

COAST GUARD.

James H. Brown to be senior captain.
Harry G. Hamlet to be senior captain.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Omah Coulter, Omaha.

LOUISIANA.

Lillian P. Witherow, Lake Providence.

MISSISSIPPI.

Mellon E. Daniel, Dlo.
Jerry T. Talbert, Grenada.
Zilpha L. Killam, Hickory.
Pearl Young, Noxapater.
Edwin L. Sibley, Philipp.
William A. Davis, Wiggins.

OHIO.

John W. Kramer, Maumee.

VIRGINIA.

George E. Harrison, Lawrenceville.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate June 2, 1920.

POSTMASTER.

NEBRASKA.

Edward F. Lusieniski, Platte Center.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 2, 1920.

POSTMASTERS.

Edwin C. Johnson, Craig, Colo., sent to the Senate January 19, 1920.

Dewey E. Wilcox to be postmaster at Richfield, in the State of Idaho.

Ronald H. Gordon-Ross, Hudson, Ohio, sent to the Senate January 19, 1920.

Robert L. Wheeler, Delta, Pa., sent to the Senate April 29, 1920.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, June 2, 1920.

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

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

O Thou Infinite, Invisible Spirit, whom we call God, to whom the humblest and most forlorn soul may look up and call Thee Father, receive consolation, hope, and courage.

In its sublime research, philosophy
May measure out the ocean deep—may count
The sands of the sun's rays—but, God! for Thee
There is no weight nor measure:—none can mount
Up to Thy mysteries; reason's brightest spark,
Though kindled by Thy light, in vain would try
To trace Thy counsels, infinite and dark;
And thought is lost ere thought can soar so high,
Even like past moments in eternity.

We come in our weakness, praying for strength; in our perplexities, praying for light; that we may use the faculties Thou hast bestowed upon us to the betterment of mankind, satisfy our longings, and receive Thine approbation. In Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN LAND AT CRISTOBAL, CANAL ZONE.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill H. R. 6222, which is now lying on the Speaker's table, be now taken from the table and the Senate amendment concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls from the Speaker's table and moves to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A 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).

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. As the bill originally passed the House, I remember it was for the correction of title in the Masonic lodge in Panama. Is that the purpose of it?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Does not this Senate amendment change the purpose?

Mr. DENISON. In answer to the question I will state that after the bill passed the House an opinion was rendered by Judge Feuille, attorney for the Canal government, who said that he had serious doubts whether or not the first provision of the bill, as a matter of law, would accomplish the purpose. And he asked that the bill be amended as it is amended. I suggested the amendment to the Senate committee, and they made the amendment as suggested.

Mr. DUPRE. It is still intended to convey the land to the lodge?

Mr. DENISON. The purpose of the amendment is to better accomplish what was sought to be accomplished.

Mr. GARD. I have not seen the amendment to read it, but just heard it read, and I think from the reading of it that the amendment provides for the sale to some one other than the lodge by the Panama Railroad Co.

Mr. DENISON. No; it simply authorizes the Panama Railroad Co. to make conveyance to any person. Of course, they contracted to sell the property to the Masonic lodge, and the only reason they did not do it was because of this flaw in the title.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The situation, then, as I understand it, is that the House bill simply removes the prohibition against the disposition of the property?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. And the attorney thought that the removal of the prohibition would not of itself authorize the sale of the property?

Mr. DENISON. That is it.

Mr. MONDELL. And the amendment goes to the removal of the prohibition as well as authorizing the sale?

Mr. GARD. But under the original title it authorized the sale.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, the amendment was made at the suggestion of the attorney for the Canal government. It has the approval of the Panama Railroad Co., I suppose, and of all parties concerned.

Mr. GARD. It has not gone back to the committee for its consideration?

Mr. DENISON. I consulted with the chairman of the committee in regard to the matter, and from my understanding with the chairman I suggested the amendment myself which was made by the Senate, and I think it will meet the approval of the committee.

Mr. GARD. But it has not been considered by the House committee since the Senate amendment was made?

Mr. DENISON. No; but it is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I will.

Mr. WINGO. Unfortunately for me, my attention was diverted. What was the provision in the House bill?

Mr. DENISON. The provision of the House bill was that this tract of land upon which the Masonic Temple had been built be taken out from under the operation of the Executive order of the President in 1912 expropriating all land and land under water in the Canal Zone.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, your House bill removed the inhibition which prohibited the sale or transfer of this property to this lodge?

Mr. DENISON. That is the effect of the bill as it is now.

Mr. WINGO. What is the Senate amendment to which the gentleman asks us to agree?

Mr. DENISON. The Senate amendment simply authorizes the Panama Railroad Co. to go ahead and make conveyance, as the title was in the Panama Railroad Co. before the order of expropriation.

Mr. WINGO. I gathered from the question of the gentleman from Ohio that the Senate amendment authorized the conveyance to anyone instead of those people who had put the building there?

Mr. DENISON. Well, we did not know to what particular persons they wanted to make conveyance nor what words they wished to use, so we made the grant of authority general.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is satisfied that the Senate amendment will permit the carrying out of this intention of the company to convey this title to the lodge which has now been built on it, and that it is satisfactory to them?

Mr. DENISON. I am sure it will have that effect.

Mr. GARD. The original act which I have in my hand provides for the withdrawal of a certain tract of land, describing it as a tract of land, lot No. 641, and so forth. It is a withdrawal from the operation of the act of Congress known as the Panama Canal act, and provides for an absolute withdrawal. Now, this amendment provides:

That the Panama Railroad Co. is hereby authorized to sell, transfer, and convey said lots or tracts of land with all improvements thereon to any other person or persons or association of persons and retain the consideration therefor for its own use.

Mr. DENISON. You see the title was in the Panama Railroad Co. before the order of expropriation, and it was not intended or thought that these lots in the city of Colon would go to the Government with the other lands in the Canal Zone under the order of expropriation; but after the Panama Railroad Co. had given the lodge an option on it and attempted to make the conveyance the attorneys found this land was included in the general order of expropriation, and the title passed constructively to the Government.

Mr. WINGO. Is it true that the reason you do not specify the names of persons to whom the land is to be conveyed is because you do not know the names of the trustees of that lodge?

Mr. DENISON. That is it. And we did not know but what there had been new trustees chosen since our last communication with them. Nor did we know but that the method of financing the sale to the lodge might require the conveyance of title temporarily to other parties.

Mr. WINGO. You did not have the names of the trustees?

Mr. DENISON. No; we did not know their names.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I believe the amendment ordinarily should go back to the committee for its determination, but if the gentleman is satisfied with the conditions I will not object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

SALE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 406, with Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon calls up a House bill with Senate amendments, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 406) amending an act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., certain public lands in California; and granting rights in, over, and through the Sierra Forest Reserve, the Santa Barbara Forest Reserve, and the San Gabriel Timberland Reserve, Calif., to the city of Los Angeles, Calif.," approved June 30, 1906.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate amendment No. 7 with an amendment as follows:

After the word "page" strike out the figure "5" and insert the figure "6."

The purpose of that amendment is to correct a typographical error in the message, and I move to concur in the other Senate amendments.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman explain the other Senate amendments? From the reading at the desk we could not understand them.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will first report the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SINNOTT: Amendment No. 7: Strike out the figure "5" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "6."

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 406 granted certain rights of way and privileges to the city of Los Angeles to enable the city to secure an additional power and water supply for the city. The Senate by its amendment has restricted and lessened and regulated the right granted by the House. It has really diminished the right and given certain protection to parties interested in irrigation where the grant is desired.

Mr. GARD. I think the matter should be explained. I am frank to say that a great deal of adverse criticism has come to my attention regarding this bill, both at the time of the passage and since.

Mr. SINNOTT. Whatever additional explanation the gentleman wants I shall be glad to give.

The first amendment modifies the House provision. There was no restriction upon the right granted by the House. The word "such" is inserted in the Senate provision, and also "as have heretofore been constructed." Now, that confines the grant to the canals, ditches, and so forth, heretofore constructed by the city. The second amendment eliminates from the act

certain lands that are now in controversy in the court. That does not apply to those lands if the court finds that they have been illegally purchased. The third Senate amendment is for the purpose of clarity. It strikes out the following language—

Mr. GARD. What is the second amendment? Is it about litigation now in court affecting the title to the land?

Mr. SINNOTT. Affecting the title to the land. A certain power company is endeavoring to circumvent the efforts of the city to secure its rights under a prior grant.

Mr. GARD. There seems to be a suspicion that this is in the interest of the power company instead of in the interest of the city.

Mr. SINNOTT. The power company has been fighting this legislation. And if it is found the lands have been illegally purchased they will be eliminated from the provisions of this grant.

The fourth amendment further limits the rights given to the city by reserving the right to the Government to grant rights of way for road purposes over the land granted. The next amendment to the last provides that in considering the application of the city the consideration of such applications by the department shall be upon the merits of such applications, unaffected by any possible conflict with the plans of the city. That is to protect certain irrigation districts which desire rights of way and certain rights over the land in question. The other amendment is that the approval of the rights of way for reservoir purposes shall not be made without the consent of the parties having irrigation rights. That is also to protect the proposed irrigators of that section of the State.

Mr. GARD. Is there any protection for the United States of America in this bill as to its public land?

Mr. SINNOTT. The whole matter rests with the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GARD. Is it necessary to submit the plans to the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. SINNOTT. They all have to be submitted to the Secretary and be approved by him, and the work must be undertaken within a certain time.

Mr. GARD. How much additional land is put in here by the Senate amendment?

Mr. SINNOTT. There is no additional land put in by the Senate amendment. The rights granted by the House are diminished by the Senate amendment.

Mr. GARD. Of course it is difficult to understand it by the reading of it, but as I understood it seemed to me the Senate amendment provided for other land than that contained in the House enactment.

Mr. SINNOTT. That is not true.

Mr. GARD. It did not?

Mr. SINNOTT. It did not.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments with the amendment.

The amendments were agreed to.

ADDITION TO THE CARIBOU NATIONAL FOREST.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Caribou National Forest, with Senate amendments, and move to agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon calls up the bill H. R. 4311, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Caribou National Forest.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to add some 60,000 acres to the Caribou National Forest in Idaho.

The first Senate amendment eliminates the following language in line 6 of the House bill: "or regulation and improvement of the grazing thereon." The language of the bill left will permit additions to the forest of lands chiefly valuable for the production of timber or the protection of stream flow, a real forest purpose. The language eliminated would have enabled the Secretary to add lands to the forest nontimbered lands and land of no value for forest purposes, but only valuable for grazing purposes. The Secretary of the Interior in his letter to the Senate committee asked for the elimination of that language. He said if Congress was going to adopt the policy of adding purely and solely grazing lands to the national forests, that should be done by general legislation.

The second amendment was one suggested by the Secretary of the Interior. As the House bill had it it read: "All lands embraced in any lawful application or entry pending at the

date of the approval of this act be, and the same are hereby, excluded from the provisions of this act." Under the House language if there was a pending homestead entry at the time of the passage of this act on any land, even though the land was proper land to include within the forest reserve, it could not be included. The Forest Service or the Department of Agriculture suggested the following language in lieu of the House language:

The inclusion of any of the aforesaid lands in the Caribou National Forest shall not affect adversely any valid application or entry pending at the date of the approval of this act.

The language in both cases was designed to protect the homestead entryman, but under the House language should the homestead entryman abandon his homestead entry, the land would not be included within the forest reserve, but under the language suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture in case the homestead entry was abandoned or found invalid or not made in good faith, then the land would automatically be included within the forest reserve, and that is the purpose of the amendment.

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

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. GARD. As I understand from the gentleman's statement of it, the first amendment of the Senate eliminates all regulation of grazing land as the House carried it in the bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. No; not the regulation of grazing.

Mr. GARD. What was the language stricken out?

Mr. SINNOTT. "Or regulation and improvement of the grazing thereon."

Mr. GARD. Then that strikes out regulation.

Mr. SINNOTT. No; it strikes out that standard for including the land, "that any of the lands within the following described area, if not valuable for grazing purposes," that land is not to go within the forest.

Mr. GARD. This refers to the land?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes; the standard for judging the land.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the votes whereby the Senate amendments to the two bills were agreed to, and move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further 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.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 14335, the deficiency bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Pending that, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. How much time does the gentleman expect to devote to extraneous debate on the bill?

Mr. GOOD. One hour and a half was proposed, but I hope to cut that down.

Mr. BLANTON. Then we will begin reading the bill for amendment?

Mr. GOOD. No; there is some time left for general debate to the other side. This is the last of the appropriation bills, and we want to accommodate Members on both sides.

Mr. BLANTON. Will we have to sit up late at night and listen to some more of this wind jamming?

Mr. GOOD. No; I hope not; but we will probably have some conference reports to act upon.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 14335, the deficiency bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the deficiency bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A 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.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, every administration—or, I may say, almost every one—from the beginning of the Government to the present time has been marked by some outstanding event of legislation, some of them adversely rather than favorably. The first, quite naturally, was marked by the many acts necessary to put the Constitution in operation. The administration of the elder Adams was marked by the alien and sedition laws. Jefferson's administration will always be looked upon as the one administration that started the expansion of the country, so far as territory goes, in the purchase of Louisiana. Madison's administration was principally marked by the War of 1812. Monroe's administration probably will be longest remembered by the doctrine that bears his name, which makes the name of Monroe better understood in Europe than that of any other American unless it would be the names of Washington, Lincoln, Roosevelt, and President Wilson—the latter not with credit that it once promised, for reasons apparent to us all. Jackson's administration will always be regarded as the one in which the outstanding event was the fight against the national bank idea and the specie circular. Polk's administration will be remembered by the Mexican War. Lincoln's administration, among other things that will mark it, will be remembered by the great Civil War; Grant's by the reconstruction effort; Hayes's by the resumption of specie payments and the introduction of the civil-service system. Garfield's administration was short-lived because of the assassination soon after he took his seat. Cleveland's first administration will be remembered by the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the unfortunate tariff law known as the Wilson tariff bill; his second by his stand for the integrity of the Monroe doctrine. Harrison's administration will always be remembered by the antitrust law of 1890, known as the Sherman Antitrust Act, and the McKinley bill of the same year.

And so on down the line. Almost every administration has at least one outstanding piece of legislation. Those of McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft were all marked by important constructive legislation. The first administration of President Wilson will be remembered by the Underwood tariff bill, which will not be very savory, except the income-tax feature, which was made possible by an amendment introduced and passed by a Republican Congress and ratified by Republican States. The Federal reserve act, which has a good many qualities of redemption, since it was drafted upon the basis of the Aldrich Monetary Commission and is copied from the Aldrich bill, will also mark the first Wilson administration. The only features of value in it were what were found in the former measure, written into it by Republicans. [Laughter.]

Those features for which we are now apologizing are the things that Republicans tried to prevent. [Applause.] I know this statement is not welcome and it will create some opposition on the part of our Democratic friends, who claim everything for the law, which sees the Nation to-day in the midst of dangerous inflation. I think later on in our development the opposition to what I am now stating will vanish, as it is well known that the measure did not come into effect until long after the World War had broken.

The last administration of President Wilson, of course, will always be identified with the Great War, in which we are still weltering because the President prefers it to reservations on his league. This present Congress, which our Democratic friends like to assault, has passed more legislation, not only in quantity but in quality, than any other Congress in the same length of time that ever sat under this roof. It has passed some legislation that in the future will demonstrate it to be one of the constructive legislative bodies of our history. It has worked from a plan adopted in the beginning and is about to complete its program. The railroad bill, made necessary because of the unwise political operation of this vast industry for a time, which has been assaulted viciously, and which I am sorry a Democrat very recently referred to as a piece of legislation unduly delayed, is one of the great pieces of constructive legislation in a century. Those who claim that it was delayed are not speaking seriously and would not so speak to this group of Congressmen. The outside public not conversant with legislative procedure might think it was delayed. The time of the Congress was taken up from May 19, when the Congress first came in session, until July 1, when the fiscal year ended, in the passage of the appropriation bills that had to be passed in order that the Government could run. We did this on record time and saved the Government \$40,000,000 a day every day in session.

Immediately following the passage of those bills the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee began its hearings, and con-

tinued in daily session listening to testimony, both forenoon and afternoon, and almost every day, from the early part of July until October. And, gentlemen of this committee, the best expert information that has ever been gathered by any committee upon any great question in the history of this Government was heard by that committee. These hearings supply the finest body of information upon a great question ever collected. During the hearings, supplying the information upon which legislation was to be drafted, there were 32 plans proposed, and those 32 were sifted down to 7 specific plans.

Those seven specific plans were strongly backed, not only by the ability of their advocates but by a marshaling of facts that demanded the attention of the entire country. Finally, the committee took those seven claims, eliminating what the committee thought was dangerous in all, and adopted what the committee thought was safe in all, and presented the bill to this Congress. It was reported here sometime in October. It was thoroughly debated and passed. In the meantime the Senate was working upon the Senate bill which passed that body. In December a conference was held between the committees of the House and the Senate, and from December until the middle of February, without the loss of a day, including Sundays, the conference committee worked upon the two bills and finally brought them in here, where they were passed against some considerable opposition on one side of the Chamber, but by a safe majority made up not only of Republicans but partly of Democrats as well. There was no delay. Time for consideration of such a measure is necessary. No consideration could deny the time. No piece of legislation that ever came to a body of legislators had back of it such expert information, such strength of advocacy, and no piece of legislation was given such wide and impartial and capable consideration as the railroad bill. And when you realize that we were dealing with the interest that represents \$20,000,000,000 and involves the property rights of owners and thousands of security holders as well as 2,000,000 laborers, and encompasses 20,000,000 of our people directly interested in a pecuniary way, if you count those affiliated with the railway business, one-fifth of the population of the United States, and which involves the welfare of the entire population of the Nation, I say that a solution of that problem will forever redound to the credit and glory of this Republican Congress. [Applause.] It was a problem that was made more dangerous by the Democratic administration having involved the whole railway system in its political operation of the railroads, under which such deterioration of property, service, and general morale had to be suffered. It is a piece of legislation that will stand out as the very acme of constructive legislative ability of any Congress that has been in session within the memory of any man to-day living. And as other administrations are remembered by outstanding pieces of legislation, so this Congress will be equally remembered by the outstanding accomplishment of the railway legislation, which is but one of others of similar importance.

This Congress is called upon to reconstruct the Nation's business. The very phraseology suggests what we have been compelled to suffer. Extravagance in war and many other elements have embarrassed the country with high cost of everything in a falling off of production, due to different causes and administration of laws. We attempted to make possible increased production. This Congress passed the water-power bill, a bill designed to utilize the waste of nature at a moment when the world suffers from lack of production. All of this cheap talk about reducing the cost of living without adding in some way to the increase of production and decrease of extravagance by the Government induced by the war is tommyrot of the worst sort. It is mere demagoguery and does no credit to the Member who employs it. You can not reduce the cost of living until you increase production and increase the efficiency of the producers. [Applause.] Instead of this Congress talking demagoguery for political purposes, a practice not confined to Congress, it goes straight to the center of the difficulty and proposes to utilize the waste in production that otherwise would not be utilized. [Applause.] The water-power bill has been before the American Congress for over 12 years. It took a Republican Congress, House and Senate, to do what a Democratic Congress, House and Senate, had been unable to do in the 10 years that party controlled this House, beginning with 1910. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman from Ohio think it entirely fair for him, as one of the leading Republicans of this House, to claim the entire credit for the water-power bill, when he remembers that it passed a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate in identically the same form in which it was

passed at this session, and was only prevented from becoming a law in the former Congress by a filibuster in the Senate which was made by a few Republicans?

Mr. FESS. My friend evidently feels hurt that this Congress is able to do what the last Democratic Congress could not do, and he does not want me to claim all the credit, just as I do not want my friend to claim the credit for the good that is in the Federal Reserve System, because the Democrats borrowed it bodily from the Republican idea. [Applause.]

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. SINNOTT. Does not the gentleman think the party in control of the last Congress was guilty of contributory negligence in the very matter of that filibuster?

Mr. FESS. I certainly do, for the reason that some of the bills that went over from the Democratic House to the Senate did not get there until the 3d of March, and some of the House bills were not even reported to the Senate by the Democratic Senate committees. That was not the fault of the Republicans. That was the fault of the Democrats who controlled both branches of Congress and the Executive, who were guilty of delaying the passage of such an important bill until the closing days of the session when eight supply bills, some unreported to the Senate, could not be delayed.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. IGOE. I am glad to know that Republicans concede that there is some good in the Federal reserve act.

