democracy's interest in the producer, is, in effect, of secondary importance to the benefits resulting from the many agricultural acts written into the national statutes during the recent seven-year period.

Strenuous as is the life of the farmer, perplexing as are his problems, and hard as is his fight—and I dare anyone deny that conditions in the country are now extremely critical—the struggle would to-day be more unequal and more discouraging but for the passage of some of the friendly and helpful legislation of the seven good years.

Let us here hastily consider some of this legislation, all of which was enacted by Democratic Congresses and approved by a Democratic President.

For many years the American farmer, while offering the best security known, was paying the highest rate of interest of any class of borrowers. To-day, when practically everything is higher in price, the farmer is able as a result of the passage of the Federal farm loan act to borrow money at a 5½ per cent

interest rate without commission and without the necessity of having to renew his loan every few years with its accompanying uncertainties and costs. Through the working of this law, the act being approved July 17, 1916, one of the chief handicaps of agriculture has been removed.

Not only does the farmer secure money on the most favorable terms, but it is his own institution from which he is borrowing. This institution is largely managed by himself and for its stability he is personally responsible. This increases his self-respect, gives him valuable experience in cooperating with his neighbors, and at the same time greatly helps him in the conduct of his business.

May I say here that the greatest need of agriculture is agricultural leaders. If the farmer is ever going to be uplifted it will be by the men who actually do the work of feeding the world.

Since the passage of the farm loan act $344,721,366 has been loaned to 124,492 farmers through the national farm loan associations and the Federal land banks. During April an aggregate of $2,078,675 was loaned to 513 farmers of the United States. Loans totaling $79,259,971 have also been made through the joint-stock land banks, another character of institution provided in the law.

Large as are the benefits which have come through direct borrowing under the farm loan act, perhaps larger benefits resulting through the indirect influence of this act have come to borrowers patronizing land mortgage banks and other institutions which lowered their rates as a result of the rate provided through the farm loan act. The lower interest rates thus provided have made it possible for a larger number of producers to stay on the farms at a time when production has been paramount to all other problems. So the consumer has been benefited. Had the farmer been compelled to pay the old interest rates of 8 and 10 per cent, food, if it could have been produced in quantities sufficient to meet the demand, must have been practically prohibitive in price.

Another act of far-reaching importance and one which has served the Nation so admirably in these years of financial test and disturbance is the Federal reserve act of December 23, 1913.

In addition to providing a system of currency free from the domination of big business and directly benefiting all the people, provision is made under section 13 of this act whereby for the first time farm paper with six months' maturity becomes satisfactory collateral in the channels of finance. Only the imagination can measure the benefits of this section of the reserve act to the farmers of this country. It is a recognition long due the farmer and far too long deferred.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. I will.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will it disturb the gentleman if I ask a question?

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. No, sir.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I would like to have the gentleman's idea of the joint-stock land bank. I want to state to the gentleman it is a Democratic measure and has brought down the rate of interest in my State of Texas from 10 to 5½ per cent to the farmer and stock raiser.

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. Answering the gentleman, I might say that the loans coming through this particular act have amounted to $79,000,000 since the passage of the law.

As everyone familiar with the subject knows, the farmer is a heavy borrower for current expenses. It frequently happens that the local banks are unable fully to meet his demands when the crop season opens or when he is feeding or grazing cattle heavily. Through the Federal reserve bank, which came into being in the period of the seven good years, years of the well-favored kine, and the seven years of corn upon one stalk, the local banks can rediscount the farmer's paper and accommodate him without difficulty and without excessive costs.

Especially has the Federal reserve banking system been helpful to the cattle interests, which before the establishment of the Federal reserve bank were without adquate financial support, and every few years were forced to refinance, often at great loss, and always with uncertainty and expense.

Heavy as have been the losses sustained by live-stock feeders during the last few months, these losses would have been greater but for the limited relief afforded through the Federal reserve act.

The farmer is also interested in that feature of the Federal reserve act which authorizes national banks to lend money on farm mortgages.

That the farmer must be afforded still further relief as a matter of justice, and in order to enable him to feed his fellows, is a fact that some future Congress, more friendly to the farmer than is this body, is sure to concede. In the meantime former Congresses are to be congratulated.

Referring again to the Federal reserve act, when we couple with it the proper utilization of the Federal warehouse act we at once recognize a measure of far-reaching possibilities in production and marketing. Under the Federal warehouse act there is proposed a system of Federally regulated warehouses for agricultural products issuing uniform warehouse receipts. These receipts, when issued by a licensed warehouse company on standard farm products, are like meal in the bin or money in the bank.

The cotton-futures act, which is the first successful attempt to regulate the operations of futures exchanges and which has enhanced the value of cotton to the grower, the man entitled to the returns, represents other forward-looking legislation.

Early in the period of the seven good years, years of the well-favored kine and the seven ears of corn upon one stalk, rank and good, came the passage of the agricultural cooperative extension act of May 8, 1914. This act, frequently referred to as the Smith-Lever Act, represents the most important movement ever attempted in direct popular education along a given line. Providing as it does a method of itinerant agricultural teaching of home economics and agriculture, it is perhaps not too much to say of the Smith-Lever Act that it is the greatest single contribution to the cause of farming anywhere in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The amount of money now available for extension work will be increased from year to year until it reaches its full development in 1922–23. At that time the Federal Government alone will appropriate $4,500,000, which, with the States matching all amounts above $10,000 a year each, will make available through this single source $8,680,000 a year.

Designed to help solve the problems of the farm as they developed in peace times, the Smith-Lever Act yet proved the most effective piece of war machinery in the entire Government when America threw her strength into the great struggle. Three days after war was declared Hon. David F. Houston, then Secretary of Agriculture and a Missourian, participated in a great conference in St. Louis, where there was worked out a far-reaching program of food production and conservation. So under this act, which represented agricultural preparedness, there were mobilized the tremendous resources which in the months that followed made of the farmer an effective fighting force second only to that on the front.

But it is not sufficient that it be made easier for the farmer to finance his business, and that the best agricultural information, the result of the experiences of the practical farmer and the findings of the scientist, be made available. There are other problems, including those of marketing and transportation.

The Bureau of Markets, created in 1913 as the Office of Markets and Rural Organizations, had by 1917 grown to such proportions that it was designated as the Bureau of Markets. This bureau provides an agency for furnishing information as to crop movements and prices. While designed primarily for the consumer, this bureau confers benefits directly upon the producers.

The ship-purchase act, a measure necessary to the commerce of the country and of prime importance to agriculture as well, and the marine-insurance act, which under war conditions was necessary to insure transportation of farm products, both represent legislation directly affecting the farmer.

The progressive income tax and the progressive inheritance tax are other measures designed to place the burden of taxation upon those most able to pay. It has been held that it is only proper that great wealth should meet its due obligation in the matter of taxes. Immense fortunes are not found among rural folk. No farmer made a fortune out of the war. In the country we find practically no millionaires, no mendicants, just men.

Lastly, in referring to the legislative acts of the seven good years, I mention the Federal aid road act approved July 11, 1916, and amended February 28, 1919. When we bear in mind how the highways offer infinite possibilities of local communication while linking together widely separated farms and cities, when we think of the hundreds of thousands of miles of roadway in the United States, and when we pause to consider that the highways in truth represent the arteries of trade through which flows the rich red blood of commerce, when it is known that every bushel of grain and every pound of beef and pork must pass over a country road before it reaches the consumer in the city, we better appreciate the meaning of the Federal aid road act.

Think of what it means. It appropriates from the Federal Treasury, to be expended in cooperation with the States in the construction and improvement of rural post roads, a total of $75,000,000. Just as truly does it influence the development of road building along right lines, promote a fuller and more attractive rural life, and add to the happiness and well-being of all the people. It also helps lighten one of the heaviest taxes the farmer pays and from which he receives no protection—the mud tax.

Does anybody believe that with such a record, covering a period of years when Democrats were in power, there would at its completion come the question, "What is the matter with Congress? Is it trying to put the farmer out of business?" Of course not. Nor was such a question asked—not then.

Turning again to the forty-first chapter of Genesis, we read of seven other kine, "ill-favored and lean fleshed," and of seven ears of corn, thin, empty, and blasted with the east wind. And we are told that when the seven good years were past famine followed.

Changes come, changes not alone in cattle and in corn but in Congresses.

In November, 1918, the country, impressed with the promises freely made in many districts that a Republican Congress would support the President, and, ignoring politics but prompted by the loftiest of patriotism, would intelligently and earnestly seek to solve the after-war problems, placed the Republican Party in power.

Mr. DAVEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. I will.

Mr. DAVEY. The gentleman does not believe, I am sure, that the people are going to accept and welcome seven Republican famine years?

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. I think we will get our answer, and it will be satisfactory, next November. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So, on May 19, 1919, the new Congress convened. With the reorganization of the House of Representatives there came many changes. The Speakership, long held by the beloved CHAMP CLARK, passed from Missouri to Massachusetts, from the great corn-belt country with its farms to New England with her factories. Complete were the changes made in committee chairmen. Agriculture, charged with having received more than its just deserts under Democrats, was disciplined. While Maine and Massachusetts were each given three committee chairmanships, such agricultural States as Missouri, with 155,000,000 bushels of corn and 57,000,000 bushels of wheat to her credit in 1919; Oklahoma, with 74,000,000 bushels of corn, 52,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 930,000 bales of cotton; and Texas, with 202,000,000 bushels of corn, 31,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 2,700,000 bales of cotton [applause] are unrepresented at the head of any committee in the present Congress. Vermont, a pygmy State in agricultural production, is given a committee chairmanship, but not so Virginia, land of corn and cotton. So might we continue as to committee chairmen.

Time forbids an analysis of the membership of the many committees. We may, though, pause to inquire as to how fares the farmer in that master committee—or should we say "his-master's-voice-committee"—the steering committee? Surely, on this committee we shall find farmers—"horny-handed sons of toil"—or if not, then those whose training and environment have been such as to enlist their every sympathy with the man who struggles to wrest a living from the land. Unfortunately, I do not find in the Congressional Directory official information concerning this committee. In lieu of this, I turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 22, 1920, and to page 5997. Here, in the report of a speech by Representative HENRY T. RAINEY, there appear the names of four Members of this House declared to constitute the steering committee, and whose respective home addresses are Chicago, Cincinnati, Rochester, N. Y., and Worcester, Mass. After calling this roll, to which no farmer or near farmer could answer, Mr. RAINEY said: "These gentlemen whose names I have read are reputed to be millionaires, every one of them, and they have never been heard to deny it." So the farmer, whose work places him in closest partnership with the Master of the Vineyard, is unrepresented on the master committee of this Congress.

And, again, I want to say in the country you will find no millionaires, few mendicants—just men.

But let us look to legislation, let us review the work of this body during the last 12 months. As our inquiry is one concerning agriculture, we turn to the Agricultural appropriation bill. What do we find? What does the debate, continuing over several days, disclose?

Strange as it may seem, and at a time when farmers are engaged in a supreme struggle against discouraging odds, a constant fight, directed by Members on the Republican side of this Chamber, was waged to prevent any increase, and in various instances to force a reduction in, this bill, which carried a little more than $30,000,000, only two-thirds of which is for agriculture proper, and at a time when appropriations made and expenditures authorized by this Congress will total more than four thousand million dollars.

But let us not deal in generalities. Who, when the bill was under consideration, fought the farmer? For answer, read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Do so, and you will find where a Member on the majority side of this Chamber offered an amendment to cut $100,000 from the appropriation for hog-cholera control, notwithstanding it is estimated that the loss from this disease in the year ending May 1, 1919, amounted to 2,800,000 head of hogs, worth twice the entire amount carried in the Agricultural appropriation bill. The amendment, which was adopted over the protest of Democratic Members, was voted on in the House February 14, at which time 164 Members voted for it. Of these there were but 8 Democrats.

We lead the world in number and value of registered and pure-bred animals, more than 60 pure breeds of live stock being found in the United States. Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and other South American countries are, or soon will be, actively in the market for breeding stock. With this thought in view, a representative was last year sent by the Bureau of Markets to South America to look into conditions. This man, a practical farmer and extensive breeder of live stock, reported and recommended that special live-stock representatives be placed in South America to assist in turning trade to the live-stock breeders of the United States, as England now has her representatives on the ground. Strange as it may seem, the proposed appropriation, amounting to but $25,000, was stricken from the bill on a point of order made by a Republican Member.

Again, during the consideration of the Agricultural bill, a Republican Member from New York offered an amendment to take $500,000 from the cooperative agricultural extension work. In contrast, we find Mr. RUBEY, Democrat, of Missouri, making a fight for an appropriation for $300,000 to provide means to protect the corn crop of the United States, worth $3,934,000,000, from the European corn borer, which threatens to cause losses amounting to millions. On the roll call by which this amendment was defeated in the House, after being adopted in committee, practically the entire support came from the Democratic membership. In fact, as the records show, during all the time this bill, which more than any other affects the farmer, was being considered by this body, Members of the majority party were constantly engaged in an effort to reduce the appropriation or to prevent increases, however worthy.

Mr. Chairman, a few months ago, while speaking on the Agricultural appropriation bill, then before Congress, I took occasion to express my approval of an investigation made by Fourth Assistant Postmaster General Blakslee. Thousands of farmers reported a great shortage of help, with consequent increased cost of production and with greatly decreased acreages. This information, which was given wide publicity, opened the eyes of a lot of city people who needed to have their eyes opened. I feel that Mr. Blakslee rendered a great service to the farmer and to the entire country, yet I find him criticized. I can not understand it. I can no more understand it than I can understand why on February 13 an amendment to increase by less than $5,000 an appropriation to provide for the better distribution of agricultural food products was so vigorously opposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], and who during the debate was referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] as "the leader of the steering committee on the majority side and * * * who is always loud in his opposition to anything of interest to the farmer."

I can not understand why the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], chairman of the Republican congressional committee, should on February 19, 1919, have spoken at length in an effort to strike from a bill a provision relating to organizations of farmers.

While the congressional legislative mill has ground out about the usual amount of grist, some of it designed to fatten special interests at the expense of the farmer, not one big constructive measure to aid agriculture has been written to the credit of this Congress. While the farmer is calling for laborers to till acres which otherwise must remain idle, Congress has through legislation made it more difficult for him to secure the help he must have if we are to avert world hunger. Because the ground does not plow itself, because the seed of the plants upon which we depend for food or clothing are not self-sown, because corn and cotton can not be cultivated by the magic waving of a wand, because wheat and a hundred other crops can not be humanized and cafeteriaized, there comes from the country the Macedonian cry for help—first of all, help in the form of workers, help through legislation which will guarantee to the farmer that he will not be less favored than are men in other callings.

This Congress passed the railroad bill which guarantees the roads a profit, but there is no such provision for the farmer. Instead, Congress has refused to provide adequate appropriations for the continued improvement of the great inland waterways of the country which, if given deserved support, will become carriers of an ever-increasing amount of farm produce and at reduced rates.

As the result of an investigation which President Wilson ordered made by the Federal Trade Commission, and also an

investigation made by the Bureau of Markets under authority granted by the food-control act of 1917, startling disclosures as to the immense profits and indefensible practices of the big meat packers have been made during the last year. Yet a year and a day after this Congress convened, we find Senator KENYON complaining that the packers' bill has been given no place by the steering committee and hear him making a plea for a "square test on whether the packers' bill is to have any consideration at this session of the Senate." In the House, after extensive hearings have been had before the Agricultural Committee, no bill to curb the packers, who have not only been skinning cattle but "skinning" producer and consumer, has yet been reported for passage.

While it is true that not until the passage of needed legislation, including the food-control act which gave to a branch of the Department of Agriculture power to go into the market and make a close-up study of conditions, were there provisions for securing such evidence as has been recently made available, the question has heretofore claimed the attention of Congress. As long ago as 1888, Senator George G. Vest, the beloved "Little Giant," at one time a citizen of the district I now represent, was made chairman of a committee to investigate the question of the transportation and sale of meat products. In its report, this committee referred to "an abnormal and ruinous centralization of the cattle market and its domination by a few men and railroad corporations."

To-day, with the cost of pork production practically doubled, largely because gamblers and speculators have been playing with corn, just as a cat plays with a mouse, hogs are selling at six to seven dollars a hundredweight less than when this Congress convened, while the slump in cattle prices amounts to from 30 to 40 per cent. This condition means ruin and failure for thousands of farmers and feeders.

I quote from a recent letter written by one who is connected with the Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. I will.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The slump in feeder cattle now is over 100 per cent, I would like to state to my friend.

Mr. NELSON of Missouri. I think that is true. I am referring to cattle finished for market.

He says, "Our cattle will go to market within the next 10 days; they are good cattle, have been fed sufficient rations, and have made satisfactory gains. They will lose between $12 and $35 a head. It may be argued that the State is in a better shape to lose than are some others, but it is not a very satisfactory situation to face. You can announce to Congress that the farmers who fed cattle this winter are pretty well 'fed up' on it."

With lower prices prevailing for almost all farm produce of which there is at this season any surplus, the cost of almost everything that the farmer and his family must buy is unreasonably high, and in many cases is still advancing. Wool is lower, but clippers and shears used in removing the wool from the sheep cost more money, as do the twine with which to tie it and the sack to hold it. While the live-stock market is lower, the price of wire to fence the feed lot or pasture in which hogs or cattle are held is priced out of all reason.

Under these conditions is it to be wondered that men out on the farms are asking, "What is the matter with the present Congress? Is it going to put the farmer out of business?" These are pertinent questions. They are proper questions, and, like Banquo's ghost, they will not down. In fact, in the language of one of the Nation's great farm leaders:

> I can conceive of nothing of more overwhelming importance than the deliverance of the farmer from the conditions which hang like a galling yoke about his neck at this time.

But the question may be asked, "Has the House passed no measures which would affect prices?" Oh, yes. There have been passed over the protest of Members on this side of the House several protective-tariff measures, including one calculated to increase the cost of every ax, every scythe, every edged tool used by the farmer. The tariff bills forced through the House do not represent large items, but they do indicate a dangerous tendency. They stand for activity in the wrong direction. Of such action the farmer will say, as said the live-stock shipper who read "Market active and 25 to 40 lower," "Darn such activity."

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any farmer, regardless of what his politics may be, will approve of the record of this Congress. I do not believe that any farmer Member, if such there be, sitting on the Republican side of this House, will "point with pride" to such performances. I am frank to say that as a Democrat, but first of all interested in the welfare of the farmer, I would not attempt to defend such a record if made by my own party. I might apologize for it, but defend it, never. No man can do that.

Let me not be misunderstood. Among the Republican Members of this House there are as patriotic citizens, as lovable characters, as genial gentlemen as on this side of the Chamber. Some of the warmest friendships I have formed here are with those of opposite political faith. Some of the truest and best friends I have in the world are Republicans. Differences between Members of this House are not personal. They represent differences of principles, of platform, and procedure.

As a rule the official action of Members represents a response to the interests and people responsible for their election. In most of the rock-ribbed Republican States manufacturing is a leading industry, just as in the dependably Democratic States farming comes first. So, in the very nature of things, we expect to find agriculture receiving the fullest recognition not only in organization but in legislation at the hands of a Democratic Congress.

In justice to individual Members of the majority I want to say it is my belief that had the present House organization been more friendly to the farmer, had the steering committee been differently constituted, there are Republicans who sometimes would have voted differently. It is therefore unfortunate not only for the farmer—whether Democrat or Republican—and for the country as a whole, but for many rightly disposed Republican Members representing rural districts, that conditions in this Congress are such as they are. Individual Congressmen have been crushed by the machine they helped make.

The farmer is warning this Congress that it can not eternally temporize. He is telling us that the worm will turn; that without remedy, without relief, want will come. He has since the convening of this body hoped and waited in vain. Daily he has seen the situation grow more serious; seen values of what he had to sell slump, while what he must buy goes skyrocketing. Under these critical conditions party names mean less than ever before—promises but little, performances everything.

Political platforms, like the pink and perfumed buds and blossoms of this month of roses, while attractive, will not satisfy this matter-of-fact farmer. Next November he will measure the result of his year's work in garnered grain, in the plenty of field, crib, and granary. So, too, will he next November weigh the work of this and other Congresses. He will be fair. With works, not words, as his standard of measure, this man to whom has been reserved the gigantic task of feeding the world, and who asks only that it be made possible for him to play his part, will seek the truth. Seeking it sincerely and unselfishly, he will not fail to find it. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, on the 14th of May last, in my absence from the floor of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. BYRNES, in a 20-minute speech, which was afterwards extended by leave in the RECORD, indulged in considerable criticism of the policy of the Republican majority in the Sixty-sixth Congress in so far as it has appointed various investigating committees. Most of his criticism is not founded on sufficient information, and all of it is violently partisan and manifestly offered for political purposes only.

In those matters attacking the committee of which I am chairman, I think I am fully advised and take this occasion to correct the gentleman from South Carolina, and to call attention to the incorrect and misleading character of his remarks.

The Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department was created by House resolution 78, adopted by the House on June 4, 1919. The vote by which this committee was authorized was 340 yeas and no nays. One of those voting for it was the gentleman from South Carolina. On the discussion of the question, Mr. POU, of North Carolina, upon the minority on the Committee on Rules, said:

> If there has been extravagance, the minority party wishes that extravagance exposed. If there has been rascality, no one is more earnestly in favor of exposing the rascal than the Democratic minority on this floor.

The gentleman from Virginia, also speaking for the minority, stated that the Democratic minority desired the investigation, wanted it to be thorough, and would support it.

Thereafer, on June 11, on House resolution 98, authorizing the select committee to hire clerks, accountants, attorneys, and so forth, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CLARK, minority leader, said:

> It is absolutely necessary for these gentlemen to have clerical help. It is absolutely necessary for them to have accountants. It is absolutely necessary for them to have stenographers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri also said, in these remarks:

My suggestion is that everybody quit nagging and criticizing and lampooning until we ascertain the truth as the result of this investigation which we are undertaking and which is going to cost a good deal of money.

And this sentiment was greatly applauded on the Democratic side. Since that time the minority leader has scrupulously followed his own advice; it remained, however, for the gentleman from South Carolina to do the very thing the gentleman from Missouri has said ought not to be done, and this apparently for political purposes.

The select committee began its investigations almost immediately, and has for the past year been continuously employed in this work. In its work its subcommittees have taken evidence in 13 different States, and one of them has had extensive hearings in France. Its printed hearings comprise approximately 20,000 pages. The work has been arduous and constant, and has practically taken every man on the committee out of active participation in the other legislative business of the House for a year. Some reports have been made, some are pending, and many are yet to be made. No one who has not been a member of the committee can have any comprehension of the magnitude of the task. While the committee has labored for a year, it has as yet but scratched the surface. The immense bulk of the business of the War Department during the war will forever remain a closed book, except in so far as this and other investigations may partially disclose the facts and as the historian may unearth some parts of it.

The War Department spent from April 6, 1917, the date of the declaration of war, to September 1, 1919, $18,501,177,999.12, a sum so vast as to stagger the comprehension. A slight idea is gathered when I tell you that this represents more than $180 for each man, woman, and child in the United States. What we got for it I shall hereinafter refer to. The War Department itself does not know how many war contracts it made. I have here a volume consisting of 1,116 pages, filled completely with a list of contracts of over $100,000 in face value. It is probable there were more than 50,000 war contracts made, both formal and informal. There were over 22,000 contracts in the Ordnance Department alone.

The gentleman from South Carolina, in his zeal, criticizes the employment by the committee of certain employees. He speaks of an employee named Bennett, whom he says controls the committee. Mr. Bennett was a man of independent means, too old to enter the war. Knowing this, he came to Washington and offered his services, without compensation. He was finally hired at $1,800 a year in the Quartermaster's Department. He saw practices that outraged him in the allowances of war claims, and went to his Member of Congress, who sent him to the select committee. He was offered employment with the committee. As soon as the War Department found this had been done, Maj. Holder, of the War Claims Board, offered to double his wages and appoint him an examiner for the War Claims Board if he would stay. He declined to do so, and until recently has been employed by the committee. By his fearless investigation of the War Claims Board work, I have no doubt this one patriotic and right-minded man has saved the country millions of dollars. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Criticism is made of some moneys paid an accountant, George W. Storck. Storck is a registered accountant and was employed four days at $50 a day. The account on file with the Committee on Accounts shows that there was no duplication of accounts in his case, as the gentleman from South Carolina could have seen had he been desiring to state the exact facts instead of his political conclusions.

The committee had very few accountants employed. When Storck was paid $50 a day, he was trying to get from the Attorney General an inspection of certain audits that had been made of the Muscle Shoals expenditures, and was attempting single-handed to deal with the Attorney General, one of his asistants, and the secret service of the Department of Justice. It will be conceded, I assume, that this required the efforts of a man of ability.

Criticism is made of one C. D. Worley, a leather investigator. Although not so expressly stated, it is intimated he came from the district I represent. Such is not the case. This man lives in Iowa, and was entirely unknown to me when he came to Washington. As a matter of fact, there is not and has not been a single employee of this committee or any of its subcommittees that ever lived in my district, to my knowledge, except one man by the name of H. W. Thoreson, who assisted for a while in the Muscle Shoals investigation. Worley was employed because for 10 years or more he had worked in leather at an arsenal of the United States. The officers in the Quartermaster Department in charge of leather were almost all men who were or had been manufacturers of leather goods for the Government. We had to have some one who knew leather and who would also tell the truth about what he saw. Worley was such a man. He may have been a shop workman, but he was honest, knew what the Government ought to get for a dollar, and you could rely upon him. Practically all the facts that have appeared in the record about the leather deals of the Government during the war and the overproduction that was so pronounced were developed by this one quiet, unassuming shop workman. Incidentally, when he, a civil-service employee on leave, went back to his work at the Rock Island Arsenal he was refused employment by the Ordnance Department.

Such criticism is trivial and puerile. No one who has the slightest comprehension of what such an investigation means could for an instant indulge in it. When one thinks of the modest sums this committee has expended, he must compare it mentally with the machinery it had to investigate. He speaks of the enormity of hiring one accountant four days at $25 a day. From the outbreak of the war to this date the War Department, especially the War Claims Board, has had 78 men employed, each of whom drew more than $50 a day and many of whom are still employed. I insert the list here. Some of them get $100 a day. Experts and advisers on anything and everything. From my experience with them, the thing they do best is to draw their salaries.

Civilian employees of the Ordnance Department receiving $25 per day and above (covering period of 1918, 1919 and 1920).

Name.	Designation.	Rate of pay.
Rogers, George V	Boston district ordnance office	$25 per day.
Watkins, Arthur M	Bridgeport district ordnance office.	$50 per day.
Kennedy, George W	do	May 26 to June 4, 1919; total amount paid, $200.
Strimple, Theo. H	Cleveland district ordnance office	$25 per day.
Chase, E. M	Cincinnati district ordnance office	$50 per day.
Drach, Gustav W	do	$25 per day.
Doolittle, Fred A	Detroit district ordnance office	Do.
Miller, Benjamin	New York district ordnance office	Do.
Brown, E. W	Philadelphia district ordnance office.	$35 per day.
Hampton, John W	do	Do.
Turner, C. L	do	Do.
Coughlan, Edw. A	do	Do.
McHenry, Wm. E	do	Do.
Whitaker, S. Edgar	do	Do.
Gantt, Henry L	Frankford Arsenal	$100 per day.
Barth, Carl G	Watertown Arsenal	$70 per day.
Holcomb, Roger	do	Do.
Smith, Robert H	do	$50 per day.
Whitmore, John	do	Do.
Leach, F. R	Administration Division	$25 per day.
Teele, A. W	do	$50 per day.
Chase, Aurin M	Office of Chief of Manufacture	$25 per day.
Faber, Henry B	do	$30 per day.

Purchase and storage.

Name.	Designation.	Rate of pay.
Charles L. Depollier	Technical advisor	$200 per 5-day period.
L. W. Holder	Legal expert	$10,000 per annum.

Transportation service.

Name.	Designation.	Rate of pay (Mar. 1 to date).
Noble, H. S	Federal manager at New York City	$10,000
Sanders, M. J	Federal Manager at New Orleans	15,000
Brent, Theodore	Traffic Manager at New Orleans	10,000

These employees are engaged on work in connection with the Division of Inland Waterways and were transferred to the Secretary of War in accordance with section 201, paragraph A, act of Congress, February 28, 1920, effective March 1, 1920.

Sales branch, purchase, storage, and traffic.

C. Willing Hare	per annum	$25,000
Do	do	12,000
E. C. Morse	do	10,000
Do	do	12,000
W. G. Sloan	do	9,000
G. H. Dorr	do	12,000
Guy Hutchinson	do	12,000
Alfred Lamar	do	10,000
*A. J. Bruff	do	12,000
*C. Y. Smith	do	10,000
*L. I. Harvey	do	12,000
*Henry Doerr, jr	do	12,000
G. M. Chambers	per diem, including commutation	35

In the case of the names starred (*) on this list the employment was in France and exact records as to periods have not yet reached this office.

Report of civilian personnel employed by War Department Claims Board at salaries of $25 per diem or over from Aug. 1, 1919, to Feb. 29, 1920.