Mr. FESS. Oh, yes; the Republicans concede that. They had worked on the monetary commission for years and reported a good bill.

Mr. IGOE. I am glad to know that.

Mr. FESS. Republicans concede that there are splendid virtues in it, because in passing the Federal reserve act the Democrats adopted those splendid Republican ideas. [Applause.] It is the same thing with reference to the Federal Trade Commission. Mark you, the Federal Trade Commission was the creation of President Taft, and it was good in its inception, but the same faults that you find in the Federal Reserve Board, namely, its administration, you find now in the Federal Trade Commission which has been absolutely honeycombed by the socialists that have taken possession of it.

Mr. IGOE. That is what the packers say about it.

Mr. FESS. Well, the truth should not be unwelcome, no matter who tells it. Gentlemen of the committee, the water-power bill is not the only thing looking to increased production. The gas, oil, and coal lands leasing bill is a second measure that is again to utilize the powers of production as a substantial method to reduce the high cost of living. It is a creature of this Congress, and is a measure that a Democratic Congress for 10 years was unable to pass. [Applause.] That has also become a law.

In addition to that, we have gone as far as this Congress could go to enfranchise one-half of the American people by the extension of suffrage to the women of the country. [Applause.] The very first act of this Congress, by an overwhelming vote, was the enactment of this reform. The Republicans are hopeful that the closing drama may take place to-day over in Delaware; and if it does, look at the record. But whatever happens, Republicans are pledged to see this right given under the law. There were 204 votes on this side of the House for it, with but 18 against it, or the ratio of 11 to 1, and on the other side not sufficient to mention; 44 of the Democratic votes for it came from Republican States. Subsequently 29 Republican States have ratified it, and not a single Republican State up to date has rejected it. Eight of the 29 did not cast a single vote against it in either House or Senate. Six Democratic States have ratified it, and 6 Democratic States have rejected it. I do not know that I need to inject that activity of this Congress, but I do not want my friend from Alabama to insist that that is a Democratic measure, because it passed in spite of Democratic friends, although some Democratic States voted for it.

That is not all. This Congress has gone to the extent of its ability—aided by a loyal group of Democrats, it is true—in abolishing for all time from our midst the saloon business in America, and it has passed a law to enforce that decree. The time will come, if it is not already here, when this legislation will stand out as a great enough reform to distinguish any Congress.

Mr. Chairman, these are some of the measures looking directly to improving conditions of production.

This Congress has also enacted some of the most far-reaching measures on behalf of the toilers.

The industrial cripples' bill, now before the President awaiting his signature, is an epoch in constructive and remedial legislation. It proposes, by cooperation with the States, to train the unfortunates of industry, including the farm, so as to make them self-supporting rather than subjects of charity and victims of misfortune.

This Congress has also passed the retirement bill—a proposed form of legislation before the country for the past 20 years. It has also passed a minimum-wage bill, another measure for years demanding in vain a favorable action. It has also created a Woman's Bureau, to be a part of the Labor Department.

It will to-morrow put through the House the postal relief bill, upon which the committee has been laboring night and day in order to get the facts upon which rational action can be based.

I challenge any Congress to show a record of constructive and remedial legislation for the betterment of labor equal to this.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans are not ungrateful. They have made their record upon their gratitude toward the Nation's defenders on land and sea. Liberal legislation for the care of the disabled and infirm and their dependents has ever marked Republican policy toward the soldiers and sailors of all the wars in which our country has participated. The present Congress has appropriated generously for the disabled of the World War. The amounts already applied and authorized for the fiscal year 1920-21 for this purpose reach the stupendous sum of \$1,180,671,893. This legislation is significant of the party's purpose in generously caring for the maimed and disabled men of the recent war.

Mr. Chairman, we all grant that the war Congress was faced with stupendous problems, the problems of a successful ending of the issue.

Republicans took the lead not only in urging preparation when the President cautioned Congress not to become "nervous" but in supplying the legislation necessary when we had entered it. The record is made up. The votes are entered, and any man with the hardihood to deny it ignores the printed official record known to most of the country. Knowing the inevitable tendency to use war for excuse for extravagance, Republicans at once attempted to create a committee on expenditure to guard against the useless wastes.

The President, instead of welcoming the cooperation of Congress, which was Democratic in both branches, demanded the proposal killed, which was accordingly done. A second attempt by Republicans met the same fate.

The array of facts epitomized but yesterday upon this floor by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], chairman of the War Expenditures Committee, leaves no further comment necessary upon the wisdom of the Republican proposal, but this array must hold the administration responsible for the orgy of extravagance. No man who lives to-day will see or hear the last of the claims demanded from the Government permitted by the War Department and other kindred responsible heads.

This Congress, alive to the real problem, saw at once the necessity of denying appropriations for every unnecessary agency. It ordered the dismantling of the war machine. Its difficulty is shown by the fact that while Government employees in Washington before the war numbered 37,000, to-day, two years after the war, we still have over 100,000 on the pay roll in Washington. Congress ordered in one bill a reduction of 40,000, to begin with July 1, by refusing to appropriate for them.

Every conceivable interest was exploited for the war, and now all power turned upon Congress to continue them, such as the infamous Muscle Shoals proposition, which interests are now, this very moment, attempting in the name of the farmer to turn into a nitrate plant. The present session has succeeded in saving below executive requests over a billion dollars.

In order to guard the future against such preposterous situations, the Congress only yesterday took the last and only other needed step to adopt a real budget system.

Next to the railroad bill, this legislation is the most important; indeed, many think it the most important of all the measures thus far passed. It will take its place alongside in importance of the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Sherman Antitrust Act, as the farthest reaching in its significance for the people of this Nation in this time of fiscal burdens.

Mr. Chairman, there are other measures too numerous for me to take the time to mention, because my time is limited now to a very few minutes.

I want to read you some facts. If there is any just criticism that anybody can make against this Congress, it is not that we have not done anything, because we have been so busy that we placed more laws on the statute books than any Congress that ever sat has placed on the books. [Applause.]

Let me illustrate what I mean. I want my Democratic friends to note this: This Congress convened on May 19, 1919. Take the date up to June 1, 1920, and then take the Democratic Congress, the Sixty-fifth, and bring it up to June 1, 1918, and compare the two. The calendar days will be 367 for this Congress to 368 for the Sixty-fifth Congress.

The bills introduced in the Sixty-sixth Congress up to June 1, 1920, were 14,344, as against 12,351 of the Sixty-fifth Congress; joint resolutions, 369 as against 298; simple resolutions, 576 as against 369; concurrent resolutions, 60 as against 11. Summing up, 15,349 as against 13,029.

Comparing the Sixty-sixth Congress up to June 1 with the Sixty-fifth Congress up to June 1, public laws were 250 in this Congress and 163 in the Sixty-fifth Congress. Public resolutions 48 in this Congress and 31 in the prior Congress. Private laws and resolutions 59 in this Congress and 6 in the Sixty-fifth Congress. Committee reports on the Union Calendar 348 in this Congress and 223 in the last Congress.

On the House Calendar there were 230 as against 161 in the Sixty-fifth Congress. On the Private Calendar 251, as against 91, a total of 829, as against 475. This shows committee action on legislation.

Reported bills acted upon by this Congress, 202 on the Union Calendar, 148 on the House Calendar, 82 on the Private Calendar, making 432. Pending, 397; total, 829.

Resolutions agreed to: Simple resolutions 227, as against 123. House concurrent resolutions 18, as against 25. This is one case where the Sixty-fifth Congress went beyond this Congress. Senate concurrent resolutions 9, as against 5. Totals, 254 for this Congress to 153 for the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Gentlemen of the committee, propaganda was early started by our Democratic friends in the hope of correcting a blunder that was made by the President of the Nation when he demanded by letter the return of a Democratic Congress, and from that moment that propaganda has been assiduously worked overtime by our Democratic friends, by the national Democratic committee and the congressional committee, to put upon this Congress the label of doing nothing when the facts of record indisputably prove that it has done more than any Congress that ever sat in the same time, and the reporters will tell you, if you refer to them, that so far as their knowledge goes, not a single Congress but one in the past, and that was years ago, have gone so rapidly in the business of the Government as has this Congress. Let me assure you that there will be a different story told when the facts are given to the people, which will not be deferred beyond the opening of the campaign of education.

In conclusion, summing up the work of this Congress, there was the greatest outstanding single attempt at legislation to cure the one difficult problem we inherited from the war, namely, providing revenue to pay the stupendous burdens of debt, taking steps in time to reduce taxation, stopping extravagance, turning war material back into peace channels, get away from a war basis to a peace basis, going straight to the remedy, namely, increased production. We adjure you to stop your tomfoolery talk about reducing the high cost of living by more legislation and proceed to use what legislation your administration has, if the remedy is in that line. [Applause.]

It must not be forgotten that all this was accomplished while the Senate was in the struggle, and a successful struggle, to preserve the independence and sovereignty of the Nation against the insistence of one man, who by his own will has decided that peace shall not be declared so long as he can prevent it or until his unmodified league is accepted, which, of course, means the beginning of wars. The issue will not be long deferred.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, two days ago I secured unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of Federal aid to road building. That extension did not appear in the RECORD and at this time I renew my request to so extend my remarks in the RECORD.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATIC ACHIEVEMENTS IN ROAD BUILDING.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, the achievements of the Democratic Party while in control of the Government, expressed in constructive, beneficial legislation, are too well known to need emphasis now. It is sufficient to contrast this brilliant record by Democratic Congresses with weak, vacillating, colorless, leaderless, nothingness that characterizes the present Republican-controlled Congress, which has not a single constructive measure to its credit.

CHEAP POLITICS BY REPUBLICANS.

The present Republican millionaire steering committee, in complete control of this Congress, using methods so autocratic

as to cause "UNCLE JOE" to smile when "Cannonism" is mentioned, is without courage to proceed constructively for the good of the people and is afraid to permit the minority to initiate wholesome legislation. The Republicans in this Congress have but one thought, and that is how to get control of the White House through the next national election. As an example of autocratic methods, they limited all debate Saturday, May 29, on the soldier bonus bill to 40 minutes and refused to permit any amendment. Gag rule with a vengeance! Afraid a tax on war profiteers would be substituted for the proposed Republican consumption tax! Instead of transacting the people's business, they play cheap politics incessantly. Instead of returning the country promptly to an honorable peace basis, repealing war measures, and proceeding vigorously to the adjustment of social and economic conditions, they fritter away the time in partisan wrangling and squander the public funds in political investigations and other nauseating personal and partisan political performances to the chagrin of the Democrats in Congress and to the disgust of the American people.

BRILLIANT DEMOCRATIC ACHIEVEMENTS.

In striking contrast with the pitiable spectacle of Republican inefficiency are the achievements of the Democratic Party. The results during Democratic control of Congress are written in the bronze of history. The record of accomplishment is without parallel in the annals of American Government. Constructive measures successfully dealing with finance, industry, tariff, human welfare, commerce, and credit were written by Democrats into law. In no instance did the Democratic Congresses evade or ignore. Tariff revision, the Federal reserve act, the Federal Trade Commission, rural credits, extension of parcel-post system and motor-truck lines, the Clayton antitrust law, child-labor law, eight-hour day, workmen's compensation, the development of natural resources, seaman's law, the shipping act, the income-tax law, the vocational education act, the election of Senators by direct vote, the abrogation of boss rule in Congress, publicity of campaign expenses, the corrupt-practices act, marine insurance, soldier's insurance, the warehouse bill, the agricultural extension law, nitrate plants, the Bureau of Markets, farm-loan bonds, Federal land bank, establishment of the Department of Labor, the Children's Bureau, and the Federal-aid road law are but a part of Democratic achievement. Along with other Democrats since I have been in Congress, I have supported these measures wholeheartedly.

DEMOCRATIC ROAD BUILDING.

My purpose to-day is to present but one of these great constructive Democratic measures.

Three hundred years ago the people had a faint vision of the value of good roads when the Virginia Colony recognized the principle by colonial legislation. One hundred and thirty years ago this vision found expression in the privately owned toll road, again in the old national road under President Jefferson, and again in the stagecoach roads, then in the State and turnpike roads; but it was left to a Democratic Congress to clarify this vision and crystallize this sentiment in 1913 by creating in the House the permanent Committee on Roads. Although the Federal Constitution authorizes Federal road building, nothing was done from Jefferson to Wilson. The long period of Republican rule is properly named the "dark ages" in Federal road building. The Democrats proceeded to act efficiently. In 1916 a Democratic Congress passed the Federal aid road act appropriating \$75,000,000, and established as a governmental policy the principle of Federal aid to road building in the States.

EFFECT FAR-REACHING.

Upon the passage of the act making this appropriation the Federal Government proceeded promptly to cooperate with and utilize the existing State highway departments, but it was found that 17 States had no highway department with which the Federal Government could cooperate under the terms of the act. The earliest and most far-reaching effect of the new legislation was to bring about the creation of an adequate highway department in each State. In one year more constructive State highway legislation was put upon the statute books than had ever before been enacted in the history of the country. A wholesome condition was brought about which otherwise would not have been reached in many years. The conditions laid down by the Federal aid act operated most powerfully in strengthening State highway departments, the placing of road construction under skilled supervision, the standardization of road-construction methods, and the creation of large funds for construction and maintenance.

In harmony with road improvement since the passage of the Federal aid act, 59,427 miles of additional rural mail service, 1,993 miles of star routes, and 1,250 miles of motor-truck lines have been established.

REQUIREMENTS OF ACT.

The Federal aid road act requires, first, that the State legislatures shall assent to the provisions of the act; second, that each State shall have a State highway department, which department shall have direct supervision over the construction of roads on which Federal funds are to be expended; third, Federal aid shall be met by an appropriation of at least an equal amount of State funds, the highway department representing the State and its subdivisions.

PROGRESS STIMULATED.

In 1915, the year before the passage of the Federal aid act, the total expenditure for roads and bridges by all the States and local governments in the United States was estimated at \$267,000,000. It is estimated that the funds available in the States for highway improvement for the year 1920 are in excess of \$600,000,000.

My own State of Louisiana, having made provisions to meet the Federal aid road fund, will receive \$3,742,524.57 of the funds already appropriated to June 30, 1921. The number of miles in Louisiana of roads completed, under contract, or approved to date is 534.22.

WAR PERIOD ROAD BUILDING.

The Federal aid road act was signed by President Wilson on July 11, 1916. It provided an appropriation of \$75,000,000 over a period of five years to aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and \$10,000,000 for the construction and maintenance of forest roads.

The operation of the law had hardly begun when war with Germany was declared. Other interests were subordinated to war work, and Federal aid road construction was immediately curtailed to release vitally necessary men and materials for war purposes. The War Department during the emergency, on its own account, constructed 1,075 miles of excellent roads in the United States, 846 miles of which are paved, at a total cost of \$17,562,341. But the Federal aid act was on the statute books, the principle was established, and upon the signing of the armistice road work was promptly resumed under this beneficial act.

FEDERAL MONEY AVAILABLE.

The total Federal appropriations to date for road building in the States to June 30, 1921, are \$275,000,000, apportioned according to area, population, and mileage of rural delivery and star routes in each State, each of these factors having a weight of one-third. The sum of \$19,000,000 has been appropriated for forest road building.

BUREAU OF ROADS EFFICIENT.

Under the law the Secretary of Agriculture is charged with the administration of the provisions of the Federal aid act. He has delegated this duty to the Bureau of Public Roads. This bureau, through experience, has become very efficient and is in closer touch with the highway situation and requirements of the country, as a whole, than any other agency in the United States. It consists of a headquarters force in Washington and 13 district engineers in charge of the work in 13 groups of States.

The Bureau of Roads, being thoroughly progressive and scientific, has corrected many errors in road building and become the controlling influence in standardization of the details of specifications and methods used in the construction of the various types of road the country over. The bureau is a clearing house for the collection and dissemination of the best ideas of all State forces, and through its contact with all the States it is able to raise the standard of construction in many States by directing attention to improved methods in use in other States. With experience, this improvement will continue to advance. The Bureau of Roads, in close cooperation with State and county authorities, is the most efficient agency in promoting substantial and permanent road building in the States. No commission or body of men sitting in Washington could do the work half so well or in double the time.

ACTUAL WORK.

The Federal aid act properly requires that road projects for Federal aid be initiated by the States. Up to March 31, 1920, 2,602 projects, involving a total of 26,012.6 miles of roads, had been approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. The preliminary estimate of the cost of these projects is \$326,750,928.76, of which \$139,840,901.63 will be approved as Federal aid. On the same date 1,590 projects, representing approximately 15,350 miles, had either been completed or were under construction. The estimated total cost of these projects is \$160,000,000, and, as they average about 40 per cent completed, the value of the work which had been done up to March 31 is \$64,000,000.

The total cost of Federal aid work approved by the Secretary of Agriculture in the year and a half subsequent to the signing of the armistice and prior to March 31, 1920, is \$274,000,000.

exceeding by \$7,000,000 the cost of all road and bridge work done by States and counties in the United States in the year 1915. This sum is only \$100,000,000 less than the total cost of the Panama Canal. The work of this Government in the construction of the canal has been regarded the world over as a record-breaking achievement in respect to the dispatch with which it was carried out. The cost of that work was \$373,000,000, requiring 10 years to complete it, the rate of expenditure being \$37,000,000 a year. The record has been surpassed by the Federal Government and the States in the construction of Federal aid roads since the armistice. This rate has been attained in the face of the worst economic conditions in a century, and in spite of railroad strikes, inadequate transportation facilities, and shortage of construction materials and labor.

DEMOCRATIC COOPERATION.

In road building the Federal Government and the several States are acting in the closest cooperation. The dual interest of the Federal and State governments is recognized throughout. The States have the larger interest in the development of good roads, since 90 per cent of the traffic is local in character. Yet the Federal Government also has an interest in the betterment of the avenues along which this local traffic flows. A large part of it is the traffic from farms to shipping points and nearby cities and towns. Any improvement which expedites this traffic will go far to ease the existing critical situation in respect to the supply of agricultural products. This we must regard as most important. The Federal aid act is helping mightily in increasing farm-land values, the betterment of the conditions of rural life, the promoting of educational and social opportunities of our rural communities, and the development of the inherent attractions of country life. No special roads are needed for purposes of military defense, except to connect points of strategic importance. In the main, the highway requirements of war coincide with those of peace.

The Chief of the Bureau of Roads has therefore called into consultation the several agencies interested in the development of roads for the several purposes, including the War Department, the several State highway departments, and other similar agencies representative, respectively, of the National, State, and local needs. In conference with these agencies a systematic program of permanent highway development is being outlined. The roads which are required for national development are in no way separate from those required for State development. The Federal aid act recognizes this fact and provides for cooperation between the National and State Governments, permitting the Federal Government to participate in the cost of construction to the extent of 50 per cent. The States are required to pay at least the other half of the cost. That such a division of the cost is considered equitable is evidenced by the fact that the States themselves, of their own volition, are actually paying 60 per cent of the cost of the construction which is now proposed and underway.

GOOD RESULTS.

When the Democratic Congress in 1916 enacted the Federal aid act it was not possible to estimate accurately the extraordinary interest in highways that would follow and the vast resources which the States and their subdivisions were willing to invest in highway improvement. In order to meet Federal aid, State after State has passed special tax laws or issued bonds, or, where prevented by constitutional law or otherwise, the counties of States have themselves issued bonds and placed the proceeds at the disposal of the various State highway departments.

MARVELOUS ACHIEVEMENTS.

The development of highway financing, started and stimulated by Federal aid, has been truly astounding. Immediately upon becoming familiar with the terms of the Federal aid act, bond issues were voted throughout the country, conditioned upon the matching of the bond money by the Federal Government. This process has developed until we now find a reserve fund held by many States and counties amounting to over half a billion dollars, which funds will greatly exceed all Federal money now provided. This process is continuing. Several States will vote on new bond issues this fall, and many county bond issues already remain unsold and unavailable until more Federal aid and insurance of careful Federal supervision are provided. *That the Federal aid road act is a marvelous Democratic achievement no one will deny.*

REPUBLICAN FAILURE.

The present appropriations for road building will end June 30, 1921. No provision has been made by the present Congress to continue Federal aid after that date. Thirty-six State legislatures meet in biennial session next January and six meet in annual session at that time, when the 42 States will desire

to make provisions to meet Federal aid for road building in the States, but will have no assurance from Congress. To meet this serious situation in the States 36 bills, most of them by Democrats, are now pending but ignored by this Congress.