Name.	Designation.	Rate per diem.
Bush, Lincoln [1]	Special adviser	$50.00
Clark, Alfred E.[1]	Special technical adviser	50.00
Davis, Charles [1]	Special adviser	40.00
Davis, William H	Special adviser to Secretary of War upon appeals from board of contract adjustment.	50.00
Dorr, G. H	do	50.00
Ennis, Wm. D	Special technical adviser	50.00
Ewing, Thomas [2]	Special adviser to the Secretary of War.	135.00
Goodale, R. C	Special adviser to Secretary of War upon appeals from board of contract adjustment and member War Department Claims Board.	50.00
Goodrich, E. P	Special technical adviser	75.00
Greenfield, J. A	do	30.00
Haveron, F. L	Special assistant	35.00
Hewins, G. S.[1]	Special technical adviser	58.41
Hixson, A. W	do	50.00
Hodge, Henry W.[1]	do	50.00
Lacombe, Henry	Special adviser to Secretary of War upon appeals from Board of Contract Adjustment.	75.00
Lehman, Herbert H	do	50.00
March, Robert McC	Special technical adviser	50.00
Marshall, C. A	Special assistant	40.00
Miller, Fred J.[1]	Special technical adviser	50.00
Neville, Charles	do	50.00
Pettee, E. E	do	40.00
Rautenstrauch, W.[1]	do	50.00
Reece, W. R	do	25.00
Rogers, Fred E	do	50.00
Scott, Campbell	do	50.00
Skene, W. H	do	40.00
Van Winkle, Edward [1]	do	78.45

[1] No longer in service.

[2] Thomas Ewing is engaged as chairman, Munitions Patents Board, including both the Army and Navy activities as affecting patents and patent rights. The Navy Department has agreed to contribute $2,500 toward the payment of his salary. He is engaged approximately four days a month.

Employees engaged on monthly basis.

Name.	Designation.	Rate per month.
Clark, Alfred E.[1]	Special technical adviser	$1,000.00
Fairbanks, Joseph	Special assistant	750.00
	Vice chairman	1,000.00
Frazer, J. P	Special assistant	750.00
Marshall, C. A	do	750.00
Safberg, B. F	Special technical adviser	833.33
Steever, M. D	Special assistant	750.00
Goodale, R. C	do	750.00

[1] No longer in service.

Medical Corps.

Name.	Designation.	Rate.
Dr. John S. Shearer	X-ray expert	$25 per day.

Air Service.

Name.	Designation.	Rate.
Alexander Klemin	Expert	$40 per day.
Guy Leonard	do	$12,000 per annum.
Dr. J. E. Teeple	do	Do.

Engineer Corps.

Name.	Designation.	Rate.
S. M. Felton	Director general military railways.	$1,000 per month.

No one will ever know just how much the War Department squandered on accountants and other similar help during the war. During the settlement of the Dent bill claims as many as 7,000 people—accountants, lawyers, and so forth—were employed by the War Department in their settlement. During the war and while the Ordnance Department was contracting with thousands of people and building and running countless factories, the Ordnance Department alone had in the field at one time as many as 30,000 accountants, inspectors, and the like. During the war, in the war bureaus and branches at Washington, there were employed 1,395 accountants, 385 lawyers, and 37,406 other civilian employees. The consistency of a man who votes to set a committee to work investigating the work of such an army of employees and then captiously carps and quibbles when they employ one accountant four days at $50 a day is but to be wondered at. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is said the amounts expended by the investigating committees of the House in this Congress are extravagant. It is alleged that a million dollars have been spent in the investigations. Mr. Cummings, of the Democratic National Committee, makes it $2,000,000. This is reported in the Democratic platform in Virginia and probably will serve as the model of a plank in the Democratic national platform. The fact is there has been spent by the House in all its investigations in this Congress $147,278.27. The Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department has spent $116,124.32. The Senate, to May 31, 1920, on all investigations—eight in number—has spent $75,497.69. The total, therefore, for the Congress is $222,775.96. This is said to be exorbitant and unusual. What shall be said of committees which the Democratic House appointed after it came into power in 1910 and which expended from the contingent fund $288,794.60, and this in times of peace? I insert a list of them here.

The statement requested by the chairman of the committee, showing the expenditures incurred by certain committees, i. e., the committees appointed in the Sixty-second, Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, and Sixty-fifth Congresses, 1911–1919, to investigate the United States Steel Corporation, the American Sugar Refining Co., the so-called Money Trust, the "Taylor system," the Manufacturers' Association (Mulhall), the shipping industry, the affairs of the District of Columbia, the so-called "leak" investigation, investigations by the several standing committees on expenditures in the executive departments, and the so-called Ballinger-Pinchot investigation in the Sixty-first Congress (1909–1911), follows:

Investigation of the United States Steel Corporation	$4,643.91
Investigation of the American Sugar Refining Co	7,556.83

The resolutions authorizing these investigations were in identically the same language and authorized, respectively, investigations of alleged violations of the antitrust and other acts. Vouchers covering expenses of both committees were submitted in practically the same form, so that it is impossible to differentiate them and identify those relating to the sugar investigation and those relating to the steel investigation. Therefore, except to the extent above indicated by the figures set opposite the respective headings, they are included as expenses of the—

Investigation of alleged violations of the antitrust and other acts	37,408.89
Total for sugar and steel investigations	49,609.63
Investigation by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the so-called Money Trust	61,277.12
Investigation of the "Taylor system"	4,287.00
Investigation of the Manufacturers' Association	4,119.56
Investigation of the shipping industry	15,284.00
Investigation of the affairs of the District of Columbia	51,191.03
Investigation of charges by F. T. Lawson (leak)	22,883.76
Investigation of expenditures in the Interior Department	13,503.16
Investigation of expenditures in the Post Office Department	10,639.96
Investigation of expenditures in the Departments of Commerce and Labor	6,175.34
Investigation of expenditures in the Department of Agriculture	5,461.95
Investigation of expenditures in the Treasury Department	3,682.78
Investigation of expenditures in the Department of Justice	3,834.48
Investigation of expenditures in the War Department	3,665.13
Investigation of expenditures in the Navy Department	3,074.60
Investigation of expenditures in the State Department	2,969.20
Investigation of expenditures on public buildings	2,135.90
Investigation of the Forestry Service (Ballinger-Pinchot)	[1] 25,000.00
Grand total	288,794.60

As a matter of fact, about one-third of the amount expended by the select committee, of which I am chairman, has been for stenographic work. It is said the War Department has been put to great expense in preparing material for the committee. If so, it is due to the fault and lack of system of the War Department. The committee made but few requests, and these requests were such as should have been speedily answered. For instance, we inquired what the War Department had spent during the war, and the War Department was asked for a list of war contracts in face value over $100,000. Aside from these matters, almost all the requests were for specific papers or for witnesses who could tell us of particular matters. As a matter of fact, the utmost confusion prevailed in the War Department. When requests were made, sometimes it seemed to be necessary for them to hire experts to hunt it. Information given the committee was frequently erroneous. For instance, the Secretary of War informed the committee on June 20, 1919, as to the total expenditures of the War Department during the war, divided into departments. The figures he gave were afterwards found by a committee accountant to be erroneous in some items as much as $184,945,938.47. The Director of Finance, Gen. Lord, was asked on January 6, 1920, what the cost of the nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals was. He gave $42,570,000 as the figure. On March 23, 1920, after testimony had been brought out by the committee showing the expense to have been approximately $60,000,000, The Adjutant General communicated to the committee that he had been in error, and

[1] The appropriation was disbursed by the Senate.

that the correct amount was approximately $70,000,000. An officer, Lieut. Col. T. N. Gimperling, of the Quartermaster's Department, sent by the War Department to the committee for that purpose, testified the Government had purchased 28,000,000 pairs of shoes during the war.

Our own investigators developed that 32,227,450 pairs had been bought. In one case the chief of manufacture in the Ordnance Department informed the committee that 3,600 machines of a certain type had been moved into a certain storehouse. It developed that the correct number was 2,100. Almost as soon as the committee was appointed, June 18, 1919, it directed 27 questions in writing to the Secretary of War, seeking certain information, and particularly the amounts expended during the war. The last of these questions was answered September 18, 1919. Whenever the committee asked about any particular thing, it seemed to be necessary to build up a staff of experts to get the information, information which ought to have been easily available from the books of the department. When one of the subcommittees began an investigation of some small claims in the War Department Claims Board, employees were brought in from outlying districts to defend the department. In one case the committee room would hardly hold the Government representatives, both military and civilian, brought from Boston, New York, Chicago, and elsewhere, and who remained for weeks, defending the board. When the committee took testimony in other places military officers were sent with the committee at Government expense, but where they were required by the committee the War Department required them to be paid from the contingent funds of the House.

It is said the investigation has been futile from a money standpoint.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No. I have not the time.

It is hard to discern exactly what effect the investigations of the committee have had. It will be remembered that the committee has been investigating departments that must necessarily reflect upon themselves if they give credit to the criticisms of the committee. However, some tangible effects are noticeable.

The committee reported out House resolution No. 212 from subcommittee No. 4, requesting the Secretary of War to sell to the people the surplus Army food held by it and valued at approximately $100,000,000. The War Department had entered into tentative agreements with the packers and canners not to put this food upon the market, and were using every method to dispose of it by feeding it to soldiers or otherwise, so that it should not be sold to the people. As a result of the passage of this resolution by almost a unanimous vote of the House, this food was placed upon the market. Up to this time $57,000,000 of this food has been sold, and that much money has gone into the Treasury that would otherwise have not been there.

The committee reported out House resolution No. 362 from subcommittee No. 4, requesting the Secretary of War to distribute through the Agricultural Department for distribution among highway departments of the States 22,195 motor vehicles and to sell the balance. The House passed the resolution by almost a unanimous vote. Thereupon the Secretary of War, who had theretofore failed to distribute any of these motor vehicles to the highway departments, began the distribution and has thus distributed machines to the value of $67,341,479. In addition to this, $2,800,000 has been paid into the Treasury for machines sold. If it had not been for the report of this committee, in all probability these machines would now be rusting in storage.

The committee made an oral report to the House on October 14, 1919, relative to the sale of the Government powder plant at Nitro, W. Va. At that time bids had been received for this plant, the highest being $5,800,000. The committee called the attention of the House forcibly to the matter, and also advised the director of sales that it be informed of the nature of the bids received before any sale was made. Thereafter all bids were rejected, and the property readvertised. At this resale it brought $8,551,000.

The committee began an investigation of war claims filed with the War Department Claims Board under the Dent Act. It reported its investigations to the House on November 11, 1919. In this report it specifically insisted on the necessity of an audit of war claims. As a result of this report, the War Department Claims Board has been demanding and receiving greatly advanced salvaged prices for goods turned over to contractors, and millions have been saved to the Government thereby. As an example, tin plate, which was before this report considered as worth only $33 a ton, was revalued at $110 a ton, and the Government received this price. Contractors' claims were rigidly inspected and an immense sum saved thereby.

The committee began a vigorous examination of the allowance of contractors' war claims by the War Department Claims Board on September 8, 1919. Doubtless influenced by the disclosures of loose practices developed by the committee, on November 7, 1919, the War Department Claims Board adopted a rule requiring an audit to accompany all claims from district and zone claims boards, a practice that had not obtained theretofore. This resulted in an immense saving to the Government in the settlement of claims under the Dent Act.

In addition to the above, on October 3, 1919, a special auditing committee was appointed by the War Department to audit these war claims, a practice that never before had obtained. This committee is engaged in the audit of about 350 claims that have been allowed and paid, and expects to recover approximately $10,000,000.

How many criminals have been uncovered? Asks the gentleman from South Carolina. It matters not how many have been uncovered, it goes without saying that none will be prosecuted while the present administration continues. During the war hundreds of people were prosecuted by the vigilant Attorney General for violation of the espionage act; but who has heard of a prosecution of a war profiteer? I say to you, with a full comprehension of the nature of the charge, that there are thousands of men who have violated the law during the war, of whom the Attorney General's Department has full knowledge, and none of whom has been or will be prosecuted. You talk of prosecution! You might as well submit to the prisoner in the dock the question of his own guilt. There will be no prosecutions, no court-martials. What this committee uncovers will be laughed to scorn by the War Department and Department of Justice. But I take considerable hope in the thought that after the 4th of next March another Secretary of War and another Attorney General will have something to say about the administration of these matters if, happily, anything is left to administer upon.

While time and space will permit mention only of a few of the instances disclosed by the record, it will be instructive to here indicate a few of the instances which indicate the faulty nature of both the language and the facts of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Col. Edward A. Deeds, while in charge of the aviation section of the Signal Corps, let about $50,000,000 worth of contracts to his friends in Dayton, Ohio, acted as confidential adviser to his former business associate, H. E. Talbot, of the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co., in respect to business between that company and the division over which he was the head; he also gave to the representatives of the Committee on Public Information false and misleading statements with respect to the progress of aircraft production for the purpose of publication, with the authority of the Secretary of War. Ex-Justice Hughes, acting by appointment of the President, recommended him for court-martial; the Attorney General and Judge Advocate General concurred. Secretary Baker intervened, ordered him retried, and, as a result, he was whitewashed, and immediately thereafter was tendered a banquet at Washington by Gen. Squier, head of the Signal Corps, where he was joyously acclaimed as one of the heroes of the war.

Director of Aircraft John D. Ryan, while director, ordered the continued manufacture of De Haviland 4 observation planes at a time when it had been called to his attention by responsible officials and a committee from the United States Senate that these machines were "flaming coffins," were killing our aviators, and were entirely unsuited to their purposes, and that the public moneys were being squandered in their production.

Director Ryan, while director and the responsible head of the department, consented to and was fully cognizant of the construction, by his subordinate officers, of a so-called spruce railroad in Oregon, 38 miles long and costing $4,000,000 or $110,000 a mile, connecting with the Milwaukee Railroad, of which Mr. Ryan was then a director.

This railroad was of no value as a logging road, and was only of value as an extension of Mr. Ryan's railroad. Mr. Ryan was given the distinguished-service medal for his services by the Secretary of War.

Colonel, afterwards brigadier general, Brice P. Disque, formerly a captain at $3,000 a year, then warden of the Michigan Penitentiary, then called to the War Department during the war as a colonel in the Spruce Production Division of Aviation, built 13 railroads for spruce operations at an average cost

of $107,000 per mile, and over which no logs were hauled, and one of which roads was the road built connecting with Mr. Ryan's Milwaukee road. He caused large numbers of soldiers to be sent to him, and these he paid civilian wages while other soldiers in France served for $1 a day. This was in direct violation of statutory law; $4,500,000 was expended in this way. For his services Col. Disque was made brigadier general, given the distinguished-service medal by the Secretary of War, and was taken from the War Department on the signing of the armistice and given a position by Mr. John D. Ryan as president of one of Mr. Ryan's companies, the Amsinck Co., at a salary of $30,000 a year, a salary twice that of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, a position which he now holds.

Gen. G. O. Squier, Chief of the Signal Corps, with the consent of Secretary of War Baker, permitted the waste of over a billion dollars of public funds, knew and consented to the construction of American flying machines that were deadly and inefficient, and to the purchase in France for our aviators of Sopwith planes which had been abandoned and considered obsolete by the French for over a year and a half before they were purchased by us. He was condemned by ex-Justice Hughes, in his report to the Department of Justice, as inefficient and incompetent. He was given the distinguished service medal by Secretary Baker, and is still at the head of the Signal Corps of the Army.

William A. Starret, an architect and chairman of the subcommittee on emergency construction from the Council of National Defense, contrived the system of cost-plus contracts that was used during the war in the building of camps and cantonments. In the making of this plan and the contracts under it the interests of the Government were ignored and all safeguards for the Government were omitted, principally by direction and consent of Mr. Starret, who was supposed to be guarding and representing the Government in these matters.

Thousands of dollars paid as automobile hire by the United States was received by representatives of A. Bentley & Sons Co., in charge of transportation, for the contractors at Camp Sherman, Ohio, fraudulently, and which are recoverable by the Government from the contractor.

Favored contractors, some of which were former friends or clients, were selected or designated by William A. Starret, and these contractors were, in turn, given by contract large fees for supervision, far in excess of any sums which they would otherwise, or by open bidding, have received.

Scores of foremen and superintendents and others in positions of authority are named in the report of the subcommittee on camps, who have personally caused, ordered, aided, or abetted waste and wanton destruction of property, paid for with Government funds. All this was done with the apparent knowledge and consent of the contractors. Such acts constitute frauds against the Government, and every man who was a party to this violated the law and is personally and criminally responsible. The names of these men are plainly evident to anyone who reads the record.

The contractors responsible for this waste and destruction of property are liable to the Government for the amount of such waste, and civil suit may be maintained against them, unless the Government is estopped by the acts of its agents.

Millions of dollars were paid out to owners of by-product coke oven projects on a so-called Falk chart, a chart that was false and fraudulent, and was prepared for the purpose of permitting these claimants to receive greater sums of money from the Government on their settlements. This money could be recovered. The names of every officer and man connected with this matter are in the record.

Thousands of claims were adjusted by the War Claims Board, where insufficient salvage values were allowed the Government by means of the intent or ignorance of the persons having to do with the settlement on the part of the Government. Millions of dollars improperly paid might be recovered under the Dent Act on these claims.

Officers resigned from the military service and took employment with contractors who had claims against the Government. In some instances these officers represented the claimant. This was in direct violation of law. The names are in the record.

Large numbers of officers in the War Department were drawing salaries from the Government and from private employers at the same time, and in most instances their duties as officers had to do with contracts which their business associates had with the Government. This was in direct violation of law. The names of such officers appear in the record.

Officers were authorized to make purchases of military supplies. In some instances these contracts were made with firms or companies in which the officer had a financial interest. This was in direct violation of law. The names of such officers are to be found in the record.

Scores of foremen and superintendents employed by the contractors at Nitro, W. Va., and Muscle Shoals, Ala., directed loafing of men and ordered wanton and deliberate destruction of materials and property. Their names are in the record. Every man who did this committed a crime.

The administration building at Nitro, W. Va., was burned on the night of November 9, 1918, after news of a supposed armistice had been received, destroying many records of the Thompson-Starret Co. Every fact seemed to indicate arson. The special representative of the Department of Justice there requested that an investigation be made. Nothing was done.

The chief of police at Nitro was reported by the Government's agent as stealing blankets at wholesale for sale. When it was reported to the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, the agent was reprimanded for sending the telegram, and nothing was done.

Hundreds of workmen at Muscle Shoals were arrested, taken to jail, or fined by men without warrants, and without a trace of legal authority, in open violation of law.

The wanton waste of materials constituted crime that would be punished by any court having jurisdiction. To illustrate: On one occasion, the Secretary of War was to make a Liberty loan speech at Nitro, W. Va. In order to clear a place for the erection of a small platform from which he could speak, they set a large force of men to work the night before, hauled off a large pile of good lumber covering an acre and a half and piled 10 feet high, and before morning burned every foot of it. The names of the men responsible for this are in the record.

Hundreds of horses having nothing wrong except, perhaps, a temporary lameness or sore back were killed and burned with the finest lumber provided by the Government. The names of those directing this brutality and waste are in the record.

Approximately $2,000,000 was paid to the Standard Steel Car Co., of Hammond, Ind., which was pronounced by the Government accountants to be absolutely without justice or foundation; the award was approved by the fraudulent practices of Col. E. S. Hughes and other officers of the military service whose names are in the record. Civil and criminal proceedings might well be brought in this case.

To attempt with any economy of time and space to give the names of individuals who have committed crimes or to direct specific attention to civil suits which might be instituted would be impossible. The committee has gathered the testimony in great volume. It suffices to say that the record bristles with such names and instances. The bulk, however, of the business transactions of the Government during the war were so vast as to stagger comprehension. There were probably 50,000 war contracts made. To examine them is the labor of a lifetime. Only a cursory glimpse of the entire field can be had, and an occasional contract inspected. The investigation of each such contract is a long and involved proceeding and requires months of effort and study. For example, the contracts of Jones & Laughlin Co., American Can Co., Standard Steel Car Co., and American Brake Shoe & Foundry Co. each required extended investigation and time. A typical example is the contract for purchase of canned salmon for the Army, the facts being furnished me by Mr. REAVIS, chairman of the subcommittee on quartermaster supplies:

The War Department, through the Quartermaster Corps, between the 6th of April, 1917, and the 11th of November, 1918, purchased 208,681,244 1-pound cans of salmon, at a total cost of $38,814,703.91. This salmon was purchased by commandeering the output, with the Food Administration to fix the price upon an investigation of cost to be made by the Federal Trade Commission. The first cost was fixed at $6 per case of 48 cans for tall pink salmon, $6.50 per case for tall medium red, and $7 per case for tall red. This was considered a tentative price that was subject to revision, either by being increased or lowered when the Federal Trade Commission made its report of cost. Before the Federal Trade Commission made its report of cost, the War Department, on its own motion, increased the price of the better grade of salmon to $7.50 per case. A great deal of this salmon was found to be spoiled salmon. The list of spoiled salmon will be found on pages 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, and 926 of serial 5, part 19.

The contract of purchase guaranteed the Government against all loss because of spoiled salmon. The Government purchased this salmon f. o. b. Seattle, and then shipped it to its eastern warehouses, the Government, of course, paying the freight. Some of this salmon was stored for many months, during which time the Government kept it insured. In many instances the spoiled salmon was spoiled at the time it was canned, and this fact was known to the canners (pp. 878, 879, 880, and 885, ser. 5, pt. 18). Most of the salmon found to be spoiled by the Bureau of Chemistry was in cans which were not swells. This, according to the testimony of the experts, conclusively shows that the fish was spoiled at the time it was canned (p. 904, ser. 5, p. 19, and p. 917 of the same serial and part). Notwithstanding the Government was fully protected on the spoiled salmon and was entitled not only to the money paid to the canners for the salmon, but was entitled to return of the freight from Seattle to the eastern warehouses, the storage and insurance charges, and the interest on the money, the War Department executed a contract, shown on page 351, part 17, serial 5, whereby it agreed to keep this salmon stored for six months without charge to the canners (this storage was in commercial storage, for which we paid 2 cents a case per month. Some of it is still in storage at our expense. We paid the canners 2 cents per month storage for all salmon of ours held by them awaiting delivery orders) to keep it insured

at the expense of the Government, to pay the freight charges to wherever the canners wanted it shipped, and to make a reduction of from 31 to 47½ cents a case for what they called "reconditioning." We also sold all the good salmon under this contract back to the packers for the price that we paid for it, agreed to keep it stored for six months, to pay the insurance on it, and to pay the cartage charges and the freight charges to any point that the packers ordered it shipped. We lost under this contract $3,000,000 (p. 857, ser. 5, pt. 17). At the time we were selling this salmon back to them for the original price, less than the reductions noted, the same salmon was worth on the open market $12.60 a case. If we figure the loss sustained by not selling it on the open market, it will approximate $15,000,000 (p. 891, ser. 5, pt. 28). It is shown in the testimony by the officers of the War Department, and is not disputed anywhere, that notwithstanding we allowed a reduction of from 31 to 47½ cents a case for reconditioning, not a single case was ever reconditioned by the packers, and this reduction was simply a gift.

The Navy Department purchased its salmon in the same way and of the same people. The Navy Department returned a very small proportion of its salmon to the packers, but compelled them to pay, in addition to the original price paid by the Navy Department, the freight from Seattle to the warehouse, all storage and insurance charges, together with interest on the money, and then made the canners pay the freight from the warehouse to wherever they wanted it shipped. The most of the Navy Department's surplus salmon was sold, for which they received $9.32 a case. (P. 1093, ser. 5, pt. 20.) This was the same kind of salmon that the War Department at the same time was turning back to the canners at less than $7 a case.

The War Department refused an offer made by McCord & Brady and Paxton & Gallagher, of Omaha, Nebr., two of the most reliable jobbing firms in the world, of $10 a case for the same salmon, which they put back in the hands of the canners for about $7 a case. (P. 867, ser. 5, pt. 17.) The Omaha warehouse was filled with salmon. By consulting serial 5, part 20, on pages 1021 to 1056, it will show the packers sold this Army salmon, which the Government was holding for it, among others to McCord & Brady and Paxton & Gallagher, for which the Government received, it being an inferior grade of salmon, but $6 a case, and the salmon was shipped to these jobber firms, together with firms in Lincoln, Nebr., Kansas City, Mo., Atchison, Kans., and other places in the vicinity of Omaha, from New York and Baltimore to these places, with the Government paying the freight, while the salmon that was in the Omaha warehouse, instead of being turned over to the Omaha firms, was shipped from Omaha to the eastern market, the Government paying the freight that way. The total freight paid by the Government on this salmon was shown on page 982, serial 5, part 20, to have amounted to $205,768.19. The salmon that was sold back to the packers for the original price, ranging from $6 to $7.75, depending on the class of the salmon, less storage, interest, insurance, reconditioning, and freight, was selling on the open market at a part of the time when these sales were made as high as $16 a case, and the Government could more than have doubled its money if it had sold on the open market instead of turning it back to the canners. The salmon was sold by the canners to the jobbers at the prevailing market price, which was from $9.50 to $16 per case, and the consumer did not benefit a penny in the premises.

The testimony shows conclusively that the War Department and the Bureau of Chemistry knew that the canners were willfully and knowingly packing spoiled fish and selling it to the Government. They knew it not alone from an inspection of the cans in which the absence of swelling showed it to be spoiled but they knew it by a personal inspection of the fish and the canneries at the time it was being canned, and yet no presecution has ever been instituted for this violation of the food law, even though soldiers might have been poisoned and killed by eating this spoiled food.

It is said the chairman of the committee has maligned and abused the Council of National Defense. Here again the gentleman from South Carolina has not been careful in his criticism. But he is not alone in this.

Attention has been repeatedly called by Democratic Members to the alleged fact that the committee has sought to criticize the Council of National Defense for making secret preparations for war months before the war began. A careful reading of the record of the committee will disclose that the criticism is not so much directed against the Council of National Defense as against the policy of the administration that created the council. On August 26, 1916, the act authorizing the creation of a Council of National Defense became the law. A political campaign was in full swing. Not a step was taken toward the meeting of the Council of National Defense for three months and until after the election. Meantime the President and his party went about the country telling the people they had been kept out of war and telling them we would continue at peace. The campaign textbook of the Democratic Party in 1916 bore on its cover in bold letters these words: "Peace with honor, preparedness, prosperity." They circulated about the country, showing pictures in colors of the President, with this legend upon it: "Peace with honor, he kept us out of war." And then at the bottom, to signify verity, his signature, "Yours, Woodrow Wilson." With this miserable deceit the American people were deluded. The statements that were being made to the country were not true and were circulated only for political effect. Almost before the votes at the election were counted, on November 11, 1916, Secretary Baker called the Council of National Defense to meet at Washington on December 6. They met there, and less than a month after President Wilson and his party had solemnly assured the country there would be no war this council were meeting in secret session and beginning their consideration of measures to draft the young men of the country, to put a censorship on the press, and for a daylight-saving law.

The German Government did not notify us it intended to resume its unrestricted submarine warfare until January 31, 1917, almost a month afterwards. The criticism is not directed, gentlemen, at the plans, but at the administration that knows the truth and calls its ministers together to confer about it while it deludes and deceives the Congress of the United States and the people.

Permit me, however, to say that the preparedness that was the slogan of the Democratic campaign textbook and the plans of the Council of National Defense were paper preparedness and paper plans only. Not a single additional gun was bought or made, not an additional pound of powder prepared, not a ship built, not a flying machine ordered. Not a single blue print or specification was made, not a contract entered into, not an inventory of our industrial resources made, not a thing but secret plans to have Congress pass a draft act, a daylight-saving law, and a carefully prepared plan by which the Government might buy supplies from the manufacturers and fix prices for the producer.

WHAT WE GOT FOR OUR MONEY.

The gentleman from South Carolina says, as do many other gentlemen from the Democratic side of the House, that, while there was necessarily some waste in our war expenditures, in the main the funds so lavishly taken from the Treasury and from the pockets of the people went far toward "winning the war." In view of such contentions it is well to briefly inspect some of the more salient features of these expenditures and the results accomplished, as shown by the hearings.

We expended $1,051,511,988 for aviation and airplanes, and up to the time of signing of the armistice not a single fighting plane was at the American front.

As a result of our entire aviation program we obtained 213 De Haviland 4 observation planes, all of which were illy designed and constructed and extremely dangerous, and 527 second-hand foreign planes, which we either bought or borrowed from our associates in the war.

We expended $50,000,000 on a spruce-production program, building elaborate railroads, camps, and facilities, and then were forced to buy 92.6 per cent of our spruce lumber from private independent spruce lumbermen.

We spent approximately $10,000,000 on spruce railroads that never hauled a log of lumber.

We spent $20,000,000 for 4,608 Curtiss motors, 1,616 Curtiss-type aeroplanes, and 1,100 Standard JN-1 aeroplanes, which we purchased from the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Corporation, then sold them back to this company for $2,720,000. The War Department refused to sell these machines to aviators for less than $3,500 each, and provided in the contract by which they were sold to the Curtiss Co. that the Curtiss Co. should have the first opportunity to buy any other aeroplanes which the War Department might thereafter declare surplus.