As a final effort to get action for the States I have introduced H. R. 14255 continuing the present Federal aid road program through a period of four years. As a ranking member of the great Committee on Roads, I am eager to continue and increase the inestimable blessings of Federal aid to road building for many years to come. Nothing could mean more to our material progress and to the proper development of our immeasurable resources.

Failure to act by this Congress before the January sessions of the 42 State legislatures will be another shining example of Republican stupidity and inefficiency.

When the truth is fully revealed to the country, the record of this Republican-controlled Congress, bossed by a millionaire steering committee, should condemn the Republican Party for all time to come as inefficient and incompetent to handle the country's serious business. Let Republicans name one unselfish, patriotic, constructive measure initiated and enacted into law by them.

Elect a Democratic Congress in November and the money for the proposed soldier bonus to become effective July, 1921, will be raised by taxing the 69,000 war profiteers in the United States; elect a Republican Congress and the burden of this tax will fall upon the consuming public. Are you in favor of taxing the war profiteers or the public?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon the influence of the private soldier and the soldiers and sailors legion in furthering bonus legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BEE. Reserving the right to object, do I understand this refers to the bonus bill?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; to the part of the private soldier and sailor in that legislation.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the press of the country published the report of the Russell Sage Foundation showing the relative rating of the school systems in the several States. This report places Montana, the State I have the honor in part to represent, at the head of the list. On a percentage basis it stands 75.8, more than 5 per cent above its nearest competitor and more than 10 per cent above the District of Columbia. This excellent showing is, of course, very gratifying to me and the people of my State, and if permitted I shall print this brief paper as part of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, about the time this report was made there appeared before the Appropriations Committee a delegation asking that the teachers of Washington be given a bonus of \$500 each to enable them to live in a State commensurate with their station and duties in life. The only bill pending before the committee was this deficiency measure, and in the judgment of the committee this was not a deficiency and could not be attached to this bill under our rules. I am therefore directing attention to the matter in the hope that some way may be found by this or some other bill to give the matter the consideration that the gravity of the subject demands.

Always in our American democracy education is the thing of supreme importance. In a democracy like ours all things wait on education—public health, material wealth, civic righteousness, political power, social purity, spiritual ideals, individual happiness, the strength and safety of the Nation. The public schools, nonpartisan, nonsectarian, nonexclusive, are of all our organizations of education the most important. The efficiency and the effectiveness of the schools depend almost wholly on the teachers, their education, their general culture, their professional knowledge, and their technical skill. Teachers in our public schools are our most important public servants. Upon them as on no others depend the public weal in which the individual welfare is bound up, the happiness of the people, and the prosperity, the strength, and the safety of the Nation. True at all times, the emphasis on this truth is greater at this time of crisis than at any other time in our history, and it is more important now than ever before that all our children shall be taught by competent teachers, that all the schools shall be maintained at the highest state of efficiency.

Yet reports from the Bureau of Education indicate that more than 18,000 schools, or about 3 per cent of the total in the United States, were in January of this year without teachers of any kind, and that more than 40,000, or about 7 per cent of the total, were supplied with teachers whose qualifications

were below the minimum standards of the States in which they taught. If both the vacancies and the places filled by teachers below the minimum standards are counted, there were nearly 60,000 schools, or about 10 per cent of all the schools of the country, without teachers or taught by teachers who would not in normal times be permitted to teach. This shortage of teachers applies to elementary schools and high schools alike. It is especially difficult to find competent teachers for the sciences and technical subjects.

In reality, the shortage of competent teachers is much greater than these figures would indicate, and this greater shortage has long existed. This statement will be better understood when it is remembered that it has long been recognized that for elementary schools the minimum standard of qualifications should be graduation from a good modern high school and not less than two years of professional training in education in addition. Certainly, teachers who are charged with the task of preparing boys and girls for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, and for making a good, honest living, and adding to the common wealth by intelligent and skilled labor, should have no less preparation than this. Yet there are now and always have been a very large number of teachers in our schools with less preparation than this. In only five States is professional training, in addition to graduation from high school, required of teachers in country and village schools. In only 18 States is high-school graduation required as a minimum standard.

Studies made by the Bureau of Education just before we entered the World War indicated that in the country at large 4 per cent of the rural teachers had less than eight years of elementary school; 22 per cent had no high-school education; 55 per cent had less than four years of high-school education. Only 45 per cent were high-school graduates and only 10 per cent graduates of normal schools or colleges. In one of the richest States of the Northwest only 8.2 per cent of the rural and village teachers were graduates of normal schools and colleges; 52.6 per cent had less than high-school education. In one of the Western States 58 per cent of the teachers had high-school education; 42 per cent had no higher education; and only 8 per cent had as much as four years beyond high school. In many States conditions are still worse. Besides having had little general education and little or no professional training, the great majority of rural teachers have little of the power and skill that can come only from experience. On the average, they teach less than 48 months before quitting school for other occupations. In some States the average life of the teacher is less than half this. The average age of the country teacher is less than 25 years. In one State the average of country and village teachers was, before the war, 23 years, and the average time which they had been teaching was only 2 years.

Much more than one-half of all the teachers of the United States have had less preparation than two years beyond the high school, and more than one-half did not teach long enough to acquire the skill which comes from experience.

Remembering that the teacher makes the school and that the school can never be better than the teacher, what can we expect from conditions such as these?

There are probably many causes for this low standard of preparation of teachers and short terms of service, but the most important is the low pay. In the country at large teachers have never been paid salaries in keeping with the importance of their work. Their salaries have never been sufficient to attract and hold in the school men and women of the best native ability, positive and aggressive in character, well educated, and possessed of professional knowledge and skill. Three years ago the Commissioner of Education reported that the average salary of teachers for the United States was less than \$500. In many States the average was less than \$400, and in many counties the average annual salary for rural teachers did not exceed \$300.

Within the last few years the cost of living has increased more than 100 per cent, and wages paid for most kinds of labor, skilled and unskilled, have increased in somewhat the same proportion. But the increase in the pay of teachers has been much less. In a few places the increase has been from 25 to 60 per cent, but in most places it has been less than 25 per cent, and in some there has been no increase at all. As a result, the pay of teachers, always low, is lower in proportion than ever before, and many thousands of the best teachers, both in the elementary and in the high schools, are quitting teaching for more remunerative work, and comparatively few young men and women are being prepared to fill their places.

The attendance in the normal schools, which prepare teachers for the elementary schools, is 20 per cent less this year than it was in 1916, and the proportion of young men and women in the colleges and universities who are preparing themselves for

work as teachers in the high schools is still less. The Commissioner of Education estimates that next fall the number of vacancies in the elementary schools will be at least 80,000 more than the number of new teachers graduating from the normal schools and other schools that prepare elementary teachers, and that the number of high-school positions to be filled will be nearly 20,000 in excess of the number of young men and women graduating from colleges and universities and expecting to teach.

Statistics gathered by the National Education Association last fall from 392 cities show that 9 per cent of the teachers in the elementary schools of these cities were paid less than \$600 a year; 62 per cent between \$600 and \$1,000; 26.7 between \$1,000 and \$1,400; and only 13 teachers out of a thousand in the elementary schools of these cities were paid as much as \$1,500. These were the few best men and women who, beginning with the greatest native ability, most comprehensive education, and the finest culture by long, efficient, and faithful service, have won the confidence of the people and of their representatives on school boards. Street-car conductors and motormen, carpenters, and unskilled workmen in these cities are paid more than the best of the teachers, and the average wages of telegraph messenger boys were greater than the average wages of the school-teachers.

In the schools of the small towns, villages, and open country conditions are worse still. Twenty-five per cent of the teachers in these schools are paid less than \$500 a year; 70 per cent between \$500 and \$1,000; 95 per cent of all the teachers, men and women, in the country and village schools are paid less than \$1,000; and only 1.5 per cent are paid as much as an average of \$100 a month for the entire year. The wages of unskilled farm laborers are considerably larger than the average of the school-teachers. The pay of rural mail carriers is twice as much, and they are not paid enough.

Even in the richer States of the Middle West, which are most proud of their school systems, the conditions are only a little better than the average indicated in this statement. A recent report of the superintendent of public instruction of the State of Illinois shows that the average salary of teachers for last year was only \$848.62. In only one county, Cook County, in which the city of Chicago is located, was the average more than \$1,000, and in more than a dozen counties it was less than \$500.

In proportion the salaries of high-school teachers are no better than those of teachers in the elementary schools. Men and women of the best native ability, who have spent four years or more in college or university and have continued their preparation through long years of study and who have proved their worth by many years of successful teaching, work for less than \$2,000 a year, and consider themselves very fortunate if they ever reach a maximum of \$3,000.

Nor are conditions better in colleges, universities, and normal schools. In the last few years thousands of professors, associates, and instructors have left the institutions of higher learning to enter other occupation in which they receive as beginning wages 50 to 500 per cent more than the wages to which they had attained through long years of service in teaching.

Evidently we must spend more money for teaching if we would make our schools efficient and be sure that our children shall receive the kind of education necessary for their success in the new era. And we shall be wise in doing so. Nothing is more costly than ignorant and unskilled teachers. They waste not only the money paid but also the time and opportunity of the children, and lowers the standards of intelligence, virtue, and skill of the people of the Nation.

The schools of Washington should set the standard of ideals and efficiency for the whole country. This can be done only by making the salaries of teachers sufficient to attract and hold the best. The salaries of these teachers are paid out of the treasury of the District of Columbia and of the United States. I am sure that neither the people of the District nor of the country at large will object to paying all that may be necessary to make the schools of the Capital of the greatest, most powerful, and most wealthy country of the world the model for all the world.

This request of the teachers for a bonus of \$500 is moderate and just. Let us give it to them and then raise their salaries permanently, so that they may correspond to the difficulties and responsibilities and dignity of their task.

OFFICIAL STANDING.

The standing of the 48 States and the District of Columbia:

1. Montana	75.8
2. California	71.2
3. Arizona	66.2
4. New Jersey	65.9
5. District of Columbia	64.3
6. Washington	63.7
7. Iowa	61.9

8. Utah	61.4
9. Massachusetts	61.0
10. Michigan	60.1
11. Connecticut	59.8
12. Ohio	59.7
13. New York	59.4
14. Colorado	59.2
15. North Dakota	59.1
16. Nevada	59.0
17. Indiana	58.9
18. Idaho	58.6
19. Minnesota	58.4
20. Oregon	57.8
21. Pennsylvania	57.7
22. Nebraska	57.1
23. Hawaii	57.0
24. Illinois	56.8
25. Wyoming	56.7
26. Rhode Island	56.3
27. Kansas	55.2
28. Canal Zone	55.1
29. South Dakota	55.0
30. New Hampshire	54.4
31. New Mexico	53.0
32. Vermont	51.5
33. Wisconsin	51.3
34. Missouri	49.6
35. Maine	47.4
36. Oklahoma	44.4
37. Maryland	43.2
38. Delaware	42.3
39. Texas	41.1
40. Florida	37.8
41. West Virginia	37.7
42. Porto Rico	35.8
43. Virginia	35.3
44. Tennessee	35.1
45. Kentucky	35.0
46. Louisiana	33.9
47. Georgia	32.6
48. North Carolina	30.6
49. Alabama	30.6
50. Arkansas	30.3
51. Mississippi	30.0
52. South Carolina	29.4

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, we often hear expressed in rather vague and indefinite terms the statement that we are the richest Nation in the world, and we are prone to state our wealth in that indefinite way without making a comparison with the wealth of other nations.

Of course, we are as yet too close to the Great War to strike any trial balance of the economic conditions of all the great warring nations, though in a way we may approach the economic strength of the various great nations by comparing their wealth or economic strength before the war with their strength as it is to-day. But there is chargeable, of course, to each nation its loss entailed by the war—the money expended, the wealth destroyed, and, greatest of all, the economic loss in man power.

I can in this address but skeletonize the assets of the various nations, and I will start by saying that the national wealth of the United States when the war began was estimated to be \$250,000,000,000; the wealth of Great Britain at that time was \$90,000,000,000; of Russia, \$60,000,000,000; and of Italy, \$30,000,000,000.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman also give us France?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I was just about to state that the national wealth of France was \$65,000,000,000, or less than one-fourth the wealth of the United States. The wealth of Germany was \$85,000,000,000 and of Austria-Hungary \$40,000,000,000.

It is rather a coincidence that the ratio of the present debt (\$189,000,000,000) of the great nations, other than the United States, to their national wealth August 1, 1914 (\$370,000,000,000), averages about 50 per cent of their total wealth, this being also true of each nation individually, while the debt of the United States, when loans granted to our European associates are paid, will net only about 6 per cent of our national wealth August 1, 1914.

For four and a half years the warring nations turned aside from the arts of peace and peace production and mobilized every ounce of their economic strength and strategy for the production of war material and the effectuating of economic destruction.

The greatest surprise of that titanic struggle has been the power and efficiency of man to produce an almost inexhaustible supply of material and strength from what had been considered a resource bounded by reasonable limitations.

The wealth of the world when the war began was estimated at \$750,000,000,000, while the cost of the war was more than \$200,000,000,000, not including the possible loss of from fifty to one hundred billion dollars of property, such as cities, towns, farm

properties, the sinking of ships, their cargoes, and sundry other things of a material nature.

Only a small percentage of the total wealth of the world—\$750,000,000,000—could be utilized for war purposes, as much of this wealth consisted of lands, cities, buildings, and railroads and other transportation facilities. Hence the \$200,000,000,000, or more than one-fourth of the world's total wealth of every description, with which to prosecute the war had to be raised either by taxation or issuance of bonds.

But great as were the ravages and destruction of things that existed when the war began, the output of the warring nations was immeasurably increased during the progress of the war, as the energies of men were expended at full capacity and nothing remained dormant or stagnant. Fortunately the salvage of war material and everything connected therewith was of a considerable percentage, and many factories and other agencies and energies of destruction have since been and will continue to be converted into instruments of peace production and human welfare.

Immeasurable as were the loss of property, the expenditure of money, and the mortgaging of the world's future income to liquidate the war's indebtedness, much greater was the loss entailed by the checking of the spiritual and material progress of the world and the blight—at least the temporary blight—put upon the world's civilization. But great as were all of these losses, the greatest of all was the loss of life, the killing of 10,000,000 soldiers upon the battle fields—the total loss of that blessing which their living would have vouchsafed to society, not to mention the wealth they would have wrought in the world nor the millions of posterity that would have been born into the world had these brave souls been permitted to live out their natural lives in peaceful days.

Nor is this all the loss the war entailed upon the world. The loss sustained by the lack and want of material production that would have come in times of peace from the hands and labors of those who died upon the field of battle—that economic loss likewise is a debit against the frightfulness of those dark and bloody years.

Added to this likewise must be a charge against the war of the multiplied millions of crippled soldiers who will be throughout their natural days a tax and burden upon society.

And added still to all of this catalogue of losses must be the shortening of the days, as a result, of millions too numerous to count of men, women, and children undernourished and underfed; not only during the war, but even for the next few years to come will this shortage of food prevail.

While added still to these is the demoralization of wars, the loss of interest and initiative in the souls and hearts of people who, when the tragedy is over, their homes burned down, their families destroyed, their hopes blasted, look out into the world of Stygian darkness and despair and wonder if, after all, life is worth the living.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we take this hasty retrospect and view the physical plight and the spiritual life of the balance of the world, look upon the millions of graves of those who lie buried across the sea, the destroyed homes and hopes of millions still living, behold the debt generations yet will have to pay, lands and properties reduced in values and the taxations to be borne for the next hundred years, and then turn our faces and behold the plentitude of American wealth, with no indemnities to bear and the few billions only that we in years will pay, we should again, again, and still again thank our Maker that we are American citizens—the richest, happiest, and the most prosperous Nation upon the face of the earth. [Applause.]

Not only were 50,000,000 soldiers taken from the fields and factories of production during these long, wearisome years of fighting to destroy not only the white races of the earth but to destroy for all time to come every vestige of physical property owned by the contending forces, in order that after the war was over the physical possessions of each should be reduced to the minimum, but also whole populations of countries were taken from the fields of production into the very charnel house of war.

And just here, may I not for the moment be justified in diverting to the thought that aside from profiteering—not one dollar of which can be justified—the cost, the high cost, of living may at once be laid at the doorway of the war, to the \$200,000,000,000 issued by the nations of the world to carry on the war, as well as to the fact that to-day the world is under-supplied with food, clothing, machinery, implements, and everything that man eats, wears, or that gives shelter and protection to men and their families? This flotation of cheap money, this inflation of billions of dollars, coupled with the shortage of the world in everything necessary to life and the demand for all

things material to supply the wants of man—the underproduction and the great demand for consumable things—these, these, Mr. Speaker, are the inevitable outgrowth of and reasons for the high cost of living.

And in the face of this awful world indebtedness and the high cost of everything, many people are more extravagant than ever before and are demanding luxury after luxury which a few years ago they never dreamed to have. And I maintain that the only way to reach and to attain some avenue to the normality of things must be the road to increased production and wise conservation and enforced economy. And this, sir, must apply to a curtailment of expenditures made by Congress, by legislatures, by cities, and by communities in public works and improvements of every kind, as well as personal expenditures, unless absolutely indispensable to the progress and welfare of homes and the country at large.

But pardon me for diverting myself from the world's economic condition, to which I must now again give my attention.

Mr. Speaker, something over a year ago I gave considerable thought to, and made no little research into, the economic conditions of the United States and the six principal European nations engaged in the war—Great Britain, France, Italy, and Russia of the Entente group, and the Imperial German States and the dual monarchy, Austria-Hungary.

There is still, I understand, no complete appraisal or inventory of all the data incident to the Great War. I must in this connection, in addition to several books and pamphlets and articles of a general nature which I have read, ascribe much of my material and thought in this discussion to a pamphlet issued in the early part of last year by the Mechanics and Metals National Bank of New York. In a most detailed and elaborate way this record of analysis of the financial obligations entailed on the world by the Great War is set forth in the pamphlet referred to, and I believe it to be fairly accurate in many respects, though the writer of that article, in my opinion, missed rather wide the mark in making estimates of the postwar expenses of the seven great nations enumerated by me in this discussion. This authority holds that the gross indebtedness of the seven great nations engaged in the war, thus named by me a few moments ago, had an outstanding debt when the war began of \$27,000,000,000, whereas that indebtedness now reaches the staggering sum of over \$200,000,000,000; and, furthermore, it took 100 years, including many wars, to accumulate this \$27,000,000,000 debt, whereas this late war produced nearly seven times the indebtedness that was required by 100 years of war and peace.

The gross indebtedness of the seven principal nations—not including Japan—engaged in the Great War August 1, 1914, when war broke out, and their indebtedness to-day is in round numbers as follows:

Gross debt of—	Aug. 1, 1914.	Jan. 1, 1920.
United States.....	\$1,000,000,000	\$26,000,000,000
Great Britain.....	3,500,000,000	42,000,000,000
France.....	6,500,000,000	33,000,000,000
Russia.....	4,800,000,000	30,000,000,000
Italy.....	2,800,000,000	13,000,000,000
United States and her associates.....	18,400,000,000	144,000,000,000
German Empire and her States.....	5,200,000,000	45,000,000,000
Austria-Hungary.....	3,200,000,000	26,000,000,000
Teutonic nations.....	8,900,000,000	71,000,000,000
Gross debt.....	27,300,000,000	215,000,000,000

Thus we see that whereas the total prewar debt of the seven nations named above totaled \$27,300,000,000, the estimated indebtedness of those same nations on January 1, 1920, was \$215,000,000,000. These figures, of course, are only approximately correct, and a large part are taken from the estimates made by the Mechanics and Metals Bank above referred to, which, in my opinion, are conservative and approach the total indebtedness of the above-named nations.

This total indebtedness of the European nations above named does not take into consideration the amount of indemnities assessed against Germany and Austria-Hungary by the peace conference, the amount of that indemnity to be assessed against the German Empire being, in round numbers, \$25,000,000,000 and against Austria-Hungary being several billions more. Nor do these figures take into consideration the amount, or any part, of the property destroyed, the sinking of ships, and other losses of a general nature.