We spent $6,000,000 on Bristol planes and $17,500,000 on Standard-J planes, and got not a single machine that could be used for any purpose.

We spent $206,632,920 for 16 National Army cantonments, built by the cost-plus system. These could have been built for $128,101,399, or $78,531,521 less.

We expended $1,200,000,000 for the construction of camps and cantonments, largely by the cost-plus system, a system adopted by the War Department. By this system costs were increased, labor demoralized, the completion of the camps was delayed, soldiers called to the colors were subjected to conditions that induced disease and death, and from 40 to 60 per cent of the money was wasted.

Twenty-two million dollars was spent for fees to favored contractors on camps and cantonments, most of which would have been saved had this work been let by bids.

We spent $60,100,000 to build a powder plant at Nitro, W. Va. It never produced a pound of powder for the war. After the armistice there was stored at Nitro personal property worth at a fair cash value $10,000,000. Both plant and property were sold after the armistice for $8,551,000, most of which is in deferred payments.

We paid the Hercules Powder Co. for operating the Nitro plant $11,293,737.11. They produced no powder that we could use in the war.

We spent $2,900,000 in furnishing electrical machinery and building electric lines for the Virginia Power Co. at Nitro, W. Va., and after we had built them a first-class system, giving them a practical monopoly of the Kanawha Valley, the Government settled with them for $81,000 and in addition gave them a long-time contract to furnish electric power for the naval armor plant at Charleston, W. Va.

We spent approximately $90,000,000 in the construction and operation of a powder plant at Nashville, Tenn., called Old

Hickory, and which produced no powder that could be used in the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. May I have some more time?

Mr. GOOD. How much more times does the gentleman wish?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If I have 10 minutes, I can finish what I have to say.

Mr. GOOD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. We spent man ymillions, the exact amount being unknown, for the production of tanks, and did not produce a single tank that reached the front before the armistice. To complete our tank program we needed 1,200 tanks, which were to cost $25,000 each. To build these we started an immense steel and concrete factory in France, which was to assembl and turn out 100 of these tanks a day, or the entire supply in 12 days. The British were to furnish the guns and armor and ship them to France for assembly, while we were to furnish the engines and running gear, and ship them to France for assembly. The British supplied their part, but we supplied nothing. The factory was unfinished at the armistice and never produced anything.

We spent $116,194,974.37 on nitrate plants at Sheffield, Ala.; Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Toledo, Ohio; and Cincinnati, Ohio. These plants did not produce a pound of nitrates that could be used in the war.

We spent for poison gas $116,000,000. Not a pound of American gas was ever fired in an American shell, and only about 100 tons of American gas loaded in shells ever reached the field dumps.

The Government built three picric-acid plants and seven plants to make phenol and acid required by them. This was to furnish picric acid for the French, who desired it for explosives. None of these plants produced a pound of anything that was used in the war. The plants cost us $35,000,000. The French were to pay the whole bill, but the War Department settled with France for $14,000,000.

We spent $17,116,000 in constructing a port terminal at Charleston, S. C. It was built in an isolated swamp 10 miles up the Cooper River, where it was necessary to dredge to reach it. There never was a pound of produce, a man, or an animal shipped either out of or in to this terminal during the war.

We spent $127,661,000 for port terminals at Boston, Brooklyn, Newark, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Charleston, and New Orleans. Some of them were not finished and none of them were used for anything except storage during the war.

The Ordnance Department spent $3,991,489,570.48 from the beginning of the war until June 1, 1919, as much as it cost to finance the Civil War. A large part of it was spent in a program of manufacturing artillery and ammunition. This is what we got for it:

We had 53 contracts for 37-millimeter shells, on which we expended $9,134,582. Not one of these shells ever reached our firing line.

We had 689 contracts for 75-millimeter shells, on which we expended $301,941,459. Of these shells we fired 6,000.

We had 142 contracts for 3-inch shells, on which we expended $44,841,844. None of these shells reached the firing line.

We had 439 contracts for 4.7 shells, on which we expended $41,716,051. Of these shells 14,000 were fired by our forces.

We had 305 contracts for 6-inch shells, on which we expended $24,189,075. None of these ever reached the firing line.

We had 617 contracts for 155-millimeter shells, on which we expended $264,955,387. None of these ever reached the firing line.

We had 301 contracts for 8-inch shells, on which we expended $51,371,207. None of these ever reached the firing line.

We had 152 contracts for 240-millimeter shells, on which we expended $24,136,867. None of these ever reached the firing line.

We had 239 contracts for 9.2 shells, on which we expended $54,389,377. None of these ever reached the firing line.

We had 71 contracts for 12-inch shells, on which we expended $9,507,878. None of these ever reached the firing line.

We had 6 contracts for 14-inch shells, on which we spent $1,266,477. None of these reached the firing line.

We let 111 contracts, to the amount of $478,828,345, for the construction of artillery of all calibers, guns, howitzers, gun carriages, limbers, and recuperators. Of this immense program of expenditures there reached our troops and were actually used in combat thirty-nine 75-millimeter antiaircraft mount trucks, forty-eight 4.7-inch guns of the 1906 model, forty-eight 4.7-inch gun carriages of the same model, twenty-four 8-inch howitzers, and twenty-four 8-inch gun carriages. The details are shown in a table furnished by the War Department and attached as an appendix hereto.

To sum up, we furnished our troops for use six thousand 75-millimeter shells, fourteen thousand 4.7 shells, forty-eight 4.7 guns, and twenty-four 8-inch howitzers.

Mr. DAVEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; I have not the time.

These are the principal things soldiers need to fight with—guns and shells, gas, aeroplanes, and tanks. And while there was such a failure to produce these essential things, it is amazing to know what excessive orders and expenditures there were on other less essential things. A few instances will indicate this:

We ordered 41,100,152 pairs of shoes and received deliveries of 32,227,450 pairs for 3,513,837 men.

We bought and received 500,326 double sets of harness and 110,828 single sets. We had, in all, during the period of the war 580,182 horses, of which only 67,948 were shipped overseas and 96,000 died.

We bought 945,000 saddles and had, in all, 86,418 Cavalry horses.

We bought 2,850,853 halters.

We bought 585,615 saddle bags.

We bought 1,637,199 horse brushes.

We bought 2,033,204 nose bags.

We bought 1,148,364 horse covers.

We bought for our Ordnance officers 712,510 complete sets of spur straps, about 36 sets for each officer. We proposed to have our Ordnance officers properly spurred. [Laughter.]

We bought 8,781,516 horseshoes.

We bought 195,000 branding irons.

We ordered 149,456,611 hard-bread cans and used 31,500,000 during the war.

Mr. DAVEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No; I can not.

Who won the war? Not the present administration. It has but little ground for self-congratulation. It failed in preparedness. It failed in accomplishment. It filled the air with fine phrases and spent the people's money. But I will tell you who won the war. The people, whose great heart was stirred to sacrifice and whose funds flowed out in a golden stream. But above all, it was the man with the gun, the American soldier, the best in the world. He won the war. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

Caliber.	Model.	Number of contracts.	Quantity under contract before suspension.	Value original contract.	Quantity complete and to be completed under contract.	Quantity canceled.	Amount finished and transported to front prior to Nov. 11, 1918.		Number used in combat prior to Nov. 11, 1918.
							Finished.	Transported.	
37-mm. gun	Infantry	6	4,025	$2,251,315	1,200	2,825	826	122	
Do	Tank	5	5,083	2,012,910	1,200	3,883	50		
3-inch A. A. gun	1918	1	633	2,357,925	169	464	88		
3-inch A. A. mounts trailer	1917	2	612	4,896,000	120	492	1		
75-mm. A. A. gun	1916	1	51	331,500	51		51	26	
75-mm. A. A. mounts truck		2	51	408,000	51		44	26	39
75-mm. gun	1916 (American)	4	1,402	2,264,000	810	592	695	31	
75-mm. carriage	do	5	1,327	8,126,400	363	964	206	26	
75-mm. gun	British (1917)	4	2,868	3,030,000	909	1,959	724	124	
75-mm. carriage	do	5	2,927	14,239,500	921	2,006	724	124	
75-mm. gun	1897 (French)	2	6,550	14,056,995	1,050	5,500	74		

APPENDIX—Continued.

Caliber.	Model.	Number of contracts.	Quantity under contract before suspension.	Value original contract.	Quantity complete and to be completed under contract.	Quantity canceled.	Amount finished and transported to front prior to Nov. 11, 1918.		Number used in combat prior to Nov. 11, 1918.
							Finished.	Transported.	
75-mm. carriage	1897 (French)	1	3,049	$8,521,650	1,300	1,749	291		
75-mm. recuperator	1897	2	3,500	11,392,500	795	2,705	1		
75-mm. carriage limbers	All models	10	5,112	5,623,200	5,112		4,434	980	
75-mm. caissons	1916 and 1918	8	22,587	23,923,060	19,132	3,455	11,954	4,448	
75-mm. limbers	1918	6	22,591	28,125,795	22,591		17,702	4,084	
75-mm. store wagon	1917	4	1,737	2,340,606	860	877	495	109	
75-mm. store limbers	1902 MI	5	1,737	1,737,000	1,737		1,701	109	
75-mm. battery wagon	1917	6	1,746	2,562,799	1,323	423	615	144	
75-mm. forge limber	1902 MI	6	2,320	2,320,000	2,320		1,926	144	
75-mm. battery reel	1917	1	1,904	1,210,944	1,300	1,604	964	456	
75-mm. combined battery and store wagons	1917	2	[1] 327				38		
75-mm. reels (regiment or battalion 1909 MI)	1909 MI	3	2,396	7,350,928	1,950	446	1,084	739	
75-mm. carts (regiment or battalion)	1918	3	2,396		1,950	446	1,084	739	
4.7-inch guns	1906	4	1,244	6,990,000	417	827	157	64	48
4.7-inch carriage	1906	6	933	7,036,500	425	508	309	64	48
4.7-inch limbers	1905	4	1,059	529,500	683	376	516	64	
4.7-inch caisson	1916 and 1917	2	2,749	4,041,030	1,248	1,501	373	64	
155-mm. gun	1918	2	2,160	33,358,318	562	1,598	71	16	
155-mm. gun carriage	1918	1	1,446	10,266,600	800	646	368	16	
155-mm. gun recuperator	1918	2	1,756	9,896,000	881	875	1		
155-mm. gun carriage limber	1918	1	1,446	723,000	800	646	370		
155-mm. howitzer	1918	3	3,000	20,392,907	1,789	1,211	1,172	2	
155-mm. howitzer carriage	1918	5	2,641	24,927,000	676	1,965	144		
155-mm. howitzer recuperator	1918	1	3,714	14,071,000	1,601	2,113	854		
155-mm. howitzer carriage limber	1918	4	2,575	843,500	700	1,875	207		
155-mm. howitzer caisson	1918	1	8,937	16,389,446	8,937		4,373	552	
8-inch howitzer	M VI and VIII½	7	295	16,225,000	245	50	173	96	24
8-inch howitzer carriage	M VI and VII	7	295		245	50	173	96	24
9.2-inch howitzer	MI and II	6	100	7,000,000	1	99			
9.2-inch howitzer carriage	do		100		1	99			
240-mm. howitzer		2	1,160	16,196,745	330	830	1		
240-mm. howitzer carriage, including transportation vehicles.	1918 schedule	2	1,265	50,920,400	320	945	1		
240-mm. howitzer recuperator	do	3	1,571	23,023,000	427	1,144	1		
5-inch S. C. guns		1	28	170,800	28		28	26	
5-inch gun carriage	M1917	1	28	539,000	28		28	26	
6-inch S. C. guns (modification of)		1	78	40,092	77	1	77	74	
6-inch S. C. gun carriage	M1917 and 1917A	3	92	2,024,300	92		92	74	
6-inch limbers		1	37	40,700	1	36			
Firing platform for 6-inch mounts		1	157	800,700		157			
6-inch Navy guns		1	46	133,400	6	40	1		
6-inch gun carriage	M1917, Type B	1	37	647,500	2	35			
7-inch Navy guns		1	12	240,000	12		12		
7-inch Navy carriages		1	12		12		12		
195-mm. guns		1	2	39,620	2				
8-inch S. C. guns (modification of)		1	77	154,000	62	15	58	6	
8-inch barbette carriage	1918 and 1918 Mk-1	5	47	1,645,000	47		19	3	
8-inch Navy gun (modification of)		1	14	57,400	14				
8-inch, 50-caliber gun	1919 M1	2	25	1,467,500		25			
10-inch S. C. guns (without modification)		1	40	1,020,880	40		40	15	
10-inch S. C. gun (modification)		1	36	108,000		36			
305-mm. railway mounts (sch.):									
Fabricated parts		1	36	1,248,000	36		16	4	
Additional fabricated parts		1	36		36		8		
10-inch batignolles mounts	1918	1	18	2,772,000		18			
N. G. shell cars		1	180	216,000		180			
N. G. 12-wheel trucks		1	[1] 110	223,850		[2] 110			
N. G. gun transport cars			90	269,100		90			
10-inch ammunition cars		1	36	118,800		36			
12-inch railway carriage	M1918	1	12	1,848,000	12				
12-inch S. C. mortars (without modification)		2	91	531,094	91		91	6	
12-inch mortar carriages	1918	2	91	6,051,000	91		1		
12-inch Chilean guns (caliber 50)		1	6	1,464,996	6		1		
12-inch and 14-inch sliding railway mounts	1918	1	3	621,000	3		1		
12-inch, 20 caliber howitzers	1918	2	121	21,100,000	1	120			
12-inch, 20 caliber howitzer mounts	1919	1	1	106,000	1				
12-inch barbette carriage	1917	4	32	3,200,000	32		20		
14-inch Navy guns	1909 and 1920	4	48	6,190,080	48		6	3	
14-inch mounts		1	6	960,000	6		6	3	
14-inch sch. carriage		1	16	3,600,000		16			
16-inch howitzer	1919	1	62	6,200,000		62			
16-inch howitzer mounts	1918 and E	1	2	167,900	2				

[1] Pair.

[2] Included in completion of battery and store wagon.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the question of the investigation now being conducted by the Federal Trade Commission in dealing with the sugar situation in the West, and in that connection I wish to print a very brief letter from the acting chairman of the commission, Mr. Huston Thompson.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KINKAID. If the gentleman from New York will further yield, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the budget scheme.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman from New York will further yield, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of national taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of national taxation. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the question of war expenditures pertaining to the Subcommittee on Quartermasters, of which I am a member.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated by him. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, as an American and an American Congressman I can not ignore Ireland's just plea in her struggle for independence. To my mind for us to view with unconcern her pleadings for freedom, to permit her to stand out as the only white country barred from the family of nations, would be the basest sort of ingratitude—a reflection on our national honor and a violation of American ideals and traditions.

We have gloried always in the distinction, and rightly so, of being universally regarded as the champion of popular rights and the friend and advocate of oppressed and liberty-seeking peoples. And we have the consolation of knowing that our actions in the past justify that gratifying distinction. Hence it is but natural that the Irish people should turn to us in their hour of stress as our forefathers turned to theirs for aid in Revolutionary days.

And what are we asked to do? To extend to Ireland the same whole-hearted American support which under similar circumstances we gave the South American colonies; Cuba and the Philippines when they rose against Spain; and the Greeks rose against the Turks, the French against the Bourbons, the Poles against the Russians, and the Hungarians against the Austrians. And let us remember that this just appeal comes to us at a time when we rejoice to see the territories that were once Poland's resurrected by the Allies, the Czechoslavs and the Jugoslavs restored to their own, and Palestine freed from the clutches of the unspeakable Turks.

In view of all these events, who in this House, at a time like this, hesitates to extend a helping hand to the red-blooded white people of Ireland, whose sons for centuries have been fighting and bleeding for right and justice, who have poured out their blood on American battle fields as a free offering to the cause of American independence, and who have done the same in every war in every land where the issue was the sacred one of human freedom?

Let us not forget that Ireland is demanding the same rights from England that our ancestors demanded from that Government in 1776—the right to government only by the consent of the governed; that she asks only for the application of the principles embodied in the American Declaration of Independence, principles that won the Revolutionary War, principles for which Irishmen fought and died in that war.

Whether you will or not, the Irish question stands out boldly as a problem of the hour, a problem that not only concerns the welfare of America, but the welfare of the world. It stands out as a question of justice, right, and humanity. And manifestly, if the application of these principles is denied Ireland, there can be no lasting peace in the world, either within or without a League of Nations, so long as she or any other nationality is denied the right of self-government.

The world is weary of war and weary, too, of political hypocrisy and sham. In the present crisis the best friend England would have is the one that would solve the Irish problem by convincing her that a war which fails to bring justice will certainly fail to bring peace.

Let us contemplate the situation on the other side. The British Empire, one of the Allies for whose preservation America sacrificed her sons, expended billions, supplied the bulk of material resources, incurred a staggering debt, now begs us, in the name of a bankrupt world, a starving humanity, to feed the population of Europe, to postpone payment of their debts, to accept mandates, to support newly created independent nationalities, while at the same time she hurls into Ireland an army of soldiers with all the deadly engines of destruction and implements of war to destroy an unarmed, God-fearing, civilized, patriotic race of white men, whose demand for the right of self-government has ever been asserted and will continue to be asserted, until, with or without the assistance of the United States, they will create a free and independent Ireland among the nations of the earth.

Twelve months ago the gentleman from Illinois introduced a bill designed to help Ireland, known as the Mason bill, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Why in the name of American straightforwardness have the Republicans, as sponsors for that bill, evaded the performance of their duty and broken their word by failing to report it?

Single-handed and alone, on the Republican side, the gentleman from Illinois fought a desperate fight for his original resolution. We aided him at every turn. Driven back by the Tories on his side, he never yielded, but extorted from his party friends the resolution which was finally reported. They yielded it only in fear of the consequences of their refusal of his first proposition, and knowing they had in the Speaker's hands the weapon which would torpedo the bill by a refusal to recognize anyone to move it. The gentleman from Illinois did not fear to brook the wrath of his party organization and machine. He demanded recognition of the Speaker and met a blunt, positive refusal. Let him tell the tale of how the Republican Speaker of a Republican House strangled the resolution to express sympathy with Ireland in the idle hours it recessed on its last day.

Mr. MASON says for publication:

Speaker GILLETT has informed me that a motion to bring up the Irish resolution will not be considered at this session. As the Speaker's decision, under the rules, is final, and I can see no way to change his views, it is a waste of effort to struggle further against the influences which have caused delay upon delay, and postponed a report to the House until the closing hours of the session, when there is a tremendous pressure of business.

For months I have labored to secure action. The hearing was held December 12; the chairman never issued a call for a committee meeting to vote on my bill until May 24, and the meeting was then continued to May 27. Those American citizens interested in securing definite action have a right to feel aggrieved. It is not fair to avoid responsibility by delaying action until it becomes plausible to plead too much business to consider the cause of freedom for an oppressed people.

My original bill provided for a direct appropriation for diplomatic representatives to the Republic of Ireland. Mr. FLOOD, the leading Democratic Member, stated, in substance, that he could not support that form of resolution, and in fact a majority of the committee was clearly against me, although we have had no roll call on that question.

With the approval of the real friends of Irish freedom, I consented to adopt practically the Texas resolution, and we could not be sure of a majority for that.

Afterwards we agreed on a very modest resolution which expressed the hope of Congress that Ireland would have a government of its own choice and this was reported favorably. I think the vote was 11 to 7.

The resolution is not dead, but will have to sleep until the reconvening of Congress. Two-thirds of both Houses have shown by past votes favor toward this resolution, in substance. The House, in the last Congress, by an overwhelming two-thirds vote, expressed the hope that the peace conference would favorably consider independence for Ireland, and the Senate, by a unanimous vote, lacking one, has approved this thought.

For months I have realized and stated in the committee that my resolution was being chloroformed, but there is a favorable report now and I am thankful for being able to go as far as we have, and we are just beginning.

The real friends of Irish freedom here, represented by the National Bureau of Information, supported by American citizens, have been very fair, have conducted their affairs in a dignified and respectful way, and have always acted in accordance with the laws and customs of the country in presenting their petitions, in which they were entirely within their legal rights.

I confess I am leaving disappointed at the ruling of the Speaker, but whatever is done by this Congress, at the next session of Congress, in my opinion, the American people who believe in self-government will elect representatives who will express their opinion for the benefit of all the world. It will be done repeatedly as it has in the past entirely under the American policy established for more than 100 years to peacefully and respectfully give recognition without intervention.

I used to get discouraged at times when so many of our people were opposed to a Cuban Republic. But it has come through, and Cuba is one of our best friends. So, in my humble opinion the Irish Republic will come through without bloodshed and take its place among the nations friendly to Great Britain and to all the world, and men living now will wonder how and why it was delayed so long.

You may search, if you will, the records of the proceedings of this House from the time the first Congress assembled to legislate for the United States and nowhere in its archives will you find such an exhibition of craven mind, of ungrateful soul, of disregard of the principles of right and justice, of hypocrisy and sham, and of such shameful treatment of a great race as you have in the story of the Mason resolution and the efforts of the friends of Ireland to obtain congressional assistance.

Well might the disillusioned men and women of Irish blood now say:

> Be these juggling fiends no more believed
> That palter with us in a doube sense,
> That keep the word of promise to our ear
> And break it to our hope.

The Republican majority should have long since reported and passed the Mason bill or a similar one for the relief of Ireland. By so doing it would have followed one of its few worthy traditions.

Let me remind you that Daniel Webster, the great Secretary of State of the Whig Party, the ancestor of the Republican Party, met a situation almost parallel to Ireland's and did not hestitate to act and to proclaim bold, courageous American principles. It was in 1848, in the controversy between the United States and Austria, when Webster declared that Austria could have no grievance if the United States should see fit to recognize the independence of Hungary.

During the revolutionary movement in Hungary President Taylor sent a confidential agent to Vienna to ascertain the progress and probable result of the movement and the true state of affairs by personal observation. Learning of this action, the Austrian Government protested on the ground that it was an interference in the domestic affairs of that empire, disrespectful towards her, and that it was impossible to reconcile such a mission with the principle of nonintervention announced

by the United States as the basis of American policy. Objections were made generally against all interference in the internal affairs of the Austrian Government. Austria went so far as to threaten retaliation if this country continued to take an indirect part in the political movements of Europe.

In his reply to the Austrian note Daniel Webster maintained that the steps taken by President Taylor were consistent with the neutral policy which had invariably guided our Government in its foreign relations as well as with the established and settled principles of national intercourse and the doctrine of public law.

In the light of current events it may be interesting to quote Mr. Webster in full. This is taken from the correspondence between him and the Chevalier Hulsemann, chargé d'affaires of his Majesty the Emperor of Austria, and may be found in the writings and speeches of Daniel Webster. Mr. Webster declared:

The Government and people of the United States, like other intelligent governments and communities, take a lively interest in the movements and events of this remarkable age, in whatever part of the world they may be exhibited. But the interest taken by the United States in those events has not proceeded from any disposition to depart from that neutrality toward foreign powers which is among the deepest principles of the most cherished traditions of the political history of the Union. It has been the necessary effect of the unexampled character of the events themselves which could not fail to arrest the attention of the contemporary world, as they will doubtless fill a memorable page in history. But I go further and freely admit that, in proportion as these extraordinary events appeared to have their origin and those great ideas of popular and responsible government, on which the American constitutions themselves are wholly founded, they could not but command the warm sympathy of our people. Well-known circumstances in their history, indeed their whole country, have made them the representatives of purely popular principles of government. In this light they now stand before the world. They could not, if they would, conceal their character, their condition, or their destiny. They could not, if they desired it, suppress either the thoughts or the hopes which rise in men's minds, in other countries, from contemplating their successful example of free government. True, indeed, it is that the prevalence on the other continent of sentiments favorable to republican liberty is the result of the reaction of America upon Europe; and the source and center of this reaction has doubtless been, and now is, in these United States. Certainly the United States may be pardoned, even by those who profess adherence to the principles of absolute government, if they entertain an ardent affection for those popular forms of political organization which have so rapidly advanced their own prosperity and happiness and enabled them to bring their country and the hemisphere to which it belongs to the notice and respectful regard, not to say the admiration, of the civilized world. Nevertheless, the United States have abstained, at all times, from acts of interference with the political changes of Europe. They can not, however, fail to cherish always a lively interest in the fortunes of nations struggling for institutions like their own. But this sympathy, so far from being necessarily a hostile feeling toward any of the parties to these great national struggles, is quite consistent with amicable relations with them all.

The Hungarian people are three or four times as numerous as the inhabitants of the United States were when the American Revolution broke out. They possessed, in a distinct language and in other respects, important elements of a separate nationality which the Anglo-Saxon race in this country did not possess, and if the United States wish success to other countries contending for popular constitutions and national independence, it is only because they regard such constitutions not as imaginary but as real blessings. When the people of the United States behold the people of foreign countries spontaneously moving toward the adoption of institutions like their own, it surely can not be expected of them to remain wholly indifferent spectators.

Mr. Webster then went on to explain that in the year 1848 a number of Hungarians came to the United States, among them individuals representing the revolutionary government, to urge the President to recognize the existence of that government. Mr. Webster continued:

In these applications and in the manner in which they were viewed by the President, there was nothing unusual; still less was there anything unauthorized by the law of nations. It is the right of every independent State to enter into friendly relations with every other independent State. Of course, questions of prudence arise in reference to new States, brought by successful revolutions into the family of nations; but it is not to be required of neutral powers that they should await the recognition of a new government by the parent State. No principle of public law has been more frequently acted upon within the last 30 years by the great powers of the world than this. Within that period 8 or 10 new States have established independent governments within the limits of the colonial dominions of Spain, upon this continent; and in Europe the same thing has been done by Belgium and Greece.

The existence of all these governments was recognized by some of the leading powers of Europe as well as by the United States before it was acknowledged by the States from which they had separated themselves. If, therefore, the United States has gone so far as to acknowledge the independence of Hungary although, as the result has proved, it would have been a precipitate step, and one from which no benefit would have resulted to either party, it would not, nevertheless, have been an act against the law of nations, provided they took no part in her contest with Austria.

In closing his letter Mr. Webster added:

You may be assured that while performing with strict and exact fidelity all their neutral duties, nothing will deter either the Government or the people of the United States in exercising, at their discretion, the rights belonging to them as an independent Nation, and of forming an expression of their own opinion freely, at all times, upon the great political events which may transpire among the civilized nations of the earth. Their own institutions stand upon the broadest principles of civil liberty, and believing those principles and the fundamental law in which they are embodied to be eminently favorable to the prosperity of States, to be, in fact, the only principles of government which meet the demands of the present enlightened age, it may be regarded as certain that our principles and policy will not be abandoned from until some extraordinary change shall take place in the general current of human affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back four minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the public-land laws.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the cost of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of the Tombigbee River, but I fail to find it in the RECORD and I can not locate the date. I therefore ask unanimous consent again.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Tombigbee River. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Indiana yield a moment?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks upon past legislation and pending legislation at this session.

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

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, what particular legislation? Does that include the soldiers' bonus?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. No; nothing about the bonus.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when Mr. Herbert Hoover, expatriated American, condescended to come back from the home of his adoption to the land of his birth he brought back a great number of pat and catchy phrases. He came here, as you remember, as the purchasing agent of the Allies. He remained the purchasing agent of the Allies until the close of the war, notwithstanding the fact that during all of the time after we entered the war he was the food conservator of the United States.

Amongst other things, during the war he said that we should save more in order that we might help to feed the Allies. After the war was over he said that we should save more to help feed starving Europe. That was the slogan that went from one end of the country to the other. It is the slogan that is now going from one end of the country to the other. The invention of Mr. Hoover, it has found its place upon every billboard throughout the United States. It has found its place in almost every passenger car on all the railroads throughout the country.

I wish very briefly to call your attention to some of the results of the propaganda instituted by Mr. Hoover, which is now still being promulgated. As a result of this propaganda we find this spectacle presented at this time: That there are millions and millions and millions of pounds of bacon and ham and frozen meat taken away from the United States and from those who need it here for the purpose of feeding people across on the other side of the sea, food that is now being sold, if you please, at a penny a pound to the soap boilers of Europe. That is not all of it. There are millions and millions of pounds in cold storage upon this side awaiting shipping vessels to go over and still further glut the market on the other side. Yet we are told that there is a shortage over there.

I wish to call attention very briefly to some corroboration of the facts that I have just stated. I call your attention to a copy of the Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury of April 27, 1920, and wish very briefly to read you some extracts from that paper. I read:

FOOD MINISTRY PROFITEERING—THE EVILS OF CONTROL—CONCLUDING ARTICLE.

(By Boyd Cable.)

The frozen-meat scandal has been fairly well exposed, and the public know to some extent the appalling waste of good food which has resulted from control, is still resulting, and is going to continue to result.

The cold storage is crammed and packed with meat; ships are arriving every day with more cargoes for which there is absolutely no room; meat is going bad and being sent to the soap-boiling works; and yet the price is held up to an average 9d., at which it does not sell. Meat is being pushed onto the retailers to-day which has been anything up to two years in store; and the excuse for not reducing prices to a level at which the meat might sell and clear the glut is that there is a "world shortage."