Let us now turn to the estimated national wealth of those same countries at the beginning of the war, August 1, 1914:

United States	\$250,000,000,000
Great Britain	90,000,000,000
France	65,000,000,000
Russia	60,000,000,000
Italy	30,000,000,000
United States and her associates	495,000,000,000
Germany	85,000,000,000
Austria-Hungary	40,000,000,000
	125,000,000,000
Adding together the two groups, we have total wealth	620,000,000,000

The ratio of debt of each country in 1920 as compared to the total wealth of each nation in 1914 may at a glance be shown as follows:

	Total wealth Aug. 1, 1914.	Gross debt Jan. 1 1920.	Per cent debt to wealth.
United States.....	\$250,000,000,000	\$26,000,000,000	10
Great Britain.....	90,000,000,000	42,000,000,000	47
France.....	65,000,000,000	33,000,000,000	51
Russia.....	60,000,000,000	30,000,000,000	50
Italy.....	30,000,000,000	13,000,000,000	43
United States and her associates.....	495,000,000,000	144,000,000,000
Germany.....	85,000,000,000	45,000,000,000	53
Austria-Hungary.....	40,000,000,000	26,000,000,000	43
	125,000,000,000	71,000,000,000

Deducting the \$10,000,000,000 that our European associates borrowed from the United States, which in turn was used in the purchase for them of our goods, munitions of war, farm products, and sundry things, leaves a net balance owed by us of sixteen billions, or only a fraction over 6 per cent of our total national wealth when the war began—to be exact, 6.4 per cent of that national wealth—and deducting the \$2,000,000,000 loaned to our European associates by American banking institutions will reduce the ratio of our war indebtedness to national wealth still more appreciably.

But the comparison does not stop here, Mr. Speaker. If we charge the present indebtedness due by each country on account of the war against the total wealth of that country, and also charge the amount of property destroyed in European countries, the disparity in wealth between the European States and our own country is more pronounced than ever. The United States sustained but little loss in the war in the way of physical property, as compared to the havoc and wreckage of property, especially in France and in Belgium, Serbia, Roumania, and other countries not herein mentioned. And if Germany and Austria-Hungary are to pay the immense indemnities assessed against them, there would not be much in the way of net valuation left to either of them at this time.

Thus we see, Mr. Speaker, that the combined wealth of Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy, at the outbreak of the war, was estimated to be \$5,000,000,000 less than the national wealth of the United States; while the combined wealth of the Teutonic group—Germany and Austria-Hungary—was only one-half as much as that of the United States. And when we consider the amount of physical damages wrought to the property of the warring nations—the sinking of ships and cargoes, the destruction of cities, towns, farms, railroads, forests, orchards, fine arts, and many other things too numerous to enumerate, not to mention the assessments in the way of indemnities levied against the Teutonic powers—the wealth and superiority of the United States stand out in bold relief as a great mountain suddenly emerging from a plain. [Applause.]

But this does not begin to tell the tale of the great superior financial and material wealth of America as compared to that of the other nations of the world.

When the war came on Europe held, it is estimated, at least \$5,000,000,000 worth of American securities—that is to say, the people of Europe had invested that much money in our properties, such as stocks and bonds of railroads, banking institutions, mines, sawmills, manufacturing plants, and otherwise. These investments yielded the owners, these European stockholders, an average of 5 per cent per annum, which amounted to \$250,000,000 a year. This much money, let us say, was expatriated, was sent abroad, from year to year, to the owners of these stocks and bonds. But, owing to the stress of war, these European owners of American stocks and bonds were compelled to sell back to us a large proportion of the same, and United States citizens bought back \$4,000,000,000 out of the \$5,000,000,000.

000 of stocks and bonds held abroad. Five per cent interest on this \$4,000,000,000 amounts to \$200,000,000 per annum in the way of interest which the American people now do not send abroad, but keep at home, as they now own these properties. [Applause.]

But this is not all, Mr. Speaker. American tourists, or "globetrotters," as we call them, had been going to Europe before the war and spending some \$250,000,000 annually. Since the war began this money has been kept at home, amounting to more than \$1,500,000,000.

But this is not all. When the war came on America's merchant marine carried but 8 per cent of our foreign trade, and we paid every year to foreign bottoms for the transportation of the products of our fields and factories the sum of \$250,000,000. For 10 years before the war this amounted to the staggering sum of more than \$2,500,000,000! This money will now be kept at home, sir; for, under a Democratic administration during the past few years since my service here, we have increased the tonnage of our merchant ships until to-day we have nearly 15,000,000 tons of shipping. [Applause.]

Thus we will not only keep at home the \$250,000,000 per annum which we had been accustomed to pay to foreign vessels for the carrying of our commerce, but we will also participate largely in the carrying trade of the other nations of the world. Thus we see, Mr. Speaker, that the exporter of goods and farm products will not only find a market where he had no market before, but when his goods are sent abroad they will be sent in American ships, manned by American sailors, and flying the American flag, our white sails entering the ports of every land and clime, thus enabling him who sends his products abroad to receive a greater sum for the sale of the things that are borne in American ships. [Applause.]

If I may be a bit personal, Mr. Speaker, I may say that in no part of the work in which I have engaged since I have been a Member of Congress have I taken more interest than in the building up of the American merchant marine. [Applause.] That work and that legislation were very attractive to me as a member of that committee. I saw the necessity of owning our own ships to carry our constantly increasing exports in quest of new markets to the four quarters of the globe.

Nor is that all of the story, Mr. Speaker. For 20 years before the war came on our export trade, on account of the smallness of our merchant marine and our policy of isolation, exceeded our imports by an average of only about \$400,000,000 per annum. For the past four years our balance of trade has been ten times that amount, or, in round numbers, \$4,000,000,000 per annum. And last year—the first year since peace was declared—our exports totaled the huge sum of \$8,000,000,000. [Applause.]

Nor is that all of the superiority of our material greatness and riches. Likewise, under a Democratic administration, we made another long stride in adding to the strength and integrity of our immeasurable wealth.

When I came to Congress a few years ago, we had one of the shabbiest and one of the most ill-conceived financial systems of any country in the world. This great Government, with its bigness and stupendous wealth, this giant of the West, stood with its ponderous body resting upon veritable financial spider legs! There had been from time to time a little patchwork stuck here and there on our financial system, but nothing of a substantial nature had been done.

One of the first achievements, and possibly the greatest legislative achievement of any administration in the history of the United States, was the great Federal banking system, which took the place of the inadequate, obsolete national banking system which was the sudden and immature thing brought forth under stress of the Civil War to meet a temporary emergency in 1862. And this giant of the West, this American Commonwealth, grew and fattened and expanded all the while, resting upon that weak, uncertain, panic-breeding financial system. But the Democratic Party set to work to destroy, to overturn, this archaic system, and in doing so broke up and put to rout the greatest trust the world ever saw—the Money Trust, which held the prosperity of this country in its mighty, greedy grasp! Had it not been for the substitution of the present system for the outworn system of 1862, the world might have fallen backward for over a hundred years, for the greatest panic the world has ever seen would have followed the stress and strain put upon our resources incident to the great World War. But it stood it all without a shock, without a tremor; and so great was our wealth and unshaken our strength that we loaned to our European associates, in order that they might prosecute the war, ten billion dollars from the American Government. [Applause.]

And in addition to this \$10,000,000,000 which our Government loaned to the European nations, American bankers loaned

\$2,000,000,000, making in all \$12,000,000,000. On this \$12,000,000,000, bearing an annual interest of 5 per cent, there will be due to America from those European Governments \$600,000,000 of interest annually—nearly 50 per cent more than the world output of gold in 1918, which, as I recall, was \$458,000,000. And this \$600,000,000 in interest is even 50 per cent more than our annual balance of trade for 20 years before the outbreak of the great European holocaust. [Applause.]

But, again, even this does not tell the whole story. The records show that so wonderful are our resources in raw material, in machinery, in the science and genius of our mechanics and artisans, in the reduplication of our factories and the instrumentalities of our production that we can manufacture almost in one year as many goods as can all the other nations of the world combined. [Applause.]

And yet again, in addition to all this, America has nearly 40 per cent of the world's gold supply. To give some idea of the money cost of this war—not to mention the economic loss of man power—I will state that this war cost the world, and the nations will have to pay, six times as much money of every description as there is on deposit in all the banks of the United States. Or, to put it another way, this war cost the world twenty-five times more than our tremendous and unparalleled export trade for the year 1919. Or, to state it in still a different form, the cost of this war, it is said, to the world amounted to more than all the gold and silver that have been mined—of which the world gives any record—since the beginning of time.

Is it any wonder, then, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of everything is high when we reflect that during these awful years the soldiers now living and dead were taken from the ranks of production and placed upon the firing lines?

But for one moment let us behold America's physical and productive greatness. In 1912, the last year of President Taft's administration, and about the time I came to Congress, the total value of the agricultural products and live stock of the United States amounted, in round numbers, to \$9,000,000,000, whereas in 1919, or last year, the agricultural products and livestock production equaled the stupendous sum of \$25,000,000,000, nearly three times as much as seven years before!

The estimated wealth of the world when the war began being \$750,000,000,000 and the wealth of the United States \$250,000,000,000, or one-third of the world's total wealth, let us now compare the wealth of America at the outbreak of the war—and it is now even much greater—with the total world wealth.

Europe to-day is mortgaged to pay a debt, in round numbers, of \$200,000,000,000. The indemnities to be assessed against the Central Powers aggregate tens of billions of dollars, while the damages inflicted upon property destroyed during the war amount to between fifty and one hundred billion dollars. When these items are added together and subtracted from the \$500,000,000,000 that the world, other than the United States, owned before the war began, we witness the United States equaling, if not excelling, in wealth all the other nations of the world combined! And yet the United States has only one-eighteenth of the world's population and one-sixteenth of the world's territory, while its wealth approaches the combined wealth of all the other nations of the world. [Applause.]

If wealth would make a people happy, if riches would make a people great, then the American people as a Nation should be the happiest and the most content of all the peoples of the earth.

But what shall we do with this inheritance? Shall we bury our talent, as a certain man whom the Savior described in one of those wonderful parables? Or shall we not put it out at interest, and thus assure that this unparalleled abundance of things material shall be used for the service of mankind, that ignorance may be dispelled, superstition blotted out, vice extirpated, and that honor, justice, virtue, integrity, equality, and fraternity may be enthroned, to the end that man may yet attain unto the heights where God destined he should reside even while on this earth?

Then, behold the position of primacy the United States occupies in the world to-day! With a net debt of only about 6 per cent of her total wealth standing out as an obligation to be paid by her on account of her participation in the war, as against almost an average of about 50 per cent of indebtedness of the total wealth assessed against and to be paid by the six great European nations named in this discussion, not to mention the heavy indemnities to be borne by the German Government and Austria-Hungary, the position of the United States is not only unique but without a parallel in all the history of the world. [Applause.] Indeed, Mr. Speaker, when we contemplate the subtraction of States lost by Austria-Hungary and the attainment of independence of those nationalities that had as-

pired for hundreds of years to independence, there is but little left of what was Austria-Hungary at the outbreak of the war.

But the question may be asked, Will the \$10,000,000,000 now due the United States by our former European Allies, together with the \$2,000,000,000 now due individuals and banking institutions by the European Governments, be paid?

My reply is that one can only judge the future by the past. Thus far no nation has ever repudiated its debt to another nation, and those that sought so to do suffered immeasurable penalties. A nation is like an individual—it must live or perish. If it lives, it must have credit and standing in the world. Nothing breeds friction between nations, as between individuals, more than the refusal to pay a just debt, because nations, after all, are made up of individuals.

The unrest throughout the world is but a reaction of the war. Most nations are sick, very sick, as is a patient just slowly arising from a long fever or a serious operation. If peace continues, they will regain slowly, but surely, their strength. The people everywhere must be patient, hold up their heads, and fight the harder, every man doing his part, lest the world take a backward step.

The world must be rebuilt and order must come out of chaos. Europe needs multiplied thousands of millions of dollars' worth of products of American fields, forests, mines, and factories; and while the high cost of living, even with the pruning down of every possible dollar of Government expenditures, will continue for some time, things will gradually assume normality. But many years will pass before we approach prewar conditions. Nor should we too rapidly approach conditions that existed before the war, for if we did the suddenness of the transition would result in the greatest financial panic the world ever saw. Many contracts were made in the purchase of homes, farms, live stock, farming implements, and dozens of other things too numerous to mention, at maximum prices—and how could these contracts be paid with farm products, with—let us say—cotton at the prewar price of 7 to 12 cents a pound, or wheat at \$1 per bushel?

Prices are high, but labor, also, has never been so generously compensated; and now not too much, for labor must have its just reward, the same as capital. In fact, labor must live, and the families dependent upon labor must live, be fed and clothed and schooled and have outlook and hope in life, and if prices should drop suddenly down to prewar prices the suddenness of the shock would not only paralyze all industry, result in the wreckage of banks and the closing of mills and factories, but labor, too, would be dislocated, and the unemployment of men by the millions would come overnight.

But the agitator, Mr. Speaker, the man with nothing but hot air as his asset, who toils not, neither does he spin, is going up and down the earth telling the people that the future is gloomy, the highways dark and muddy, and that despair awaits the children of men.

The high cost of living was to be expected after such unparalleled wreckage and expenditure of over two thousand millions of dollars, which must be met gradually by the world, and for which the various nations are mortgaged to pay. How happy should every American be—yea, and very proud—that he is an American when he contemplates the richness of this mighty Republic, its peace and quiet, as compared with the ruin, wreck, and sorrow of the millions of peoples of Europe. [Applause.]

The American people, sir, since the birth of this Republic have from time to time gone, as it were, through the fiery furnace. Their souls have been tested, their faith has been challenged, but out of every ordeal has sprung a greater America—the hope of the world, the glory of all civilization. We will not hang our heads—none save the trouble breeder—but with head erect and courage undaunted we turn our faces to the east, to the rising star of hope, knowing that the dawn but awaits the passing of the night, and that this Republic, baptized at its birth in blood and dedicated to the cause of human freedom, with her multiplied billions of wealth, must serve her people with that wealth, vouchsafing to every American not only liberty but fraternity and equality before the law. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, February 7, 1920, Mr. NOLAN, of California, introduced a bill, H. R. 12397, which was referred to the Ways and Means Committee. The title of the bill was—

To provide for the raising of public revenues by a tax upon the privileges of the use and enjoyment of lands of large value.

The bill provides:

That all persons, firms, associations, and corporations owning land in value in excess of \$10,000, whether in possession or leased to others, shall be subject to an excise tax upon the privilege of the use and enjoyment of such excess at the rate of 1 per cent.

The author of the bill, it is stated, is J. H. Ralston, a lawyer of Washington, D. C., and the bill was introduced by Mr. NOLAN at his request. The bill is being promoted by a "Committee of manufacturers and merchants on Federal taxation, incorporated," located at 1346 Altgeld Street, Chicago. In an "announcement" sent out in March, 1920, it was stated that—

On April 1 this committee will begin a vigorous and aggressive campaign in behalf of the Ralston-Nolan Federal revenue bill.

The purpose of the bill is stated to be—

to reduce the excessive tax burden on business and other producing enterprises about \$1,000,000,000 by raising the same revenue by a Federal tax of 1 per cent on the privilege of holding land and natural resources valued (irrespective of improvements) over \$10,000.

It is further stated that—

More than 7,000 business houses, with an aggregate capital of \$1,300,000,000, have already indorsed the bill.

It is also stated that—

Organized opposition to the proposed law is expected, but the effective distribution of from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 pamphlets and circulars, together with the activities of a well-organized speaker's bureau and publicity department, will be sufficient, it is believed, to overcome whatever opposition may arise.

It is added—

The interest of the business men of the country having once been sufficiently aroused, the energies of this committee will be directed on Congress.

This "announcement" was followed on April 5 by a circular letter, together with a pamphlet entitled "Sane Taxation." This pamphlet was an elaborate restatement of the "announcement" with reasons why \$1,000,000,000 of Federal taxes should be removed from "business" and placed on land. It denounced the excess-profits tax and the income tax, and declared that—

The value that attaches to the privilege of land ownership is not an earned but an unearned value. It is not the result of individual effort, but the result of community growth and development only. As an unearned value, therefore, it is certainly a more just subject for taxation than the earned values of industry and enterprise.

On April 15 another circular was sent out, headed—

Wanted, 10,000 business firms to distribute 5,000,000 circulars; sample copy attached.

It was stated that the corporation wanted the circular to reach every business man in the United States.

Another circular, undated, addressed to the "Business men of America," was headed:

Do you favor a reduction of 25 per cent of your Federal taxes?

In this circular it was stated:

Business must have relief from the present excessive Federal tax load; the privilege of land ownership can well afford and ought to carry its fair and equal share.

It also states that to date, April 15, over 8,000 business firms had indorsed the Ralston-Nolan bill. It quoted President Wilson to the effect that in peace times high rates of income and profits taxes "discourage energy, remove the incentive to new enterprise, encourage extravagant expenditures, and produce industrial stagnation with consequent unemployment and other attendant evils." It also quoted ex-Secretary McAdoo as saying:

The immediate burden of taxation is too great. It is having an injurious effect on business. It is a contributing factor of large proportions in the high cost of living. Its inevitable tendency is to stifle new enterprise and to throttle initiative. It is both unscientific and inequitable.

In this work of securing the repeal of \$1,000,000,000 taxes on "business" and substituting therefor a tax of like amount on land it was stated that a fund of from \$300,000 to \$500,000 would be needed, subscriptions for which were to be solicited.

The bill was so clearly unconstitutional that it received no consideration by the Ways and Means Committee and no attention from Congressmen. It was not until it became evident that at least some business men took the matter seriously and were attracted by the pleasing prospect of relief from their income and excess-profits taxes by shifting the burden on the farmers and other owners of lands and homes, and were evidently contributing large amounts to carry on the propaganda, that it received attention. When it was known that a fund of a half million dollars was to be raised and expended to secure the passage of such a bill, it became a matter of inquiry with many as to whether such a bill would receive the serious attention of Congress and would be valid if passed.

Never before since the foundation of the Government has a serious attempt been made to secure the passage of such a law. The reason is not far to seek. On its face the bill is utterly unconstitutional.

The Constitution provides, Article I, section 8, paragraph 1:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

It is also provided, Article I, section 9, paragraph 4:

No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be made.

Under these provisions Congress has the general power to levy taxes, but no direct tax can be imposed except in proportion to the population. If a bill or act provides for the levy of a direct tax and it is not laid in proportion to population, it is invalid. If a tax is imposed on land and such a tax is a direct tax, it is invalid unless it is apportioned according to population.

If the United States desires to raise revenue by a tax on real property it can not tax lands within its jurisdiction on the basis of value, nor on the basis of extent; but it must apportion among the several States in accordance with their population the total amount of the revenue to be raised by taxes upon real property, and must then provide the rate at which such lands in each of the several States shall be taxed in order to raise in each State the sum apportioned to that State.

The difficulty and practical impossibility of levying such a tax in accordance with the constitutional requirements are so great that no successful effort has ever been made or probably ever will be made to raise revenue in this manner.

As the Constitution does not prohibit the States from levying direct taxes, that field is open to the States, and the power to levy taxes on the values of real estate is universally exercised by the States. It is believed that the limitation on the Federal Government is a wise provision, as it leaves to the States the power to raise a large portion of the revenue necessary for their support exclusively to them. For the Federal Government to invade this field of taxation would not only be double taxation upon the owners of the lands, but would raise questions of equity and administration difficult to determine and embarrassing in their execution.

The bill under consideration imposes a tax of 1 per cent upon the value of lands in excess of \$10,000. There is no attempt to apportion the tax in proportion to population. If a tax on land is a direct tax within the meaning of the Constitution, then the proposed tax is unconstitutional and invalid.

A tax on real estate has been held by an unbroken line of authorities, both National and State, to be a direct tax.

In *Hytton v. United States* (3 Dall., 171), decided in 1798, only nine years after the adoption of the Constitution, it was held that a tax on land was a direct tax, which could not be imposed by Congress unless apportioned. Mr. Justice Patterson, in his opinion, said:

I never entertained a doubt that the principal—I will not say the only—object that the framers of the Constitution contemplated as falling within the rule of apportionment were a capitation tax and a tax on land.

In *Springer v. United States* (102 U. S., 586) it was held that the income taxes provided by the law of 1862 were not direct taxes. After reviewing the authorities, the court declared:

Our conclusions are that direct taxes, within the meaning of the Constitution, are only capitation taxes, as expressed in that instrument, and taxes on real estate.

In this case it was held that a tax upon the land itself was a direct tax, but that a tax upon the income derived from the land was not a direct tax.

In the case of *Pollock v. Farmer's L. and T. Co.* (157 U. S., 429), decided in 1895, it was held that a tax upon the income derived from real property was in effect a tax upon the land itself and void unless apportioned.

This decision led to the submission and adoption of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, which provides:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration.