Here are some facts of the "world shortage" bogey in the frozen-meat trade. There is more of this meat available for export to-day than ever there was; there is greater frozen storage capacity; there is greater refrigerator steamer capacity. And consumption is much less. In 1913 world production of frozen meat was 767,000 tons. In 1919 it had risen to 1,078,000 tons—nearly 40 per cent increase. Consumption has fallen. In 1913 the consumption in the United Kingdom was 720,000 tons (out of the world's 767,000 tons), but in 1919 we consumed only 500,000 tons.

There is no world shortage of frozen meat; there is not the faintest prospect of a shortage within present-day reckoning of any experts in the trade. The cry of "world shortage" is only useful as an excuse for maintaining high prices.

THE BACON BUNGLE.

The bacon business again has been another horrible example of official muddling and waste. Bacon was decontrolled in March last year. Prices, after decontrol, rose for the good and sufficient reason that the value of the English pound had fallen in American exchange by about a corresponding amount of the increased price of bacon. The ministry took the rising price as an excuse to requisition the arriving supplies and resume control. The price had then risen to 2s. 8d. a pound, and that price, after nearly a year's control, remains to-day. If the private traders were, as the ministry asserted, profiteering at this price of 2s. 8d., is the ministry profiteering to-day at the same price? If the ministry is not profiteering because the fallen value of the English pound maintains the higher price, the same excuse would have held good for the traders.

But under control there has been heavy loss and waste. I know that the ministry blame the bacon going bad on the traders and say it is the requisitioned supplies which are being destroyed. But there are 40,000 boxes of this bacon still in store—bacon seized here last August and which the trade intended to have on the market in a few weeks. Little wonder it is going bad. Only a few days ago the Press reported a case of a box of bacon being issued to the trade bearing the date it went into cold storage—June, 1919. Is it surprising that the imported bacon we are forced to buy is unfit to eat?

MORE STALE BACON TO COME.

The Government have been so harried by complaints of the glut of bacon in the country that they have been restricting imports, and now point proudly to the fact that there is only about three or four weeks' supply in the country. One might imagine from this that in a month from now we shall be getting only fresh imported bacon to eat. The fact is that the bacon is lying in cold storage in America instead of here. There are 450,000 quarter-ton boxes of bacon belonging to the ministry lying in America to-day. So we shall go on eating months-old stale and unpalatable controlled bacon for many months to come.

A few weeks ago a statement was published by the Liverpool Provision Trade Association and the Home and Foreign Produce Exchange, in which they said that in August last, when the Government "commandeered" the supplies, bacon was on the spot and arriving to an extent of about 100,000 tons, at an average price of £185 per ton; and that "thousands of boxes (weighing four to the ton) have been sold by authority of the ministry to soap boilers and others at a loss of about £160 per ton." Other thousands of tons had been sold to the Continent and buyers here for about £45 a ton, and more hundreds of tons were still waiting to be sold and boiled down.

Under private trading bacon importers took their own risks in importing. If the goods did not sell quickly enough, the prices had to be lowered until the bacon sold freely. If the trader was fool enough to hold his stocks until they went bad and had to be sold to the soap boiler, the trader had to pay the loss. Under control we get bacon so inferior and salt-saturated that people will hardly buy it, and if stocks go bad and are condemned as unfit for human food, the taxpayer bears the loss.

RICE PROFITEERING.

Every now and then you may have read nice, plausible paragraphs in the press giving reasons for the rising price of rice—how the crop in this place or that had failed, how freight had risen, and so on. There is a strong suspicion that these paragraphs emanate from the ministry of food's publicity department, and certainly they have never made any mention of other and sounder reasons for the rising price—the profiteering of the ministry, for instance.

In 1918 the Government bought rice from Burma shippers at £8 a ton. Freight, insurance, etc., added, say, £3 10s. a ton, making purchase cost of about £11 10s. a ton. The same rice was sold to the trade at £26 10s. a ton—£15 profit to the Government on its purchase price of £11 10s. The Government is said by those who ought to know to have made £12,000,000 profit on one season's dealing in rice.

Now, the purchase price has risen, and, averaging the price they paid for the old and for the new rice, the Government will be paying about £37 10s. a ton. But the price has been put up to 7d., and the Government is still making about £11 a ton profit.

We are told nowadays that there is going to be a shortage of potatoes, and with the increased price of bread and the relief on the poor-class purse that might have been afforded by the substitution of more potatoes for bread, this is a very serious matter. The shortage can be traced distinctly to the evil effects of past control methods, the waste that resulted, and the unfair dealing of the Government.

During the last shortage the Government urged farmers to grow more potatoes, promising to take these over at a good price, and ordering them to hold them for instructions as to where and when they were to be sold. As a result thousands of tons of potatoes were grown, and the farmers obediently put these in pits and awaited instructions. In many an instance the instructions never came, and when the farmers wrote the ministry, pointing out that the potatoes were likely to go bad unless lifted soon, they were simply told to hold on to the crop and "wait instructions." To cut a long story short, there are thousands of tons of potatoes scattered over the length and breadth of the country rotted in the pits because the ministry would not allow the owners to sell them. In many other cases the ministry took over the potatoes, but have not yet paid the farmer for them, and in the last week or two committees of farmers have been forming to press the ministry for payment of potatoes taken over in 1918 and for others which were never taken over but rotted where they lay because the farmer was forbidden to sell them.

Now, when potatoes are again being controlled and the farmers are being asked to increase their potato crop it is hardly surprising that they turn a deaf ear to the urging, remembering their past treatment. So we are going to be short of potatoes this year, thanks in large part to control. And this time not even the pigs benefited by the control bungle, because the potatoes were left to rot in the pits, and are still there.

SOCIALIST SUPPORT OF CONTROL.

One finds it hard to understand why the Labor Socialists should be doing their utmost to support this system of control and to favor fastening it on the country for another term of years. One explanation is to be found in the craze of a section of the socialists for any form of "nationalization" and State trading at any price. Another apparently is in the desire of the Labor Party to make a profitable alliance with the Cooperative Party, the State buying and selling all food and the cooperatives distributing it—for the sound reason that in the past the "co-ops" have supported strikes by grants of money, by distribution of goods, and by other valuable means. This may be good business for the labor and socialist extremists, and the aim of the cooperative parties may well be to gain the support of the labor vote; but there are many sound members of the societies who view with alarm the swallowing of the co-ops by the socialists and the use of co-op funds to foster and help strikes and spread socialist propaganda, and certainly the public may jib at being made to pay extortionate food prices because of the whims and the aims of either socialist, cooperative, or any other section of the community.

The excuse given by the socialists for backing control is that it is the preventive of private profiteering. I hope I have shown clearly where this is wrong and how control opens doors to retailers profiteering, and how the food ministry is amongst the worst and most voracious of the food profiteers. I have been told that it can not be called profiteering if the Government makes ten millions on sugar or £7 on an £8 case of eggs, because this profit comes back to the country and helps to relieve taxation. It does not. It is relief to no one if dates and bacon and frozen meat go by the hundred and thousand of tons to the manure works, the pigs, and the destructors.

WASTED PROFITS.

Instead of profits coming back to the country, they are wasted in bad and inefficient methods of ministry business ways or swallowed up in the millions spent on salaries and expenses and official "publicity" to persuade the public that control is beneficial, and that the ministry bureaucrats must be kept in their comfortable jobs. And even if the profits come back to the country the principle is unsound and bad, because the public don't know that high food prices are due to Government profiteering, because, as I have shown, control hits hardest the poorer classes, who can't afford high prices, and because by fostering a belief that private traders and retailers are making the high prices and extortionate profits, the workers are being goaded into rebellion, angered beyond forbearance, and spurred harder into the class war that is such a menace to-day.

There are few who will not admit that control was a necessity during the war. There are few (except those whose persons or pockets would suffer by decontrol) who are not convinced that the sooner control is abolished now the better for the public.

Even the belief that control prevents private profiteering is not sufficient excuse for keeping it on food, because it would be perfectly simple to devise and work a scheme cheaply and efficiently whereby control could be kept over profits and traders prevented from making too high prices and profits. The first thing we want to abolish is the system of Government buying and selling of food—buying badly in many cases, handling inefficiently and wastefully, and selling dearly. Until we get rid of the system there can be little hope of lower food prices.

Mr. BLANTON. How is that—45 pounds a ton? Is that pounds sterling?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Now, that is the situation existing to-day, so far as frozen meat and bacon are concerned in England; and notwithstanding that fact we find this in the public press—I cut this out of the Washington Times of Sunday last:

BEEF WAITS SHIPMENT.

PORTLAND, ME., *May 30.*

Six million pounds of frozen beef will be shipped to Germany and other countries of central Europe on the British steamship *Armagh*, which arrived here yesterday from Boston on her way to Hamburg. The beef was sent here by western packers.

And what is true with reference to Portland is also true with reference to the millions of pounds that are stored in other cold-storage houses awaiting shipment to Europe.

Now, what is the result? We find here one of the great reasons for the high cost of living, and it is an absolute waste, for the reason that it is benefiting no one. We are sacrificing, to the detriment of the American consumer, the meat of this country to be sent across upon the other side, there to be sold to the soap boilers of Europe.

There is another thing to which I wish to call the attention of the committee. We are going to have the greatest shortage of food next year that we have had since long before the war, by reason of the shortage of labor. The great agricultural sections of the West—Iowa, Indiana, and Illinois—will produce from 20 to 25 per cent less cereal products this year than they have produced in the last five years. And what is true of the section I have mentioned is also true throughout the southland, and it is true throughout the northland. There are 18,000 farms in Michigan to-day that are idle because no one can be found to tend them.

With that condition confronting us, what is going to be the result to this country within the next nine months and during the next winter?

And here is another thing to which I wish to call attention: We have this day in every commercial center factories closing by the score for the lack of coal. One of the great universities in Indiana, unless it speedily finds relief, must close down in a very short time because it can not get coal. A gentleman telephoned to me to-day who came all the way from Indiana down to West Virginia to see if he could get coal there, and he told me this is the condition that he found: The proprietors of the coal mines say, "We can not get cars sufficient to satisfy our export trade, but if you will pay us the export price we will see to it that you get a little coal to tide you over," the export price being for smokeless coal from $8 to $12 per ton.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, right there will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I heard the distinguished gentleman this morning ask the majority leader whether an opportunity would be given him to go into this question by considering a certain resolution which he had. Is the gentleman going to let it stop there? Is he going to let the women and children of this country freeze to death next winter?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I wish to call attention to the condition that is confronting us and to what the probable result will be; and if I felt that I could get sufficient support I would introduce to-morrow morning into this House a bill putting an embargo upon the shipment of coal out of this country until our domestic demands could be supplied.

Mr. BLANTON. I will give the gentleman one vote on it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am glad to have that much encouragement. The Interstate Commerce Commission tell me that they are powerless to remedy this condition. I asked them whether it was not within their province to say to these coal-mine owners, "You shall not receive cars or have any cars unless you use them to satisfy the domestic demand." The Interstate Commerce Commission say that there is no law authorizing them to put that kind of a condition upon their furnishing these cars. What is the result? We find that every eastern terminal to-day is crowded with cars, all the sidetracks taken up with cars awaiting a chance to ship coal abroad; and I am informed by the Interstate Commerce Commission that when they say to them that the demurrage charge will be enforced against them they simply smile and say, "It will be added to the export price," and they are getting, if you please, $30 a ton for coal in London. That is the condition that is confronting the American people—with our factories closing down and men being thrown out of employment, and with the winter not so far off, contracts for the delivery of coal to fill the bins of the American consumers next winter are being evaded. Where dealers have held off in the hope that there would be a reduction in price they can not get a contract to-day of any character. That is especially true throughout the Northwest, and I am informed that it is equally true throughout the East.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is not the gentleman aware that foreign buyers are bidding against American buyers and offering large bonuses?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is not a bit of doubt about it. They are sending checks here in blank to be filled out by the sellers of coal at any price they see fit. So we have this trouble. There is not only a shortage of coal cars in this country, but the miners are taking advantage of that fact, and they say to the domestic buyer, "We can not get the cars," but when they do get the cars then they say to the domestic buyers, "We have not sufficient cars to satisfy our foreign trade, but if you will pay us the export price we will see that you get a little."

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. By way of confirmation of what the gentleman says, I will say that two or three days ago I talked with a gentleman representing the Dutch Government, and he told me that he was buying $2,000,000 worth of coal a month in the United States for use in Holland.

Mr. BLANTON. For the Kaiser to burn?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Take the price of American coal to-day in London, and it is $30 a ton, and these gentlemen, as long as they are permitted without some affirmative law whereby they will be compelled to satisfy domestic trade, will continue to take this export price. So I say that, we being cognizant of the facts, the responsibility is on us.

Somebody says that the President of the United States, in the exercise of his good offices, can call us back if this thing is not relieved in a short time. We all know that the President is in a very precarious condition. God will and I hope he may recover from his affliction, but what his condition may be in a few weeks or months immediately ahead of us none of us can predict.

If he keeps constantly growing worse and gets in that condition where he can not exercise his presidential will, and not being officially disqualified so that the Vice President can act in his stead, the American people will hold the American Congress responsible for this condition that is now confronting us. While we are still in session we should not allow the opportunity to pass without at least placing ourselves in a position whereby we can remedy this situation. It is the American Congress to whom the people of this country are looking for relief, and we will fall short of the duty resting upon us unless we afford some remedy for relief.

What is true of coal is likewise true of provisions and meats, as I have shown you from the article I have read from Mercury.

The trades people of Europe are calling attention to the fact that millions and millions of pounds of beef and various other products are going to waste there and that they are all being brought from the United States in large quantities.

I have told you the facts as I have gleaned them, corroborated by evidence not only on this side as to what is going on but by evidence that comes back to us from the other side, and I dare say that the statement I have read to you you have not seen in a single American paper. The papers that I have in my hand were received from a gentleman just back from the other side, who wondered because these things had not been brought to the attention of the American people. That they are true there is no doubt.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum. We have been here 10 hours and 23 minutes on a stretch.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman withhold that for one more speech?

Mr. BLANTON. I will withdraw the point.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. LUHRING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a review of some legislation I have supported and some work I have done here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, some of you may think that I arise to criticize the speech just made by the gentleman from Indiana, but realizing that Mr. Hoover might be the nominee of the great Republican convention in Chicago next week the only suggestion that I have is that the gentleman do not print his speech condemning Mr. Hoover and the hundreds of thousands of Republicans in this country who want to see Hoover nominated until after the results of that convention have been announced, and then if he is not nominated I assure the gentleman that the Democrats will gladly welcome any criticism of Mr. Hoover and his Republican followers that he and his stand-pat Republican friends see fit to make.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the plea in behalf of the agricultural interests of this country just made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON], and I can not proceed, in the time allotted me to-day, after listening to his discourse and realizing his knowledge of and interest in agriculture, without congratulating the people of his district and those of the United States upon sending him to Congress and of indulging the hope that every man or woman in the United States interested in agriculture will recognize his ability and interest in agriculture and see to it that he is continued as a Member of the United States Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] called attention to the lack of legislation on the part of this Congress in behalf of the postal employees of the country and plead with the Congress for favorable action on a measure looking to their relief before the contemplated adjournment on June 5.

I arise to add my plea in behalf of the faithful, overworked, and underpaid postal employees of the United States Government. It seems to me that this Congress, having been in session practically all the time since May 19, 1919, has had ample time to have taken action on this matter.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Has the gentleman read the bill which has been reported out from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads?

Mr. HOWARD. I have not; but I understand a bill has been reported. But I am also aware of the fact that there are thousands of other bills on the calendar which will not pass, and it is my interest in this bill that causes me to rise and make the plea that I have.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I have read the bill, and it gives a slight increase to postal employees, but in my judgment not a sufficient increase to meet the high cost of living.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is aware that this Congress has twice increased the pay of postal employees, is he not?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Why does the gentleman express surprise that Congress has not paid any attention to their demands?

Mr. HOWARD. Because this increase made for the benefit of our postal employees is only of a temporary nature, and I think the conditions of the service are such that permanent relief should be extended and that postal employees should know, as you and I know, what is going to be their fate in the future.

Mr. MONDELL. On the contrary, the increases that have been made are not temporary.

Mr. HOWARD. I must decline to yield further.

No member of Congress and no citizen of the United States who has given any thought at all to the matter denies but what the postal employees are entitled to relief.

It is a reflection on the Congress that these employees who have been faithful throughout it all have been neglected by this Congress as they have been. I can not see any excuse for this neglect. This Congress has found time to appropriate millions of dollars to settle war claims of wealthy manufacturers and contractors. It has found plenty of time to waste many dollars of the people's money investigating the actions of the administration and our soldiers during the war. It has found time to pass many measures not as meritorious as the claims of these postal employees. It has found time to waste hundreds of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and many, many hours of time in making political speeches and playing politics, and yet it has been unable to find time to take up and pass measures allowing to these postal employees the justice and equity to which they are entitled.

Our Postal Service is one of the most efficient departments of our Government. It is one of the most necessary departments to the benefit and convenience of the entire people. It has been through the faithfulness of these employees, whose families have been and are suffering by reason of the neglect of this Congress, that this efficiency and convenience has been brought about. They work for us faithfully throughout the day and throughout the night, under any and all circumstances and in any and all weather. It is now contemplated that on Saturday this Congress shall adjourn. Some are to hie themselves away on pleasure trips and foreign junkets; others will spend vacations at the seashore and in the mountains; others of us will content ourselves in our districts working for and urging our own interests. During all this time these faithful employees, still suffering by lack of recognition unless we act at once, will continue to serve us in their well-known faithful manner. And, Mr. Speaker, I urge and plead with this Congress that before the gavel of the Speaker shall finally fall upon this session that we stop long enough to take up and pass some measure extending to these faithful and neglected employees of the Postal Service the equity and justice to which they are entitled. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the general deficiency appropriation bill, H. R. 14335, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subjects of Indian legislation and affairs, also inserting a personal statement relative to my service in Congress and on the subject of necessity for legislation regarding peyote or mescale, and in connection therewith to include a short editorial from the Outlook.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

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

Senate concurrent resolution 27.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby respectfully declines to grant to the Executive the power to accept a mandate over Armenia as requested in the message of the President dated May 24, 1920—

to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 4927. An act for the relief of Nancy A. Parsons, C. M. Parsons, D. F. Staggs, Ollie Staggs, Rosa Staggs, Lena Birchfield, Alice Birchfield, Bertie Gwin, Greely Gilbert, Linville Gilbert, and Nelson Gilbert;

H. R. 5807. An act for the relief of John T. Adams;

H. R. 10115. An act for the relief of Harvey R. Butcher;

H. R. 11030. An act for the relief of the Woodford Bank & Trust Co., of Versailles, Ky.; and

H. J. Res. 336. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Albert Sidney Johnston Camp, United Confederate Veterans, No. 1820, Fort Worth, Tex., 100 tents and cots for the use of Confederate Veterans at the reunion of said camp June 24 to 27, inclusive, 1920.

H. R. 10317. An act for the relief of Blanche Utley;

H. R. 1827. An act for the relief of Carolyn Wheeler Kobbe;

H. R. 2396. An act for the relief of John A. Gauley;

H. R. 6198. An act authorizing payment of compensation to Swanhild Sims for personal injuries;

H. R. 9048. An act for the relief of Catherina Rea, administratrix of the estate of John Rea;

H. R. 9583. An act for the relief of Edward A. Purdy, postmaster of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., for postage stamps, postal-savings stamps, war-savings stamps, war-tax revenue stamps, and cash from money orders stolen from the branch post office at Minneapolis, Minn., commonly known and described as the traffic station and located at No. 621-623 First Avenue North, in said city;

H. R. 1309. An act for the relief of Perry L. Haynes;

H. R. 11398. An act for the creation of the Custer State Park Game Sanctuary, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9392. An act regulating the disposition of lands formerly embraced in the grants to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and Coos Bay Wagon Road Co.;

H. R. 9783. An act to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3212. An act for the relief of legal representative of George E. Payne, deceased; and

H. J. Res. 370. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," approved May 31, 1920.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to authorize the operation of Government-owned radio stations for the use of the general public, and for other purposes;

S. 4411. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Pembina, N. Dak., and Kittson, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.; and

S. 2890. An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) in accordance with the order heretofore made the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 2, 1920, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV a letter from the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting report in response to House resolution 501, directing the commission to make immediate inquiry into the cause of the recent advance in the prices of all petroleum products, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11228) to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Green Bay, at or in the vicinity of Strawberry Passage, in Door County, Wis., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1074), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3994) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1075), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 533) requesting the Federal Trade Commission to make certain inquiries into the prices of loose-leaf tobacco, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1077), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14119) fixing rates of postage on certain kinds of printed matter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1078), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WINSLOW, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) authorizing the President of the United States to manage and operate Cape Cod Canal, in the State of Massachusetts, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1080), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEENERSON, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14338) to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1081), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4435) to authorize officers of the Naval Service to accept offices with compensation and emoluments from Governments of the Republics of South America, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1082), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SANFORD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14148) to correct the military record of A. J. Henry, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1076), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13662) for the relief of Stanley Mitchell, reported the same without amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1085), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 14354) to provide for the alterations for the present post-office building at Champaign, Ill., and for the purchase of additional ground adjoining same; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 14355) to revise and equalize rates of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, to certain widows, former widows, dependent parents and children of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to certain Army nurses, and granting pensions and increases of pension in certain cases; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 14356) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Sanders Ferry and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Elbert, Ga.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON (by request): Resolution (H. Res. 578) authorizing the installation of an electrical mechanical voting machine in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BEE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) permitting Chinese to register under certain provisions and conditions; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 372) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to Jeanne d'Arc; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 373) declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, urging immediate steps by the United States as may be necessary to safeguard the future of the Armenian people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, favoring an American mandate for Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14357) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Lemons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 14358) granting an increase of pension to Lena Derl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14359) granting an increase of pension to Elvira M. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 14360) granting a pension to Martha P. Malcomson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 14361) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Dickinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 14362) to remove the charge of desertion against Lucius F. Norton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 14363) for the relief of A. O. White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 14364) granting an increase of pension to Amelia J. Barnard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 14365) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Deakyne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4049. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, favoring increased postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4050. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National League of Postmasters of the United States, for increased compensation for postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4051. Also, petition of the Chicago Federation of Labor, favoring Senate joint resolution 171 and Senate bill 1233; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4052. Also, petition of the E. & W. Clothing House, of Rockford, Ill., opposing the McNary bill for stamping the manufacturers' sale price on shoes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4053. Also, petition of the American Medical Association, favoring appropriation of $150,000 to publish a medical history of the part played by the United States in the World War; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4054. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of New Lots Citizens' League (Inc.), of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging legislation for increased wages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4055. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Teachers' Union of the City of New York, favoring increased pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4056. By Mr. VARE: Petition of Republican Club of Philadelphia, Pa., urging immediate action on postal clerks' increased salary proposals as to be recommended by the Postal Salaries Commission; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4057. By Mr. WEBSTER: Petition of numerous residents of the fifth district of Washington, indorsing Senate bill 3259 and House bill 10925, offering the aid of the National Government to the several States in maternal and infant-welfare work; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *June 2, 1920.*

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

Rev. E. O. Watson, secretary of the Council of the Churches of Christ in America, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, humbly, reverently, with grateful hearts, we bow before Thee; humbly as we think of our unworthiness, reverently as we think of Thy goodness and of Thy glory, gratefully as we think upon Thy loving kindness and tender mercies that have been ever held toward us. We acknowledge Thy hand, our Father, in our individual lives and the destiny of our Nation and of all nations. We pray that Thou wilt guide and bless each one of us as on this new day we come before Thee thanking Thee for life, for liberty, and for service; that Thou wilt guide us, that we may have wisdom to know and grace to respond to the calls of duty, and strength faithfully to discharge every obligation and meet every responsibility in this great day. Bless, we pray Thee, this great body, the Senate of our Nation, its President, and every Senator. Bless our great Nation, and guide us in all things that we may work out our high place to the glory of God and for the blessing of mankind. All this we ask, we humbly ask, in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have just been honored with a copy of what purports to be my legislative record during my service in this body since 1914, bearing the signatures of Samuel Gompers, Frank Morrison, and James O'Connell, executive committee. I shall ask at the end of my comments to place this document in the RECORD. It is too important not to have a place in our proceedings, so that my conduct here may serve as a warning both to my successor, whether Democratic or Republican, and to those of my colleagues whose terms extend over the next Congress. This document is to be read at every meeting of the organizations of the Federation of Labor until election day. I shall therefore receive some publicity between now and the 2d day of November, which is gratifying even though it may prove disagreeable.

This record begins with the 27th day of February, 1915. I presume that date fixes the limitation upon my official misconduct. Consequently offenses preceding that date are lost and forgotten in the oblivion of time.

I am recorded as voting unfavorably on a number of occasions upon the motion to strike out what is called a "vicious" provision prohibiting the stop-watch and bonus system from the military bill. In some instances I am recorded as not voting. I can not understand it. I do not think that Mr. Gompers has treated me fairly. I am entitled to a correct and complete record of all my misdeeds here, and if I at any time failed to vote to strike out what is called the stop-watch and bonus system it should be explained that I was absent from the Chamber at the time or because no record vote was taken. I voted to strike out these provisions upon every opportunity that offered itself, and surely I am entitled to some credit for having myself interposed a motion to strike out on a number of occasions. It is said that everything is fair in love and war, and I am sure Mr. Gompers intends to play the game according to that rule, so that all my misdeeds may receive the publicity to which they are entitled.

Let me proceed. I voted unfavorably once on the Borland amendment increasing the hours of Government employees and I failed to vote once upon it. Here again is a strangely unaccountable hiatus in my unfortunate record. I tried here to get rid of the system which permits some employees to work less than eight hours while others are required to work eight hours and more. I acted upon the assumption that a full day's wage entitled the Government to a full day's service, and I voted accordingly. I shall repeat the vote if given the opportunity. Again, if I failed to vote on the 21st of March, 1918, it is a lapse for which I owe the Senate an explanation. I am accused on the 27th day of August, 1918, of voting unfavorably on the "work-or-fight amendment" to the draft bill. I did vote against striking out the provision, but it is unfair to me not to record the fact that I was the author of that provision. It was I who offered it in the Committee on Military Affairs and it is I who am responsible for it, and I protest, Mr. President, that that fact should appear in this record of condemnation. I entertained the idea that a man relieved from duty at the front because of his need in the manufactures at home ought to work just as hard in the vocation to which he had been assigned as though he were in the trenches. Consequently my amendment was designed to take men who, having been thus detailed, refused or declined to work and put them in the trenches. It was known as the work-or-fight amendment. Mr. Gompers opposed it, to use his expression, viciously. We had quite a spirited correspondence about it. I got the best of the argument, but unfortunately he had the votes. My argument, albeit conclusive, was ineffectual, and Mr. Gompers's argument, however inconclusive, was very triumphant. Hence men relieved from military service and detailed to work in munitions production were permitted to work or shirk as they pleased, while their pay continued in any event.

I could read, if I were so disposed, the RECORD giving the names of the Senators who voted to strike out that provision. Unfortunately some of them have since incurred the displeasure of King Samuel, and are therefore upon his blacklist along with me.

I am sorry for them; I am very, very sorry for them; but "I can not cry for laughing."

Unconsciously, perhaps, these gentlemen have since given offense to Mr. Gompers. Unconsciously they have done things which put them out of favor at court. Unconsciously, perhaps, they have been unmindful of those requirements, the observance of which is absolutely essential to reelection.

So, while the fate now confronting me looms large and disagreeable, I shall have the melancholy pleasure of enjoying the company of a number of my associates here, who then passed under Mr. Gompers's rod, and who next November will have to pass under it again.

I am recorded as casting an unfavorable vote upon the motion to strike out the antistrike clause of the Cummins bill. Upon that I seem to have voted unfavorably three times, but upon the 23d of February, 1920, when the Cummins-Esch railroad bill conference report, containing the obnoxious antilabor and other objectionable provisions was accepted, I am recorded as not voting. I did not; that is a fact. I was not here. Unfortunately I was in New York, engaged in making an antistrike speech. I could not be here and cast my vote in favor of that obnoxious provision and at the same time be addressing an audience in New York in favor of antistrike legislation. Had it been possible for a man of my dimensions to have been at two places on the same date, I should have made my record good upon the last vote that was taken upon that bill, although I did not approve of the conference report. We had not the sand to stand by our convictions and retain the antistrike clauses of the bill, and consequently I was not at all enamored of the conference committee report.

Upon the 3d of April, 1920, that being my last recorded offense, I am charged with voting unfavorably upon the Myers amendment prohibiting the affiliation of Federal employees with organized labor. I did. I voted once since upon the same subject. My recollection is that the only votes favoring the Myers amendment were his and my own. On a subsequent occasion, however, 3 votes for were cast. So we gained 50 per cent; and when it comes up again, as it certainly will, I hope that we will record 4 votes for it, which will be 100 per cent gain. Then, after the election, when it again recurs, as I trust it will, with no election to be held for two years, I hope we will secure a dozen votes for it. That is perhaps a very extravagant anticipation, but I am sometimes overextravagant, generally, however, in a