It will be observed that in both the *Springer* and *Pollock* cases the controversy was regarding the income from real estate, and that in both cases the rule was reaffirmed that a tax upon the land itself was a direct tax. It will also be observed that the amendment adopted does not provide that a tax on land itself shall be authorized, but that a tax upon all income, from whatever source derived, even a tax upon the income from real estate, is valid.

Throughout our entire history there have been repeated decisions of courts holding a tax on real estate a direct tax, and there has been no exception to this rule. Every commentator on the Constitution has expressly stated that a tax on real estate was a direct tax. There has been much discussion as to whether other objects were within or without the rule, but there has been no discussion or difference of opinion as to the proposition that a tax on land was a direct tax.

An attempt is apparently made to disguise the nature of the tax proposed by calling it an "excise" tax on the "privilege of the use and enjoyment" of the land. An excise tax is

sometimes levied upon the right to sell liquor, tobacco, patent medicines, and the like. The Government may require a license to carry on a particular business, and stamp taxes may be required on various articles of merchandise sold. Taxes of this class are extensively resorted to in cases of emergency, and we have now a great variety of such taxes levied to meet the extraordinary expenses incurred by the Government in carrying on the late war. But a proposed tax is not made an excise tax merely by calling it such. And a tax upon the thing itself is not changed in its nature by saying that it is levied upon the "use and enjoyment" of the thing. In this bill the tax is imposed on the owner of the land because he is the owner, and he must pay the proposed tax upon the value of the land in excess of \$10,000. This is not an excise tax. The bill provides for a levy of a direct tax upon the land itself, and if it passed the act would be void because not apportioned.

To any well-qualified lawyer all this is clear; and it would not require much research for one not learned in the law to discover that the proposed bill is clearly unconstitutional. Yet we are told that 8,000 "business firms" have indorsed the bill and are presumably contributing to the \$500,000 fund that will be needed to distribute the 5,000,000 pamphlets, to pay the "well organized speakers' bureau and publicity department," and to finance the "Committee of Manufacturers and Merchants on Federal Taxation (Inc)," in its "energies" that "will be directed on Congress."

Doubtless these "business firms" are anxious to shift the burden of the \$1,000,000,000 taxes which they are so unhappily carrying to the farmers and owners of homes who have small incomes and no excess-profits taxes to pay. But it is certainly true that the fund of half a million dollars which they are to contribute for that greatly desired object is not likely to do them any good. In fact, at the end of their great campaign they are sure to realize that their shifting device will not work, and that to the burden of their income taxes and excess-profits taxes, which they are so anxious to put on other shoulders, they will have added this \$500,000, which they will pay solely for the benefit of the "committee" which has so deluded them.

An interesting fact is disclosed by a study of the terms of the bill. In the first section it is stated that the lands to be taxed do not include improvements. This would relieve our "business firms" from all taxes upon their skyscrapers, their manufactories with all their costly machinery, and their business houses with all their elaborate fixtures. All they would be required to pay taxes on would be the value of the bare land. In such cases the value of the land would be small compared with the value of the improvement. But in the case of the ranch, the farm, or the city or town home the value of the improvements would be small compared with the value of the land. This would be another reason why the shifting of the tax burden would appear so attractive.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I notice in all these letters and propaganda that are being circulated, and which I am sure every Member of Congress is receiving almost daily, that this bill is called the Ralston-Nolan bill. I am frank to say that when I first got one of these circulars I looked to see if there was a Member of Congress by the name of Ralston or a Member of the Senate, and I found neither; and I learned from the gentleman a moment ago that he is a lawyer here, and I would like to know if he knows what interest this gentleman has in it and whom he represents?

Mr. TOWNER. I am sure that I do not know.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Just wait a moment until I answer the question. I am sure I do not know, but I have indulged the suspicion that perhaps he might be somewhat interested in this committee that is making these solicitations for \$500,000 of campaign funds.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Perhaps they are paid attorneys.

Mr. TOWNER. I have no knowledge of the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to state to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] that the attorney, Ralston, here in the city of Washington, besides being the attorney for Mr. Gompers, who appeared before the Rules Committee against antisection legislation, is also the Ralston who appeared before the Rules Committee representing Mr. Post in the charges of disloyalty and affiliation with anarchy in connection with Mr. Post, and he is the same Ralston who is representing many anarchists throughout the country.

Mr. TOWNER. I can not yield further.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The interest I had in the matter was in the way he was connected with this legislation to tax the farmers of the country.

Mr. TOWNER. Unfortunately, I can not give the gentleman further information.

Evidently this brilliant proposal must have had its origin in the brain of some believer in the "single tax." The "single-tax" theory is largely the creation of the late Henry George, a strong thinker and a brilliant writer. In his work, *Progress and Poverty*, he argues the proposition that land is the common property of all the people, and that all private property in land is a usurpation and should be abolished. This he proposes to do "by the simple and easy method of abolishing all taxation save that upon land values." This is to be imposed on the value of land, regardless of improvements. No tax is to be levied upon buildings or other improvements, none upon personal property of any kind, none upon imports or exports, none upon franchises or business, none upon incomes or profits, none upon moneys or credits—everything and everybody is to be free except land and the owners of land. The adoption of this theory, it is promised, will abolish poverty and speedily bring universal peace, prosperity, and happiness to mankind. Unfortunately, a stupid and stubborn world has refused to see the value of the proposed plan and is still walking in darkness, refusing to see the light. [Applause.]

But the passage of this bill would certainly be a fair beginning. Once put in operation the simple plan proposed, and the rest will easily follow. If the scheme to shift the \$1,000,000,000 from incomes and excess profits to land succeeds, then it will be easy to shift all taxes now levied on wealth and the products of wealth to land. Then, indeed, will the farmer "pay it all." His will be a happy lot. He will be required to produce everything the world uses, wears, and eats, and in addition pay all the taxes.

But, unfortunately for those who are enamored of this program, the great statesmen who framed the Constitution made it impossible to accomplish such a result without amending our fundamental law, and that is, as we know, a somewhat difficult accomplishment. Every year throughout our history demonstrates by instances like this the wonderful prescience and supreme wisdom of those who gave us our Constitution, "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Chairman, during the debate last evening the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, under the head of "What we got for our money," made this statement:

As a result of our entire aviation program we obtained 213 observation planes * * * and 527 second-hand foreign planes, which were either bought or borrowed from our associates in the war.

Another distinguished member of this committee, of which I am a member, recently mailed out speeches, upon the franked envelope of which this statement appears:

Our contribution to war-time aircraft consisted of 213 * * * DH-4 observation planes that reached the front, with others on the way.

Wide publicity has been given such statements emanating from reports and speeches of members of this committee, claiming that as a result of our aviation program only 213 American airplanes reached the front, and that such planes, with 527 foreign-acquired planes, constitute what we procured for \$1,000,000,000.

I regret that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, for whom I have sincere friendship, and other gentlemen should have permitted themselves to have become the authors of such statements. These statements are inaccurate, misleading, and not founded on fact. The facts as to the number of American-owned planes are not matters of doubt and involve no matter of legitimate controversy.

During the war America acquired over 16,000 planes. She had over 6,000 planes in Europe. Instead of receiving only 527 foreign planes, 5,071 were purchased and paid for by American money and used in Europe by the American forces; 1,213 American-built planes were sent to France from America; 213 American-built planes were operating on the front lines at the hour of the armistice. On the day of the armistice 1,620 service planes

were immediately available for the use of the American forces, and up to that date our forces had used over 2,300 service planes. Five hundred and twenty-seven foreign-built planes were in our service at the hour of the armistice. It is improbable that a single one of them was purchased second-handed. Practically all used planes taken from the Allies were training planes and not service planes.

Instead of giving the number of American planes in Europe, these gentlemen give the number actually on the front on the day of the armistice. Instead of giving the number of American planes used on the front, they give the number used on the day of the armistice. The 213, instead of being the number used, is 204 short, according to the testimony of Pershing, which shows that 417 American-built planes were actually used at the front. [Applause.] Instead of spending over \$1,000,000,000 for airplanes and engines, in round numbers, we spent only half that amount for airplanes, engines, and spare parts. The additional sum was spent for other aircraft purposes.

I refer to these facts not for the purpose of discussing aircraft matters, but for the purpose of calling attention to the misleading information persistently furnished the country. If these misleading statements represented only isolated instances, it would be a matter of small consequence, but unfortunately these misstatements are simply examples of many similar misstatements.

This investigation committee was appointed on the 4th day of June, 1919. The papers of June 5, 1919, announcing the appointment of the committee, substantially agree with the report as carried in the *Washington Post* of that date, which stated:

While the ostensible purpose of the investigation is to give pitiless publicity to war expenditures, political observers saw in the day's developments inauguration of the big * * * fight to regain control of the White House.

The reports that the legitimate purposes of an investigation were to be used to serve partisan purposes created a distrust in the minds of the patriotic, intelligent citizenship of the country, which soon found a disappointing confirmation in the declarations and conduct of those in charge. Day after day inflammatory reports were carried in the newspapers, purporting to emanate from the committee, containing reckless charges of alleged extravagances and misconduct of the war frequently given out in advance of hearing witnesses who were supposed to support the same.

Partisanship, bias, and prejudice, utterly inconsistent with the rightful functions of an impartial investigating committee, were clearly manifested. Before getting fairly under way, by the manifestations of such an attitude, the committee was hopelessly handicapped and its usefulness largely destroyed.

Everyone will agree that war expenses were proper subject for investigation. The hearings and reports of investigations of our former wars have been preserved and have been studied in all the military schools of this country and in some other countries. Such investigations, so far as they reflect the facts in the conduct of wars, have value in presenting the experience of the past for the benefit of the future. The faithful student of the investigations conducted by this committee will be able to reach one conclusion with unerring certainty. That will be that no partisan investigation of a war will hereafter be justified.

The duty of an investigating committee is of a judicial character, to find out the facts, to consider them impartially, to faithfully represent them, and draw fair and just conclusions. The high quality of judicial fairness should be required of an investigating body, particularly where the subject is the serious, monumental matter of a great war. No man who seeks a righteous verdict desires the trial of his case before a biased or prejudiced judge. To commit a serious investigation to a partisan investigating body is to try a case before a stacked jury; to sacrifice the facts to a biased judge who has determined the case in advance and seeks only means to justify his decision.

The past has given us precedents which should have been followed in conducting this investigation.

The Spanish-American War investigation was conducted by a board appointed by President McKinley, selected without reference to partisan motives or dominance, consisting "of the most distinguished soldiers and civilians that can be selected."

In the first year of our entry into the European war, charges were made concerning the conduct of aviation matters, whereupon President Wilson ordered an investigation, freed it of partisan purposes, and placed the motives thereof beyond question by appointing Charles E. Hughes to conduct it.

Each of these two great investigations were conducted with an ability and impartiality that have given credence to their reports as faithful attempts to portray the facts.

Unfortunately, the investigation of our greatest war has been made a partisan one. The investigation has been such that its reports and findings inspire no such confidence. While not without merit, the record of the hearings will show that instead of being conducted in the impartial and judicial way the seriousness of the subject required, in many instances the investigation, in fact, degenerated into an attempt to make political capital at public expense. Instead of the committee emerging from the myriad circumstances of the war with information faithfully portraying the facts, the reports have exuded with alleged information bearing the marks of the partisan advocate instead of the impartial judge.

This situation is most unfortunate. The displacements and annoyances of war and abnormal conditions it imposed have left in their trail discontent and unrest. Thousands of anarchists are abroad in the land, teaching discontent and disloyalty. Representatives of Russia are teaching the doctrine of hate, distrust, and discontent, trying to win men away from loyalty to the country they should love.

They seek to tear down the great Republic and build in its stead that which has made Russia the most unhappy and unfortunate of lands.

America is the fairest flower of civilization. The citizens of America whose duty it is to be true to her should be so true that no personal or partisan purposes will lead them to detract from our country or our countrymen or their achievement. The man who portrays the truth serves his country. Men who by misstatements and half truths detract from our country, create disloyalty and unrest for political or partisan purposes, join their efforts with those engaged in the same campaign of detraction for the purpose of destroying our country. Only he whose motives are wrong rejoices in ill news of his country. Such a campaign is unholy and unworthy of any American.

Not long ago an anarchist paper in this country, in speaking of the fertile field in America to propagate revolutionary ideas, said:

All we need to do is to keep poking the fires of discontent and in a short while capitalism will be at our feet.

In other words, keep poking and shortly the fires will burn down the structure of popular government, to be supplanted by the vain efforts of those who believe that government can flourish without respect for the sanctity of the home or the rights of property.

In this unholy cause, let the Congress of America take no part. Rather let the motto of each of us be that which is engraved on the east façade in yonder Union Depot of our Capital City:

Let all the ends thou almost at be thy country's, thy God's, and truth's. Be noble, and the nobleness that lies in other men, sleeping but never dead, will rise in majesty to meet thine own.

[Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the House to a resolution introduced last week by my colleague [Mr. DALLINGER] making reference to the shortage of bituminous and anthracite coal in New England, and asking that the Interstate Commerce Commission exercise the powers granted it under the recent railroad act and enforce embargo against the exportation of coal from this country.

This shortage is bringing about a most serious condition among the manufacturing plants of New England. They are shutting down in every direction from lack of coal. One city in my district, running a municipal gas and electric plant, only had within a short time three days' supply of coal on hand, and was obliged to borrow from neighboring cities to keep the plant in operation. Advertisements were inserted in the newspapers that it would be necessary to close down unless relief was obtained. One of the chief causes of this condition throughout the country is the enormous exports that are leaving this country and the need of an embargo is very apparent. It is also necessary, it seems to me, that some effort be made to find where this great difference comes between the cost to the independent and to the regular coal merchants. I am credibly informed—

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

Mr. TREADWAY. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman hear the very elucidating speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] last night on this question?

Mr. TREADWAY. I was in the Hall only a part of the evening. I did not hear the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will combine with the gentleman from Indiana and get the majority leader to let us get some legislation passed that will protect the people on this coal question.

Mr. TREADWAY. There is some legislation already passed, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, giving authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to bring about the very result I am asking for, namely, an embargo against exportation. I agree with the gentleman from Texas that in all probability, so far as this effort to secure advance of prices by a scheme between speculators and the independent and regular miners, there is need of legislation, and I will join with him and with the rest of the membership of this House in an effort to regulate that sort of profiteering directly affecting our manufacturing industries and affecting the high cost of living in all our communities. No more serious situation faces the American people to-day than the lack of coal.

Now, let me just illustrate the difference in prices to-day in the city of Holyoke, Mass. A year ago to-day, I am credibly informed, bituminous coal was sold to dealers there at a price, at the mine, of \$2.95 a ton. To-day that same grade of coal is being sold at the mines for \$10 per ton. Can anybody explain to me that difference in price unless it is caused by profiteering by somebody? Further than that, the amount of production is to-day 65 per cent of what it might be if this effort to squeeze the price through supply and demand was not being engineered by somebody more powerful and bigger than I am able to comprehend. Mine owners claim a car shortage, railroad preference, and every other assignable reason. We, however, know that the shortage exists where the coal is used and the price is soaring continuously. Whatever the cause, let us cause some one to stop "passing the buck" and deliver the coal. This House should promptly pass the Dallinger resolution. Let us find out, Mr. Chairman, where that trouble lies, and protect our industries and protect our home consumption. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARRISH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as you know, during the time I have been in Congress I have not taken much stock in trying to pass the political buck from one side of the aisle to the other. There is one thing, however, to which I want to call the attention of Congress before we adjourn, a thing that I believe should have the earnest and careful attention of Congress, more consideration than has been given in the past, and that is the simplification and revision of our present revenue laws.

There are many reasons why we should give some attention to this subject. In the first place, this system was drafted during the time that we were at war and were facing a national emergency. It was placed upon the country, partially at least, as a war measure and, notwithstanding those facts and the further fact that we have been out of war for some time and have witnessed the practical operation of this law for more than two years, yet we have not amended it; we have not cured the defects that have developed by actual experience and have refused to profit by the actual operation of the law, and to-day the business interests of the United States are being seriously handicapped because they do not know, many of them, what tax they actually owe to the Government or will be compelled to pay finally. They have made their returns, it is true, for the last year and for this year, but the income-tax department is so far behind with its work that the audits have not been completed for 1918, to say nothing of auditing for 1919, and consequently the business concerns of the country, by reason of many doubtful provisions of the law as it now exists, do not know how much tax they owe. Throughout our section of the country there are many business concerns who are to-day holding thousands of dollars in their treasuries until such a time as they may know what part of it they will have to pay to the Government under the decisions of this intricate law.

The President of the United States in December, 1919, and prior to that time, called the attention of Congress to this condition, and I want to read to you his recommendation on this subject, so that you may know and the country may know that this matter has not escaped his attention and that he has not failed to call it to your attention and that the responsibility rests upon you to see that this law is made workable and is made so that it does not handicap and throttle the business interests of the Nation. He said in his message to Congress in December, 1919, as follows:

I trust that the Congress will give its immediate consideration to the problem of future taxation. Simplification of the income and profits taxes has become an immediate necessity. These taxes performed indispensable service during the war. They must, however, be simplified not

only to save the taxpayer inconvenience and expense but in order that the liability may be made certain and definite.

With reference to the details of the revenue law the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue will lay before you for your consideration certain amendments necessary or desirable in connection with the administration of the law—recommendations which have my approval and support. It is of the utmost importance that in dealing with this matter the present law should not be disturbed so far as regards taxes for the calendar year 1920, payable in the calendar year 1921. The Congress might well consider whether the higher rates of income and profits taxes can in peace times be effectively productive of revenue, and whether they may not, on the contrary, be destructive of business activity and productive of waste and inefficiency. There is a point at which in peace times high rates of income and profits taxes discourage energy, remove the incentive to new enterprise, encourage extravagant expenditures, and produce industrial stagnation, with consequent unemployment and other attendant evils.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, right there will my colleague yield?

Mr. PARRISH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman also knows that an official no less than the Commissioner of Internal Revenue—Roper—has made suggestions for 103 different changes of this law, simplifying it, and that not a single one of them has been enacted yet by Congress.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. There have been some very important changes made.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; 103 suggestions have been made; how many have been acted upon?

Mr. PARRISH. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. I want to get through with what I have in mind on this subject, and that is that the law as it now exists, as between man and man, in many instances is not working practically. There are many puzzles in it which a business man can not work out for himself, and by reason of the complicated features of the law it has been necessary for all concerns doing a business of any consequence at all to employ an attorney at a high salary, or at a large fee, in order to tell them how to pay their taxes to the Government. I believe, gentlemen, that we ought to have a taxing system that will be so clear and plain that a man could tell what he owes the Government without paying out several thousand dollars to get an attorney to advise him.

This matter has been called to the attention of the country many times, but Congress has not done anything except pass the amendments the other day, which were only a short step in the right direction, and yet we are about to leave business thus embarrassed and handicapped and go home.

Not only that, but there comes a time in the conduct of the business enterprises of the Nation when excess profits taxes or excessive taxation will stifle and stagnate industry. All over the country there are ranches that would be cut to pieces and sold to farmers and the farmers given an opportunity to buy farms; the country would get the benefit of increased production, so much needed by the world at this time, if it were not for the high excess-profits taxes which they would have to pay.

It seems to me, gentlemen, that we ought not only to simplify the laws but also by the strictest economy in Government reduce the taxes and devise a system of taxation that will be just and that will not stifle any industry in this Nation. Certainly a scheme of taxation can be evolved which will not stifle any industry, which will not destroy any industry, and which will not cause business stagnation in any section of the country, and it is the duty of Congress to work out these plans and give them to the people now. [Applause.]

Many men do not know what their taxes amount to, and their lawyers can not tell them. They can not get an audit of their taxes, and they will be in suspense by reason of the inactivity of this Congress for another year, and their industries will in many cases be handicapped, money will not be invested, and the maximum production will not be reached, and to that extent, at least, the country will suffer and our people as a whole will be the loser. I have a little sketch from a paper which shows in a way the popular idea of the complexity of these laws:

THE SEARCH.

We saw Diogenes the other day with his lantern.
"Still looking for an honest man?" we asked.
He shook his head mournfully.
"No; I gave that up long ago. I wish I'd stuck to it. It wasn't half so hopeless as what I am doing now."
He certainly looked despondent, and our heart went out to him.
"What are you looking for now, then?" we asked.
He sighed.
"I'm looking for a Congressman who made out his income tax without anybody's help."

[Laughter and applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SANFORD 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 bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3865. An act providing for the officers in the Russian Railway Service Corps the status of officers of the United States Army when discharged.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13229) to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives, and had appointed Mr. KENYON, Mr. BORAH, and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13266) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of 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.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER]. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, the great difference between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party is a difference in essentials and fundamentals.

Both parties in a way represent ideas which have prevailed and been uppermost in the minds of men before organized government took its place upon the earth.

From the earliest times the history of the human race is marked by the struggle for supremacy between two opposing and antagonistic forces. Those forces, on the one hand, whose advocates, dominated by selfishness, based upon expediency, intoxicated by the love of authority, contended for centralization of power, for special privileges for the benefit of the ruling class, and denied the people's ability to govern themselves; and, on the other hand, by those who longed for an equality of rights, who opposed privilege and class, and who believed that the people themselves were entitled to a voice in the administration of their own affairs.

The great struggle between those opposing forces has been going on for ages, and it will continue until time shall be no more. Long before "the cross cast its redeeming shadow upon Calvary's hill" there were present, as there are present now, representatives of those forces—those who stood for civic virtue, for human liberty, for equal legislation, and for the rights of mankind; and those who stood for privilege and class, for favored legislation, and who sought to further their own selfish ends at the expense of their own government.

The Democratic Party was born at a time when it seemed as though the patriot's dream of all the ages was about to be realized, the first opportunity "to demonstrate man's capacity for self-government." The shackles of English tyranny had been broken, and the longing which had existed for centuries in men's hearts for relief from a despotic form of government was at last upon a virgin soil crystallized into an infant Republic "where equality with sword uplifted" consecrated that sword to the imperishable doctrine that "freedom is the heritage of mankind."

Never perhaps in the history of any country was there such intensity of patriotic fervor. The liberties won from Great Britain had been too dearly bought for men not to determine to secure these liberties to themselves and their children forever. It was a time when men placed their country's good above their private gain, and when patriotism was measured only by service and devotion to country. At such a time and animated by such motives and impulses the Democratic Party was born.

After the Civil War, when the purpose for which the Republican Party had been organized—the abolition of slavery—was accomplished, the Republican Party found itself in control of every branch of the Federal Government, but without a platform and without a creed.

Though the Republican Party as a political organization had neither creed nor platform, yet office and appetite remained, so adopting Alexander Hamilton as their patron saint, they gathered together what was left of destroyed and repudiated Whiggery and, stationing Federal soldiers at every southern ballot box, raised the twin banners of special privilege and the bloody shirt and for many years marched to victory.

But as new generations came on, the crimson colors of the bloody shirt began to fade, and since then the pathway of the Republican Party has been beset with peril. They had wrong and extorted from the pockets of the American people count-

less millions of dollars to give to their favorites. They had repeatedly been driven from rampart after rampart of protection, and they had often been forced out from every entrenchment of special privilege. But like the proverbial cat with nine lives, or, rather, like the hydra-headed serpent—when one head is cut from its body two more will spring up—the Republican Party, squirming out of one position which had become hateful to the American people, would adopt a new platform and, making new promises, brazenly ask that they again be put in control of the Federal Government.

It has been 132 years since Washington became President of the United States. During those years the American people have had opportunity to vote to place in charge of the administration of the Republic leaders of 20 different political parties—the Federalist Party, the Anti-Federalist Party, the Democratic Party, the Whig Party, the Liberty Party, the Anti-Masonic Party, the Free Soil Party, the Know-Nothing Party, the Free State Party, the Constitutional Union Party, the Liberal Republican Party, the Liberal Party, the National Republican Party, the Republican Party, the Greenback Party, the Gold Democratic Party, the Populist Party, the Socialist Party, the Prohibition Party, and the Progressive Party.

During all those years the Federalist Party was in control for 12 years, the Whig Party was in control for 8 years, the Republican Party was in control for 44 years, and the Democratic Party was in control for 68 years.

Beginning with the history of free government in this country the Democratic Party, founded upon principles of truth and justice as everlasting, as eternal, as the granite hills of the Republic, has witnessed the wreck and decay of many political parties whose glittering generalities captured for a while the fancy of the American people. [Applause.] They have passed away, dead and buried in a past which can never be resurrected, a past which sooner or later will engulf the Republican Party, and it, too, like many others, will go down to oblivion unhonored, unwept, and unsung, for no party whose chief aim is appetite for political spoils can long survive. [Applause.]

But all the time from Washington down to Wilson, 132 years, the Democratic Party has either been in control of the affairs of our Government or else the dominant minority party, warning the American people against false gods and false idols. The Democratic Party has witnessed the development and growth of an infant Republic of 4,000,000 souls into the greatest country on the face of the earth with over 110,000,000 of people. Whenever this great country was afflicted with false gods and false doctrines, whenever famine and disaster fell upon the land, whenever the burdens grew heavy upon the tired shoulders of the toiling masses, then the American people, awakening to their sober judgment and good common sense, would repudiate the false doctrines and, relegating their promoters to the background of political oblivion, turn again and again to Democracy as the only safe and sure haven into which our ship of state in time of distress could be safely steered.

Whatever may be said about the Republican Party, yet they have been faithful and consistent in their allegiance to two great practices. One is to make a promise, and the other is to break it.

The Republican convention held at Chicago in 1884 denounced the importation of contract labor, but millions of laborers were imported during Republican administrations to take the place of American labor, and it was left to a Democratic administration, 30 years after the Chicago declaration, to enact a real immigration law.

The Republican platform of 1892 declared for efficient legislation in order to protect the lives and limbs of employees of transportation companies. The Republicans were in control for 16 years since 1892, but they never enacted any real safety appliance legislation. They were too much under the influence and control of the railroads then, as they are now, to do this; but a real safety appliance act was one of the first laws enacted by a Democratic administration.

The Republican platform of 1892, as well as subsequent platforms, denounced the trusts. This denunciation would be the rankest kind of ingratitude if it had been sincere, for the trusts kept them in power for many years. To hear a rock-ribbed, stand-pat Republican denounce a trust only shows in what wonderful ways language can be used to conceal thought.

From 1896, when the Republicans again secured control of the Federal Government, until 1912, when an outraged and betrayed public drove them from office, there was the greatest development and growth of the trusts ever known in the history of any country. Much of this development and growth was the result of Republican legislation. Why, the Republican platform in 1908 in one plank denounced the trusts, and in another declared that the American people should be taxed in order that these trusts might make a profit.

Under Republican administration every trust and manufacturing establishment, no matter how stupendous its operation, no matter how profitable its business, no matter how opulent its wealth and varied its resources, was by Republican law guaranteed a profit and insured against loss, and the only premium such insurance had to pay was a campaign contribution to the Grand Old Party.

Under the fostering care of Republican legislation it is little wonder that from 1898 until 1908, 10 years of Republican mismanagement, 458 industrial trusts bought, controlled, merged, and put out of business over 6,650 lesser industrial plants, covering practically every line of productive industry in the United States.

During those 10 years seven of these large trusts put out of business over 1,600 distinct and original plants, while one trust, the Steel Trust alone, during this decade of Republican administration was permitted to buy up, acquire, control, or destroy 792 plants, thus creating a monopoly which effectively destroyed all kind of competition in the United States.

Nor was this all, for the Republican administration threw its fostering care around the great financial institutions of the country. Three banking institutions in New York, with their affiliations, held 341 directorships in 112 railroad, insurance, banking, and other corporations, having aggregate resources of over \$24,000,000,000, which were considerably more resources than enough to control the money market of the United States, as well as the policies of the Republican Party, for over 95 per cent of these interlocking directors were high in the counsels and the confidence of the Republican Party.

The guaranty in the Republican platforms of 1900, 1904, and 1908 for the reestablishment of our merchant marine is as ridiculous as their declaration against the trusts. The policies of the Republican Party destroyed a great merchant marine. Before the Republican Party secured control of the Federal Government the American flag was seen on every sea and in every port.

We had over two and one-half million tons of American shipping in our foreign trade, and we were carrying in American vessels over 65 per cent of our exports. After nearly 50 years of Republican mismanagement, our two and one-half million tons of shipping was reduced to less than one million tons, and American vessels were carrying less than 10 per cent of our exports, which had increased over 500 per cent.

When the Republican Party took control, American vessels were carrying over \$500,000,000 of our commerce annually. Your prohibitive tariff rates, which kept out imports, only gave the American vessel one cargo for the round trip.

Republican tariff legislation drove American shipping from the seas; and up to 1912, when the Democrats went into power, American vessels were carrying only \$275,000,000 of a commerce which I say had increased over 500 per cent. As the Republican tariff went up, the American merchant marine went down. Clinging over Democratic protest and Democratic opposition to the antiquated law of 1792, which forbade registry to a vessel not built wholly in the United States, American shipping perished between the two fires of high-priced construction materials and the walled-out return cargoes. The same pen that records the upward progress of the tariff rate has also written the melancholy epitaph of American shipping on the high seas.

But now, after less than eight years of Democratic control, the American merchant marine has once more been restored, and again American shippers can send their exports in American vessels. Ten years ago, under Republican administration, American vessels carried only \$200,000,000 of American exports. Last year, under Democratic administration, American vessels carried nearly two and one-half billion dollars of American exports.

Ten years ago, under Republican administration, American vessels carried less than 9 per cent of a total commerce of less than \$3,500,000,000, while last year, under Democratic administration, American vessels carried nearly 28 per cent of a commerce of over \$10,000,000,000.

In 1910, after nearly 50 years of Republican mismanagement, the gross tonnage of American vessels engaged in the foreign trade had decreased from 2,379,000 tons to 816,000 tons. In less than eight years of Democratic administration the gross tonnage of American vessels engaged in foreign trade had increased to 6,666,000 tons, over eight times as many tons as we had under Republican administration less than 10 years ago.

Every four years the Republican Party in convention assembled would solemnly promise the American people that it would repeal the clumsy, antiquated system of currency then in operation throughout the United States; a currency system which in time of stress always failed to give relief and which in the past so often failed to prevent financial panics which paralyzed

industry, destroyed commerce, and left ruin, failure, and disaster in their wake.

All the American people ever got from the Republican Party in the way of currency legislation were a few broken promises, for the financial interests of Wall Street were in control of that party and they did not wish their interests to be disturbed. The money of the United States was gathered and sent there and controlled by less than a dozen men, who in turn controlled the policies of the Republican Party as well as the financial credit of the United States.

The Democratic administration replaced the antiquated currency system with a sound economic system of currency reform, the stability and success of which has far exceeded the most sanguine expectations of its most earnest advocates, and without which we could not have been able to have financed the enormous sums necessary to win the war.

I do not see how we could have financed the war under Republican administration. To begin with, there would have been no income-tax law, and the eight or nine billions of dollars thus raised from incomes and excess-profits taxes would have had to have been raised by some other means; and as the tariff was practically the only way in which the Republicans tried to raise revenue, we would have had to resort to excise taxes. The war stopped imports, cutting down the receipts at the custom-house, and it would have been impossible to have raised such an amount by excises. Therefore as we could not pay any considerable part of the expenses as they accrued, nearly all of the money needed for the war would have had to be raised by bonds.

No administration whose only experience in governmental affairs was how to so legislate that a few would be benefited at the expense of the many could have handled a world war. The utterly inefficient manner in which the Spanish-American War was conducted proved conclusively to the world that the Republican Party was unable to handle war matters even on a small scale.

The Republican committee appointed to investigate the conduct of the administration during the Spanish-American War admitted the incompetency of the Republican administration, but also contended that the Republican administration was not expected to successfully administer a war which suddenly called for as many as 250,000 men.

So, while we did not know at the time the Democrats were elected eight years ago that we would be called to successfully carry on the greatest war in all history, yet that Divinity which "shapes our ends, rough hew them as we will," was at work, and thus by the election of 1912 the American people were really building better than they knew.

The Republican platforms would promise the farmer a rural credit system. All the Republican Party ever gave the farmer was a tax on agricultural products, which was a pretense and a sham, but which was intended to console him for the millions of dollars wrung from his pockets every year by the plundering hand of a tariff. He was promised a rural credits act. Why did they not give him one? They were in power for nearly 50 years. This pledge was but one of many other broken Republican promises.

The Democratic administration gave the farmers a real rural credits act, which has resulted in the sum of \$426,946,566 being loaned to the farmers at 5½ per cent interest and for a period as long as 40 years.

It is a significant fact that, notwithstanding the opposition of the moneyed interests which controlled the Republican Party, when the Democratic rural credit bill came up in the House only 10 Republicans had the courage to vote against the bill.

For years the American people have been longing for an income tax. Beguiled by the false promises of the Republican Party, they had seen the expansion and development of great trusts and combines as a direct result of Republican legislation. They had seen these trusts destroy their competitors and strangle all competition, while at the same time they themselves were tax free.

No man paid to carry on the expenses of the Government according to his ability to pay, but according to what he ate and what he wore. The millionaire with a small family paid less Federal taxes for the support of his Government than the poor man with a large family. The American people were dissatisfied with so dishonest a system. They wanted the wealth of this country to pay its proportionate share of the burdens of Government. Relying upon Republican promises, they put the Republican Party into power year after year, but they looked to them in vain for the fulfillment of these promises.

The Republicans have never believed that the wealth of this country should ever contribute anything except Republican campaign contributions. That party has always been opposed

to as fair and as honest a tax as an income tax. Remembering that only a few years ago the governor of the great State of New York had proved his title clear to Republicanism by vetoing an income-tax law, they took him off the Supreme Court bench to nominate him as their last standard bearer.

The history of our Government shows that from time to time the American people have forsaken the principles of Democracy and have strayed away after false gods. History from time to time may repeat itself, but the present hopeless inefficiency of the party of special privilege is a guaranty that there is little danger of such a mistake being made by the American people in the near future. But if such a mistake should be made; if the American people should again be deluded by the never-to-be-fulfilled promises of the Republican Party; if that party, as hurtful and as harmful to the public interest as it has always been, is again restored to power, as bad and as injurious as this may be, yet there will be in the hearts and minds of all thinking people of this Republic one great consolation, which is that, as much as they would like to, the Republican Members of the National Congress will never have the courage or the temerity to repeal even one of the great Democratic constructive measures.

You are opposed to the Democratic income tax, but there is not one of you will dare to vote for its repeal.

You deceived the people about giving them currency reform, but there is not one of you who will vote to repeal the Democratic Federal reserve act.

You deceived the farmers about giving them a farm-loan act, but there is not one of you who would vote to repeal the Democratic farm-loan act.

You promised labor a safety-appliance law. The railroads made you break that promise, but there are not enough railroad magnates in the Republican Party now to force you to vote to repeal the Democratic safety-appliance acts.

The Democratic Party in less than eight years has enacted more real substantial constructive legislation than the Republican Party has in its entire history. And most of this legislation was the redemption of many broken Republican promises.

The Republican Party has been in control of both branches of the Federal Congress for over a year, and it would be interesting indeed to find out what they have accomplished in the way of reconstruction measures. Unfortunately no microscope with magnifying power sufficient has yet been invented where one can see what has been done by the present majority party in Congress.

After listening to the defense of the Republican administration in this Congress by my friend from Ohio [Mr. Fess] this morning, I was somewhat disappointed. In view of the fact that all the Democratic and independent press has unanimously stated and in further view of the fact that nearly all the great metropolitan papers of the Republican press have declared that this Congress has been the most inefficient and incompetent Congress ever held in the history of the American Republic, I was hoping that those on the other side would be forced to admit it. But the gentleman from Ohio tells us that this Republican Congress have accomplished more than any other Congress in the history of the Republic. And why? Because they introduced and passed more bills than any other Congress. What kind of bills have they passed?

Mr. MERRITT. Good ones.

Mr. COLLIER. They came here to reduce the cost of living. When a man goes to buy clothes he will find if they have any pearl buttons on them that he will have to pay an additional price to help out a little district in Iowa. Whenever that same man goes to buy a suit of clothes that has dyestuffs in it he will find that the taxes have been immeasurably raised on dyestuffs.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Did not the President recommend a revision of the tariff on dyestuffs?

Mr. COLLIER. The President recommended a safe and a sane revision; not the one that you gave here, which will increase the price of clothing to everyone in this country. And what has this Congress done to reduce the high cost of living as to food products?

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

Mr. COLLIER. In one second. What have they done in reference to foodstuffs? Despite the fact that the high cost of provisions is bearing down so heavily upon everybody, in order to take care of two little districts in this country only last week they raised the tariff upon beans from 25 cents a bushel to \$1.20 a bushel. [Applause.] The Democratic administration, believing in something that the Republicans are opposed to, believing that education should be encouraged, knowing

what the effect of German knowledge of chemistry had upon the war, permitted students of chemistry to buy chemical reagents and instruments free of duty. But what are the achievements of the Republican Party so lauded here to-day? One of the great number of bills that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] doubtless referred to is to increase to the students of chemistry the cost of chemical instruments and chemical reagents by an outrageous Republican tariff. [Applause.]

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

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAYTON. The gentleman talks about the high cost of living. The Democratic Party have had ever since 1913 to reduce the high cost of living. We have only been operating here, with the administration against us, for a very short time.

Mr. COLLIER. I will admit that you have done the best you could in the time you have been here. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COLLIER. Please be brief. They have given me only a few minutes.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman suggested that there was a difference between the idea of the President on tariff revision and the idea expressed in the legislation passed by this Congress. Will the gentleman be good enough to tell us wherein they differ?

Mr. COLLIER. The President of the United States and all others who believe in the principles of Democracy, which are that not a dollar of tariff duties should be levied except to carry on the economically administered expenses of the Government, do not believe in any kind of tariff that will increase the cost of pearl buttons, and beans, and flour, and every agricultural implement.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLLIER. Let me tell you another thing. High-grade steel can not be made without mixing in a certain percentage of tungsten with the iron ore, and, therefore, when every farmer buys a high-grade agricultural implement and when the ladies buy their typewriting machines and when mechanics buy their tools and cutting and planing machines all the ore than has gone into their manufacture has been mixed with a certain percentage of tungsten, which has been outrageously taxed. Yet one of the achievements highly lauded to-day is the putting of a tariff of 2,200 per cent upon tungsten in order to help out one or two concerns which happen to control it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You have also levied a tax upon building. The finest brick in the country is made by mixing magnesite with it, and away over in one corner of this country, in order to help out a district in the extreme Northwest, you have raised the tariff on magnesite over 500 per cent.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman stated the President's idea of the tariff on dyestuffs was a tariff that would produce revenue. His suggestion was a protective tariff. What difference was there in the mind of the President that actuated the gentleman to say that the President was in favor of one kind of protection different from the protection provided for in the legislation?

Mr. COLLIER. Oh, in seven or eight minutes I can not go into that. First let me say that the dyestuffs bill which you passed through this House was not the dyestuffs bill recommended or the kind that the Democrats tried to pass.

Mr. REAVIS. What was recommended?

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield any further.

It is a peculiar as well as a fearful thing when, according to the theory of the Constitution, the legislators are but the servants of the people, that yet the people should stand in dread of their legislation. I know a load will be lifted from every breast when this inefficient Republican Congress will adjourn, so that the people will be spared the spectacle of ridiculous investigations and cheap efforts at economy in small sums while criminally extravagant in large sums.

The Republican majority have gone mad on investigations. In their partisanship and desire to besmirch the Democratic administration they have attempted to make light of America's wonderful achievements during the war. In order to divert attention from their miserable inefficiency, the Republican leaders in the House have repeatedly attempted in their partisan, unfair, and wholly unjustifiable investigations to blacken and soil some of the brightest and most glorious pages in the history of the American Republic.

If the American people have wasted their time listening to the weak and ridiculous speeches of the Republican members of the various investigating subcommittees, they have no doubt concluded that if anything wrong was done by the Democratic administration there was no danger of that Republican investigating committee ever finding it out, no matter what facts might be laid before them.

Of all the criticism directed against every man connected with this war as brought out by the investigating committee, eight out of every ten of those criticized have been and are to-day prominent Republicans and voted the Republican ticket at the last presidential election.

If the Democratic administration made a mistake, it was in trusting Republicans by placing them in those positions of trust. But in justice to these Republicans who have been so severely criticized by the Republican members of the committee, I say that for the most part the criticism directed against them is captious and unfounded, and that instead of being criticized most of them should be commended for the patriotic zeal and energy and time they gave, practically without pay, to their country during the war. Considering all the conditions and the urgent necessity for haste, they, as I say, for the most part, did well and are deserving not of censure but of praise.

Certainly the Republican Party refused to profit by the lessons of history. Ten years ago, when that party was in absolute control of every governmental department, when flushed with the intoxication of another victory, drunk with the exercise of an almost despotic power, enriched by the spoils of nearly half a century's patronage, and swollen with the conceit of repeated indorsements, they quarreled among themselves over the distribution of spoils.

They found fault with the Cannon rule, by which the House was absolutely in control of one man. There was no Calendar Wednesday then for a committee to bring a bill before this House, as there now is. The only way a bill not from an appropriating or revenue raising committee could be brought to a consideration was for the author of the bill or the chairman of the committee reporting it to go hat in hand to the Speaker and ask for recognition, which was more often denied than given.

While that system became so hateful to the American people that the Republicans themselves were forced to abandon it, yet I must confess that as bad as Cannonism was, it is really superior to the steering committee system now in practice, where four millionaires pass on and control all the legislation of this House. Now you have gone to the four millionaires' rule, which I say is worse than Cannonism. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It will vigorously be contended by the Republicans that I am wrong in calling Cannonism a better system, because the judgment of four should be greater than the judgment of one. But the trouble is that these four millionaires have neither the courage, the intellectuality, nor the judgment of the former Speaker of this House [laughter and applause], and therefore I contend that the present system has all the viciousness of Cannonism without its redeeming intellectuality. Despotism, even benevolent despotism, is a curse to any country, but there can be no greater infliction put upon any people than to torment them with a stupid, a vacillating, and an inefficient despotism.

No matter how important the legislation may be, no matter how carefully it may have been considered by the committee, no matter how urgent or necessary it is, the legislation must first be submitted to the steering committee, and the permission of that august body must first be secured before it can be considered by this House.

On the resolution to give food to the starving children of Europe the Ways and Means Committee held meetings twice a day. The chairman of the committee on three different occasions thought he could bring the resolution up in 24 hours, and in justice to the gentleman from Michigan I will say he did the best he could.

Conditions in Austria, in Armenia, and in Poland were horrible. Children by the hundreds were dropping dead in the streets, dying from famine and starvation.

Prentiss once said when a man dies of disease he alone endures the pain:

Around his pillow are gathered sympathetic friends, who, if they can not keep back the deadly messenger, cover his face and conceal the horrors of his visage as he delivers his stern mandate.

In battle, in the fullness of his pride and strength, little reck the soldier whether the hissing bullet sings his sudden requiem or the cords of life are severed by the sharp steel. But he who dies of hunger wrestles alone day after day with his grim and unrelenting enemy. Famine comes not up like a brave enemy, storming by a sudden onset the fortress that resists. Famine besieges. He draws his lines around the doomed garrison, he cuts off all supplies, and he never summons to surrender, for he gives no quarter.

And this was the kind of famine the Ways and Means Committee resolution was trying, with wheat, wholesome but unsalable in the United States, wheat we already owned and which had cost us nothing, for it was a profit made by the Grain Corporation—this was the kind of famine we were trying to conquer,

trying to conquer it with wheat, which was the only weapon with which we could safely wage war against it.

The resolution was unanimously reported; the membership of the House were eager to vote to send this food to those starving little ones, whose piteous wailing cries could almost be heard across the waters. But the steering committee withheld their hand. In one town, in one month, out of 1,000 babies 960 starved to death. In another instance over 800 out of a thousand perished for lack of food, and still the steering committee said "no." Finally, after weeks and months, and after over 30,000 babies had starved to death, the steering committee relented and told the chairman, Mr. FORDNEY, he could bring in his resolution. In less than 48 hours the bread was on the way to those starving little children.

Nero is said to have fiddled while Rome burned, but the Republican steering committee vacillated while 30,000 babies died from famine, hunger, and starvation.

This is only one incident out of any number of instances of inefficiency, vacillation, and weakness of this wondrous four-man rule now in vogue here in the House. And yet the people back home think that Congress is a deliberative representative body and do not know that the Republican majority is by their own volition controlled by a steering committee of which four constitute a majority.

The election of a Republican Congress in 1918 was not only a calamity to the United States, but it was a political tragedy in so far as international affairs are concerned. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The damage done to the United States by the weak, vacillating, inefficient Republican Congress can in time be repaired. Ours is a country of wonderful resources and unlimited opportunities, and the people of the United States have marvelous recuperative powers, else the country could never have survived nearly 50 years of Republican mismanagement. [Laughter and applause.] Fortunate was it, indeed, that this long period of Republican tenure was not continuous, and that from time to time Democratic administrations would be called to undo the pernicious and injurious effects of a legislation made grievous and unbearable by unjust discrimination and unpardonable partiality. The student of history will bear me out in the statement that the Republican Party from time to time has lived and fattened on the good results of Democratic legislation until, by their own effort, they got turned out of office. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. From 1893 to 1895?

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that notwithstanding the damage incurred by the country being inflicted with a party which since May, 1919, has done nothing but investigate and play peanut politics, yet in so far as the United States is concerned this damage, bad as it is, can be cured in time.

But the evil effects of the Republican victory of 1918 from an international standpoint is a different matter. It came at a time when American arms, American genius, and American leadership were exciting the admiration of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Chaos and confusion reigned in Europe. The Old World was in travail. New governments arose only to be overthrown and other governments took their places. Revolution and revolt were in the air. Bolshevism and anarchy were spreading over Europe like a prairie fire. Communism and sovietism were lifting their ugly heads in every capital in the Old World. Orgies of riot and bloodshed and lawlessness as a result of the war developed all over continental Europe. Those who had been oppressed for centuries drank so deeply themselves "from the new-found cup of liberty that they became drunk and frenzied with the unusual draught."

But America, secure in her consciousness that by the glory of American arms and the splendor of American achievements the war was won and democracy was secured throughout the world, America serenely, steadfastly, confidently, magnificently prepared to gain for all time, for all humanity, a victory far greater in its character and more glorious in its consequences than those gained by the valor of her sons at the red plains of Chateau-Thierry or the bloody forests of the Argonne.

Never before in the history of any country in any age was there so glorious an opportunity to put into practice the divine precepts of the Prince of Peace as that which a year ago was afforded the American Republic.

All the enemies of bolshevism and sovietism and communism looked to America as the storm-bound mariner looked upon the peaceful haven. The friends of law and order—all who despised riots and revolutions and anarchy and bloodshed—anchored their hopes to the young Republic of the West.

After over five years of continuous warfare in Europe, in which the map of the continent had been changed, in which

kingdoms were overthrown and confusion was everywhere, all thinking men knew that if law and order were to come out of this chaos and confusion that it would be necessary for the stronger powers to form some kind of an alliance to protect the weaker countries from the territorial encroachments of their rapacious neighbors and see if some plan could not be devised where the sacrifices and the horrors of another five years' war could either be avoided or else postponed for centuries.

In this great work of democratizing the world, America, as she had done throughout every stage of the Great War, was preparing to again take the lead.

But the Republican victory of 1918 changed all this. What matters American honor, American leadership, and American prestige if a Republican Congress can be elected? [Laughter and applause.]

The campaign of slander and misrepresentation, of abuse and villification, was directed against President Wilson and the peace treaty, even before he put foot upon European soil. His utterances were condemned before he opened his mouth to speak them, and his policies were slandered and misrepresented long before his position was known. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Placing political spoils above the glory of their country's achievements in the greatest war in the greatest epoch of all time, they projected and continued a campaign of misrepresentation and slander, which has had the effect of not only changing American leadership in international affairs into a pitiful state of vacillation and weakness but at the same time destroyed forever all hope of our country playing the greatest part in the greatest drama that was ever staged in the theater of the world.

When America repudiated the Versailles agreement "walls, arches, roof, and deep foundation stones" of a league to preserve peace and tranquility throughout the world all mingling fell. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The effects of this failure are indescribable. Bolshevism is now rampant over a great part of Europe. Poland is now advancing with an invading Army 150 miles from her frontier. Berlin is in the throes of a revolution. All Germany is torn by the ravages of a civil war. Austria lies prone, prostrate, starving. Trade relations between the Allies and the Central Powers are paralyzed. Anarchy, sovietism, communism, and every other political "ism" that flesh is heir to threatens the peace and security of all mankind.

Conditions in the United States are unsettled. Labor is dissatisfied. Capital is uneasy. The war measures necessary once but worse than useless now are still in force. The high cost of living seems to be going still higher. The I. W. W. raising its vulture head is striking at the roots of organized society. All trade relations between the Allies and Central Powers are practically paralyzed. The unsettled state of financial conditions may at any moment result in disaster and "confusion worse confounded."

The peace and security and happiness of all Christendom are threatened by enemies from without and by enemies from within. What a price, what an awful price, to pay for the election of perhaps the weakest and most inefficient Congress in the history of the American Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken the floor of the House for the purpose of replying particularly to the address of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER], but rather have I arisen for the purpose of voicing my resentment generally to the unjust criticism to which Congress is being subjected. This criticism is neither unique nor unusual, but is part of a somewhat general sentiment which the people and the press entertain with reference to legislative bodies. Throughout the Nation, in the quiet cloisters of editorial rooms, men but little familiar with the activities of life or the real needs of the Nation pass adverse judgments, not only upon the Congress as a body but upon the individual membership thereof. In many, if not in most, instances the criticism is based upon misinformation, and at this particular time is inspired in large measure by the growing feeling that all ills from which the people suffer are legislative in character and will respond to legislative treatment.

Occasionally, though fortunately not often, some Member of this body, for partisan purposes, will reiterate and repeat these criticisms, and such statements made on the floor are usually accepted by the people at large as the views of Congress concerning itself. I want to express my very high regard for the membership of this body on both sides of the aisle. I want to

bear testimony not only to the accomplishments of the House of Representatives but to the sincerity of purpose that actuates the conduct of most of the Members. It is unfortunate, of course, that Congress is usually advertised by its weakest Members. Occasionally some Member will deliver an address which discloses a lack of knowledge of the subject matter and possibly give indications of being inspired by personal political interests, which the newspapers will immediately seize as indicative of Congress. The reverse is quite true. I have never been associated with any body of men of greater intellectual capacity nor who were actuated by more sincere motives than is the average Member of the House of Representatives, without regard to the side of the aisle that he sits on.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER], however, has seen fit to eulogize his own party by attacking the accomplishments of the House of Representatives. He has even gone so far as to suggest that the loss of prestige which America has suffered abroad is due solely to the inefficiency of the present Congress. I do not know by what process of reasoning he reaches this conclusion, but I must beg leave to differ with him. I regret that his statement with reference to the loss of prestige is true, and it seems to me that its consequences are not only serious but well-nigh tragic. America has fallen from a very high estate since the fall of 1918. Probably never in the history of the world was a Nation so esteemed by all civilization as was America on armistice day in November, 1918. She had given to the race an example of unselfishness that was and is unparalleled, and the value of her contribution toward saving the civilization of this earth was recognized as incalculable.

I recall standing one Sunday evening in the month of July, 1918, on one of the bridges of Paris. I not only heard the steady pounding of the German guns as I stood there, but I saw their flash on the horizon, so close were they to Paris. From March until July of that year the German Army had marched toward Paris almost without resistance. Gen. Haig, in a despairing plea to his soldiers, announced to the world that his back was against the wall. The German hosts were boasting of what they were to do with the beautiful French city, and their boasts seemed likely to be fulfilled. A million people had left Paris within six weeks. The munition works adjacent to the city had been dismantled. The fine art treasures had been removed to places of safety, and the population was ready to abandon their capital to the enemy. Far over in the southeastern part of France the American Army was training, and at this crisis some 300,000 of our soldiers were brought over to participate with the fast-breaking allies. These boys of ours struck the Germans first at the village of Vaux, next at Belleau Wood, and at Chateau-Thierry on the 18th of July. For the first time since March the German Army was stopped. After severe fighting it started a retreat that did not end until the armistice was signed on the 11th of November following. [Applause.]

It is impossible to describe the jubilation of the French people when the German Army was stopped on July 18. The nation had been depressed and heartbroken with impending disaster, but the whole situation changed within a week. They went from midnight until noon without an hour between, and the smile that had been driven from the face of France returned again because of the success that the American soldiers had achieved over their enemy. I do not believe it extravagant to say that the allied powers were literally at the feet of the American soldier in adoration. I stood on the roof of the Hotel Crillon, in Paris, and watched the parade made up of the soldiers of all of the allied forces. At Place de la Concord, across from the hotel, were massed 10,000 people, who uncovered as one man when a company of our marines went by carrying the flag of the United States. This deference was paid to no other flag save their own.

The years and the ages would have been too short for France and civilized Europe to have forgotten the contribution that the United States had made if we had brought our boys home when this war was over and had stated that the purpose which we sought had been accomplished and that we were through. Oh, that we had kept the promise that we made the year before, when it was said, "We shall leave France with our hands as empty as they were when we went there, except we shall bear the ashes of our dead." No nation was ever so exalted in the world's esteem as was America when the hostilities were brought to an end. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] states that we have sacrificed all of this because of the action of a Republican Congress, but I would call to his attention another equation that entered into the problem—the vaulting, overwhelming ambition of one man was yet to enter as a circumstance, the ambition of one who arrogated to himself the right to speak for a hundred and ten mil-

lion people not in matters which intimately and directly concerned them but in matters in which they had a remote concern. He set himself up as the arbiter of the nations of the earth, telling Italy what she could have; telling France what she could have; parceling out the territory of our ally Russia; and granting to Japan the holy ground of another ally, China. Because of this intermeddling with the affairs of Europe, the loss of prestige has come. Not only was it sought by the President to dictate the policies of the Old World but he offered as a price for such dictation the sovereignty of his own people, which offer, fortunately, his own people have repudiated.

I have not the time, Mr. Chairman, to elaborate on the accomplishments of this Congress, but I give it to you as my sincere belief that it will go into history as one of the most serviceable legislative bodies that have ever convened during the life of the Nation. I am not much of a statesman; I am not much of a Congressman, I sometimes fear, and I make no pretensions to prophecy, but I can look down the aisle of the years to come and see the children of the long future emerging from the shadows to receive from those who have carried "the torch till they fell" a Nation whose sovereignty is not divided, which is completely and utterly its own master, which is privileged to work out its own salvation and to contribute on occasion to the welfare of all humanity—not under the order of a supergovernment but on its own motion and by its own volition. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the children of that future, for whom has been preserved the sovereignty and the independence of this country, will hold in their hearts the names of LODGE, and KNOX, and BORAH, and REED, and SHIELDS, and NORRIS, and those other Senators who have offered their political careers on the altar of their conviction in the same high regard that we hold Jefferson, and Hamilton, and Webster, and Sumner, and Lincoln. Holding this belief, Mr. Chairman, I have felt at liberty to resent the criticisms of the gentleman from Mississippi against a Congress which I believe will go into history as one of the great legislative assemblies of the country. Holding this belief and contrasting our present position in the world with the one we occupied a year and a half ago, it seems to me that many years will elapse before we can fully assess the injury Woodrow Wilson has been to his people and his time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LUCE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I thoroughly agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] about the bad habit of certain people in abusing Congress. But I submit to him, and to all other candid gentlemen, if it is not just as improper for Congress to abuse the President of the United States as it is for divers people to abuse Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. I have no desire or intention to abuse the President of the United States. I was simply replying to a charge made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] that the loss of prestige was due to the action of Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman's remarks were very unkind to the President. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Some of these days I am going to deliver a lecture, or it may be write a small book, collating the abuse, first and last, that has been heaped on the more distinguished Presidents of the United States. [Applause.] It began in the beginning of our glorious national life, and when George Washington, the greatest man that ever lived [applause] stepped down and out of the presidential office a large number of people thanked God that the old tyrant was out at last.

Jefferson was most savagely abused. New England preachers bombarded him from the pulpit as the anti-Christ, which was going some. Andrew Jackson, the heroic soldier, was held up as a monster of iniquity. He was called every bad thing his enemies could think of except a coward. There was not a liar in America fool enough to say that about the conqueror of Gen. Sir Edward Pakenham.

What the Republicans said—I am not talking about what the Democrats said—what the Republicans said about Abraham Lincoln was something dreadful, something awful. Senator Ben Wade and Henry Winter Davis became associated on a paper that was a disgrace to the American Republic. The whole of it was taken up in horrible abuse of Abraham Lincoln.

You can say what you please about it, and I hold no brief for him, Woodrow Wilson will take his place in history along with Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln. Those are my four favorites.

I am going to talk a little about things that have happened. St. Peter, the great and heroic apostle, in his first epistle charged the disciples to stand "ready always to give answer to every man that asketh you a reason concerning the hope that is in you."

Of course, that was religious advice from the great apostle, but it is just as good political advice as it is religious advice. In this great campaign that is impending Democrats stand squarely and proudly on the record they made when we had the President and both branches of Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is a record of patriotism, wisdom, and unimpeachable glory. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A man that can not defend it successfully is a stark idiot. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In six years a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress put more good progressive remedial legislation on the statute books than did the Republican Party in 25 years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

One of the greatest assemblies of men that ever met in this world was the Republican national convention of 1880. Every big Republican in the land was there and a good many big Democrats looking on. The most spectacular feature of that great conclave was Roscoe Conkling's superb oration nominating Gen. Grant for a third term.

In that speech he said that "Gen. Grant's fame rests not alone on things written and things said, but upon the arduous greatness of things done." That is a magnificent sentence. It sticks to the memory like a bur. That sentence of the great New Yorker fits the Democratic record like a glove. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We stand on what we did [applause on the Democratic side]; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against us. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If I was going to pick out just one thing that has done the American people more good, and that was done by Democrats, than any other, the first one I would pick would be the Federal Reserve System. Some time ago some Democrat was making a speech, I have forgotten who he was, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], the high mucky-muck of this congressional campaign committee [laughter and applause on the Democratic side], interrupted long enough to say that we stole that bill from the Republicans. I do not know whether he put that in the Record or not.

Mr. ALMON. He said it to-day.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, somebody told me—I was detained this morning on some business matters—that he practically reasserted that thing. I thought he ought to quit it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If some ordinary plug said a thing like that, I would not kick about it, I would not care what he said, but here is a man who was president of a college, and ought to know something if he does not [laughter and applause on the Democratic side], chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee, who makes an assertion that is not warranted by the facts. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He can not steal that bill from us. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A great many of you Republicans voted for it. What did you do it for? Because you were afraid to vote against it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Of course, there are facts in that bill that were in the Aldrich bill, but it was only part of it. Well, now, if that bill is a good bill—and no man in this House will get upon the floor and deny that it is—not one—if it is a good bill, what are you kicking about? If it is not a good bill, why did you vote for it? If it is a good bill, why did not you pass it yourselves when you had 16 years of power? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FESS. Because the Democrats prevented it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, a minority can not prevent the passage of a bill here.

Mr. FESS. Sometimes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never saw it done yet. You had the President, and you had both Houses of Congress, and in one Congress you had 144 majority in this House, and you could not pass a currency bill or a banking bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You did not have the power of initiative, and you have not got it now. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I would not fear to rest the Democratic claim entirely on that one bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It alone should renew our lease of power. For 20 years the Republicans have

been tinkering at the currency question, always promising reform, but never accomplished anything, never. Everybody who has half sense knows the country had outgrown the national banking bill. It is like trying to fit a garment of a 10-year-old boy on the Kentucky giant; you could not do it. The old Republican scheme was a breeder of panics [applause on the Democratic side], an invitation to panics. I do not have to enumerate them, but all of us can remember most of them. There was no elasticity to the currency. Does any man in this House believe we could have gone through this colossal war with that old bill on the statute books without a panic? [Cries of "No!" on the Democratic side.] If he does, he has faith that would move mountains. The Republicans had a system of shreds and patches, always getting into trouble with it—

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. FESS. What is there in the Federal reserve act as it now stands that was not in the Aldrich bill except first the Aldrich bill provided for a central bank while the present bill has a regional bank and the Aldrich bill did not have the present organization of the board?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No.

Mr. FESS. What is the difference between the two except those?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, those differences are enough to make our bill immortal and condemn yours forever. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit, I would suggest that the pork-barrel system which distributes favors throughout the States is not an advisable thing to do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, is the gentleman against the Federal reserve bank bill?

Mr. FESS. I voted for it—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why did you do it?

Mr. FESS. Because the Democrats accepted the gold standard amendment that I wrote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gold standard had been fixed for years.

Mr. FESS. I was against it until that amendment was accepted.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will permit, no doubt the gentleman remembers the debate on the Federal reserve act, and one objection of one of the Republican critics, who finally voted for the bill in spite of his objection, was that under the Aldrich scheme the country banks could still keep their reserves in reserve cities; and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Prouty, made a constitutional argument that our bill was unconstitutional, in that it took control of certain assets of member banks; and yet that is the very bedrock of the Federal Reserve System and the difference between that and the Aldrich bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Arkansas. Here is the situation: For 30 or 40 years the Republicans had been bellowing at the top of their voices that we have no initiative. They admitted that in the spacious days of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson we had, but they declared that we had lost it, and if we got it we could not do anything. You know you all said that, and by blinding the people with that kind of chaff you stayed in power for 25 or 30 years; but in 1912 the scales fell from their eyes and they put the Democrats back in power, and they accomplished more than you have accomplished since the death of Lincoln. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Charley Landis used to tell a story that fits you gentlemen exactly. He said down in the mountains of Pennsylvania they built a spur out in the mountains, and an old chap who had never seen a car or an engine or a railroad track took his wife and went down to the depot and saw the train come in. He looked it over and he said, "Sallie, they will never start her." It went around the hill at the rate of about 40 miles an hour. He looked at it, and said, "Sallie, they will never stop her." [Laughter.] And that is what you people said about us. You said that we could not do anything and then that we did too much.

Another bill that I would be willing to go before the people on by itself as entitling us to another lease of power is the income-tax provision in the Underwood tariff bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And, by the way, a great many of you Republicans voted for it. Why did you vote for it? Because you were afraid not to vote for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The best system of taxation that ever was devised by the wit of man, as well as the fairest and justest, is the graduated income tax. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have been for it ever since I can recollect. I was one of the men that helped to put it in the tariff law of 1894, and it was knocked out by a 5 to 1 decision of the Supreme Court that still stinks

in the nostrils of mankind. It immediately became a part of the Democratic creed. We worked at it for years and years, and finally had to get a constitutional amendment adopted in order to get it. And we have got it. That is a Democratic measure. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It will never be repealed. It may be modified and amended and improved by reason of experience, but there is no more chance of repealing the principle of the income tax than there is of repealing the rule of three—not a bit.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman say that the amendment relating to the income tax was not ratified by more Republican States than Democratic States?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know.

Mr. FESS. It was ratified by the Republican States, and it became a law because there were more of those States than there were Democratic States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It may be. I am getting to be suspicious as to historical facts as stated by the gentleman from Ohio. [Laughter.] His memory sometimes plays tricks with him. I do not see that that matters one way or the other. Anyway, we got it, and, what is a good deal more, we are going to keep it. If we had not done anything else, it should entitle us to a long lease of power.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman confine his eulogy of the Underwood law to the income tax?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not confine it to that. It is the best tariff law ever put on the statute books even without the income tax, but the income tax improved it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. And the best proof that it is the best tariff law is that the Republicans are in power and have not attempted to repeal it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes. Any party that will go to the country with a proposition of repealing the income tax law would not carry five States in the Union. It taxes what people have and not what they consume.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is an easy question; yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that another Democratic accomplishment was getting us into the war. We would like authority on that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think a remark like that is an insult to the American people and everybody in the House as well. It was not a Democratic war; it was not a Republican war; it was an American war. The Republicans acted very well during the war. [Applause.] I will say that for them, and that is a matter of justice. A man who has held the position that I have in this House can not afford to do anything but tell the truth. But the very moment the war was over you commenced acting badly and you have been at it ever since. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not think that the Democratic record is absolutely perfect. The record of no party that ever existed was perfect. But I will tell you what I do know. Anybody can take an ordinary telescope and go out and find spots on the sun. They are there. They have always been there and they always will be there, but nevertheless the sun continues to light and heat and fructify the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You can pick flaws as much as you want to in the Democratic record, but when you take it altogether it is a great body of progressive action in the Congress of the United States and in the Democratic administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Missouri. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I will consume that much time.

Now, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] wanted to know about the war. I will tell you about the war. We all went into it, Democrats and Republicans, as Americans, and not as Democrats or Republicans. It happened that we had the administration, and it also happened that we performed the greatest stunt ever performed by the soldiers of any country at any time or at any place. We did not begin the war; we finished it. [Applause.] I said that a year or two ago here in the House one day, and several gentlemen jumped me, not in the House, but in the newspapers, where it was safer to do it. But when Gen. Pershing sent his report of his conduct during the war he said that we gained that war. Now, if there is any man in the United States that knows anything about war, it

is Pershing. [Applause.] And you Republicans—I have no license to advise you—if you want a good candidate, set aside all these boodlers and nominate Gen. Pershing. [Laughter.] The war was conducted to a successful conclusion under a great Democratic President. You can not deny that. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And you can get your spy-glasses out and examine the record, and you will find it is a fine record. What is it that makes you want to pick flaws with him all the time for, anyway? We have not heard Republicans praising him for things he has done that are unquestionably good. For instance, he insists that the Turk shall be sent across the Bosphorus and put back into Asia, where he belongs. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am in favor of it. He never had any business in Europe, to begin with. The quicker you get him out the better the peace of the world will be. But I have not heard a single Republican stand up on the floor of this House in all the talk there has been about the President, and praise him for even that meritorious suggestion. I will tell you my theory about the President. The minute a man is inaugurated President of the United States he becomes President of us all. I hope to Heaven that you Republicans will not elect a President, but if you should happen to do so through any inscrutable arrangements of Providence, the minute he is sworn in on the 4th of March he will become my President.

I will name two or three things the Democrats have done. They have established a Trade Commission; they have established all these energies of government, and the Government never has been in better working order than it is now.

Election of United States Senators by the people—a great progressive measure—for years promised by both parties, was finally achieved by the Democratic Congress and Democratic President.

We admitted Arizona and New Mexico—a performance long promised by Republicans and at last accomplished by Democrats—a great boon to those nascent Commonwealths.

We passed bills for the prevention of corrupt use of money in elections. We established the Trade Commission. We established the War Risk Insurance Bureau—a splendid benefaction. We passed the ship-purchase bill, which has given us a fine merchant fleet, the first we have had since 1863 and 1864. Once more, thank Heaven, American ships will plow every sea and the American flag will float in every harbor of the world. We passed the Clayton antitrust law; a better and more liberal Philippine bill; and the Underwood tariff bill—the best tariff law ever put upon the statute books; a conservation bill; a land-bank bill, which is a great blessing to the farmers of America; this land farm loan bill alone should give us a new lease of power.

We have passed good labor laws, pension laws, and other good and meritorious measures, which I have not time to mention in 20 minutes.

Now, in most of these great measures the Republicans voted with us. I want to impress that on your minds and stir up your recollections. If they were not good bills when we passed them, why did you vote for them? There is only one answer to that question, and that is that they were good bills.

Now, it is a curious tale that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] was telling, and it is exactly correct that for about one-half of the time since this Government was organized the Democrats have been running it, and for about half of the time the opponents of the Democrats, under various names, have been running it, and we lack four years of being quite up with the others; and we want the four years. [Laughter.] And judging from the way things have been running in the last three months, we shall get those four years. [Applause.] Three or four months ago the prospects of the Democrats were not very cheerful; but everything that has happened in Washington or anywhere else, or in Michigan or Missouri [laughter], improves the prospects of the Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You might as well cheer up. One Republican presidential candidate sent \$35,000 down to Missouri in order to get some delegates. The papers say this morning that the very fellows who got the money are afraid to vote for him in the convention. [Laughter.]

Remember, it is the Republicans that are probing the Republicans over there. I did not start it, and no other Democrat did; but I am in a frame of mind when I can say, "Go it, husband! Go it, bear!" until you dig them all out and put them all out of business. [Laughter.]

I have said we accomplished more in 6 years than you people did in 25. How did we do it? The Democratic House did its duty. The Democratic Senate did its duty. The Democratic President did his duty. It was marvelous teamwork; marvelous teamwork; and the only thing that I wonder about is that we accomplished so much in such a short time. We have

the highest authority for measuring human conduct. "Judge a tree by its fruits." It is a good rule, and we are willing to be judged by it. And on these great accomplishments of the Democrats we plant ourselves, believing that the people of the country have intelligence enough to give us another lease of power. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back a minute and a half.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. It is only now in order for some one on the minority side to second the nomination. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. The people of the United States will do that.

Mr. REAVIS. 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. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the speech delivered a few moments ago by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER]. It was a very elegant speech, and had it been occasionally punctuated with facts it would be worthy of a careful reading by the entire country. But when a few moments later I heard the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] make the declaration that the Underwood tariff bill was the best piece of legislation of that character that was ever placed upon the statute books—and it received universal approbation from the Democratic membership in Congress—I was constrained to believe that that side of the House can see fact where fact does not exist. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of discussing briefly some legislation that has recently been enacted and considered by this Congress.

Within the past two months or ten weeks there has been one of the most systematic and carefully organized propaganda against any plan that has for its object the giving of a bonus to the ex-service men of the late war. The question of a bonus to these men, or an adjusted compensation, is not new in character, for it has been discussed throughout the country from every angle since shortly after the armistice was signed, nearly two years ago. Until within the last two months there was no well-defined opinion against this course on the part of the Government. So sure was Congress, until quite recently, that these boys would be given this recognition for the sacrifices they were called upon to make that the Ways and Means Committee of the House, by unanimous voice of the House, was not only asked but ordered to report a bonus bill carrying with it a plan for raising the money to meet the necessary expense.

This committee was a unit for the idea involved and commenced this task with a unity of purpose to speedily report a bill, that it might at once be enacted into law. Soon thereafter many plans, some feasible and some not, for raising the funds were presented and discussed. Among them a tax retroactive in nature on huge and unconscionably high war profits was suggested, and from that moment the committee was met with opposition from all sides. This opposition grew in strength as time went on, until it amounted to the most aggravated and sinister propaganda that has ever been waged against any bill in recent years. At the very moment that it was thought that a part of war profits was in danger of confiscation in order to meet this laudable purpose, a propaganda against the bill had its birth. Since this time every plan proposed to raise money to meet this expenditure has been assaulted.

These men who made unlimited millions off of the blood of the Nation suddenly grew surprisingly and suspiciously patriotic. As soon as their own profits appeared as a tempting field from which to get a part of the funds, they at once discovered that to give these men a bonus must be forever killed. They said then and they say now it would be a commercialization of patriotism and would be an insult to every boy who fought for

his flag, while many of them remained at home reveling in ill-gotten gains from the very Government these boys fought to preserve. Many of these same profiteers who cry aloud against the bonus still are filching in the most high-handed way from either the Government or the public at large. Some of these men who cry "Do not commercialize patriotism" ought now to be in jail because of swindles practiced against the Government when it was bleeding from a thousand wounds and more. Many of these men have not yet given up their wild efforts, but are still robbing the people in defiance of stringent laws enacted by Congress to limit high prices. If the Attorney General of the United States would do his duty, many of these same men would be serving time in Federal prisons throughout the land, instead of being permitted to continue boosting prices out of the reach of three-fourths of the population of the country. [Applause.]

I do not intend to say and do not have in mind that all men who oppose a bonus are men who have made profits out of war, because many of the best men and women of the country do not believe in any plan of adjusted compensation for these boys, but I do say that without exception those who have made most out of war are the most bitter opponents against this legislation.

It is estimated that it will require something near \$1,250,000,000 to meet this expenditure, and they ask how can you raise this enormous sum of money?

They say the thought that is in the mind of every man and woman of the country is that the cost of living is now out of reach of practically all and this bonus would make prices still higher. Do not let them mislead you on this score. The cost of living is high, and this condition distresses the population of this country and is the one thing that lies nearest the heart of all. The price unjustly demanded in practically every instance is 100 per cent and more higher than the facts and conditions would justify.

As I have already suggested, there is a remedy for this evil, and that remedy is in the possession of the Attorney General of the United States. Congress has given the executive branch of this Government every authority to control prices of most necessities, and yet with all these laws so thick and drastic the cost of living daily increases. [Applause.]

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. WELTY. Does the gentleman know that six courts have declared that the Lever Act is unconstitutional?

Mr. KEARNS. I know that some parts of the Lever Act have been declared unconstitutional.

Mr. WELTY. Every part except that part with reference to labor.

Mr. KEARNS. I will say to the gentleman that within a week the Attorney General of the United States has seen fit, regardless of the decisions to which the gentleman refers, to bring indictments against a certain woolen manufacturing company of this country, and therefore the Attorney General seems to think that in some instances the law is constitutional.

Decided action on the part of the Department of Justice would save to the American people in one single month sufficient money to pay this bonus. Congress has given to this department authority for such action. Congress can only make laws, not execute. That function belongs solely to the executive branch of Government, and if the present Attorney General of the United States is afraid of big industrial firms that are doing an illegitimate business, let the President remove him and put a man in that office who will perform his duty, and the present great unrest will only live in memory.

I repeat that if the laws against unfair profits were enforced, in one month's time the people of this country would save enough money to pay the most liberal bonus that has ever been proposed to these men who gave up their business interests and offered their lives if need be to their country. [Applause.]

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit just one question?

Mr. KEARNS. No; I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. KEARNS. In this connection permit me to call your attention to a few, just a few, items that are prime necessities in every household in all America. The American people buy, wear out, and discard, on the average, two pairs of shoes per person per year. Some seem to require more, but counting men, women, and children the average is said to be about two pairs per person. This makes the total pairs of shoes purchased last year about 220,000,000. Is it too much to say, with shoes selling from \$7 per pair to \$20, that the average graft in the shoe business during the past year was \$2 per pair? These figures are ridiculously low, yet this makes the steal from the

public in one year \$420,000,000—nearly enough money, you will see, deliberately filched from the pockets of the people in this one item alone to pay one-third of the whole amount to be given these men as an adjusted compensation. [Applause.]

When these men were suddenly called from their homes, forced to give up their business interests, enter the service of the United States at \$1 per day, men in the same class who remained at home went into the industries and commanded in almost every instance as much money per hour as these men got per day, and often two and three times as much per hour. While the one at home was in a place of safety and comfort, the other was made to endure the hardships of war and the dangers incident thereto. The profits of those in the big industries suddenly jumped from thousands into millions, and there can be no sufficient reason why those who made the sacrifice should not receive this small amount as a further recognition of their services. Because of this wild extravagance in the governmental and private affairs during their absence, the prices of the things that they must have when they returned had gone so far out of their reach that what scant saving they could make out of this \$1 a day was wholly inadequate to start them in life again.

Allow me to call your attention to another item of necessity that is used in every home in America. It is estimated that there are 4,000,000 tons of sugar consumed by the American public in one year. A few months ago sugar was retailing in practically every city, town, and village in the United States at 11 cents per pound. The Attorney General, acting under the authority given him by Congress to control the price, allowed the southern sugar refiner to arbitrarily raise his wholesale price from 8 cents per pound to 18 cents, under the promise that he would not prosecute. Bear in mind, this sugar was already manufactured and in the storehouses of the South ready for consumption, and it was the same sugar that had been wholesaling for 8 cents a pound; there was to be no additional work done in connection with it, therefore the cost of labor was not an item, and yet it was allowed to jump from 8 cents per pound to 18 cents to the refiner without any limit as to what the ultimate consumer should pay.

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

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman give me five minutes more time?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. KEARNS. By reason of this transaction between the Attorney General and the southern refiner, sugar has gone from 11 cents per pound to the consumer to prices ranging all the way from 20 to 35 cents. I think it would be fair to say that the average price, therefore, would be at least 25 cents per pound throughout the country. There are about 4,000,000 tons of sugar consumed in the United States per year, and from these figures it will readily be seen that the average increase to each household in the country is 14 cents per pound; therefore the American people are paying for this one single household necessity per year the enormous sum of \$1,120,000,000 by way of tribute to these grafters, a sum almost sufficient to meet the entire demands that would be made on the Federal Treasury should this bill become a law, and this gigantic steal was made with the knowledge and even the consent of the present executive administration. [Applause.]

The grafter of millions from the people of this country has become the petted offspring of this administration while the consumer suffers.

There are used in the United States per year 500,000,000 tons of coal. The average cost to mine, carry from the mine to the freight car on the sidetracks and load thereon is a little less than \$1.50 per ton. That includes the wages of the miner, his blasting material, and the overhead expense of running the office and paying the salaries of all the help. In short, this is the cost to the mine operator to have the coal mined and loaded in the freight cars ready for shipment. When it reaches the consumer who lives anywhere within a radius of 100 or 200 miles of the mine, it is sold at the enormous price of from \$8.50 to \$9 per ton, and here recently it is being retailed in many places for 48 cents per bushel. These prices can not be defended on any honest theory. These prices represent graft and greed and theft of the most glaring and unprovoked character, and yet the executive branch of Government has had all these years since the beginning of war control of fuels.

The price of coal can not be attributed to the high price of labor, because, as I have already said, the entire cost of mining, transferring, and loading into the freight cars ready for ship-

ment is less than \$1.50 per ton. The difference between that and the sale price to the consumer represents legitimate profit plus the boldest kind of highway robbery—a robbery that is in defiance of both law and decency. If we grant that only \$2 of this price represents unfair profit, if you want to state it in such mild terms, then we have admitted that the mine operators of this country have grafted from the American public \$1,000,000,000 within the past year, and at the rate they are going, if unhindered, it will increase to two billions in the coming year, and the great toiling masses will continue to suffer from the curse of high prices. [Applause.]

The Attorney General found ample law to put in jail the coal miners who struck for higher wages last November, but he did not use the same law to put in prison the real evil doer who is illegally extracting from the peoples' pockets a billion annually. [Applause.] And I will repeat right here, by way of parenthesis, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WELTY], who has tried to interrupt me, that the Attorney General thought he had the authority to act under this law, because he finds law enough to put the miners who struck in jail, while he allowed the mine operators who have filched the public to go unhindered without enforcing the same power.

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

Mr. KEARNS. No; I can not yield.

Mr. WELTY. He did not use the same law to put them in prison.

Mr. KEARNS. I can not yield.

Mr. WELTY. Just for one question.

Mr. KEARNS. I can not yield. Of course, the cost of living is high, and it will be still higher if the profiteer is allowed to pursue his mad career unmolested by the Government. If our jails were filled with these men who openly defy the law there would be no necessity for increase of wages, because prices would move back to their legitimate sphere. [Applause.]

I have shown in these three great necessities of life—shoes, sugar, and coal—that there could be saved to the consuming public of America in one year, \$2,540,000,000, and still leaving great profits to those who handle these necessities. The greed of many great and powerful corporations has been allowed to go so long unrestrained that every household feels its effect and many have been reduced to an actual state of want and privation. These men and women are demanding an immediate relief, and they can get it if only the laws are enforced.

I do not know how many billions of dollars are being annually taken illegally and without color of law from the consuming public. I know it is many, however. I do know in the three items to which I have just called attention that at the very lowest estimate the amount of graft reaches the enormous sum of \$2,540,000,000. [Applause.]

I respect the opinions of those who oppose a bonus who have been led to this conclusion because the cost of living has soared until it is out of their reach, but I shall not pay heed to the voice of the profiteer and grafter who desire to continue to make millions by use of illegal business methods.

If the Attorney General of the United States would only act, the situation could be remedied; but if he will not act, the President of the United States should remove him from office and put in a man who will act. And that is the reason why the people are not going to follow the advice of Mr. CLARK of Missouri when he says they are going to turn out the Republican Congress and put in a Democratic Congress, because the people of the United States are neither fools nor knaves. They know where the trouble lies, and they are going to cure the evil. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

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

Mr. GARNER. On what subject?

Mr. LONERGAN. Not on the bonus.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the same restriction?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Yes. I do not want to talk about the bonus.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request under the same restriction.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks generally, but not on the bonus.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, not on the bonus. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I was very much interested in the appeal of the gentleman from Texas for a revision of our revenue laws. He cited some instances of irregularity, possibly items that ought to be leveled down, so that some definite rule could be given to business men by which they could make their own returns intelligently and accurately. I recall some observations that I made soon after the enactment of the Underwood tariff, and the first provision for an income-tax law enacted by a Democratic Congress. In the Treasury Department it was currently reported that the Underwood tariff was intended to cut \$100,000,000 out of the tariff revenues. It accomplished that purpose without any serious difficulty. It was also indicated that the shortage was to be replaced by a like return from an income tax. What did the accounting show? When the first returns came in and a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury threw out his dragnet over the country to catch the millionaires and round them up with funds sufficient to supply the Treasury forevermore and thus prevent a deficit, what did he discover?

Under the income tax the returns were \$67,000,000. How much had we been gathering in prior to that time from the corporation tax carried in the law of 1909? We had been collecting \$30,000,000 annually. Thus there was a net return from the income tax under the Democratic law for that first year, only \$37,000,000. You never saw greater gloom on the countenances of Democratic chiefs in the Treasury than they had at that time.

They started out in a second effort to find some more millionaires. They failed to accomplish the purpose of their search. Congress was called upon for some more legislation and enacted war taxes in times of peace. Still they were short about \$30,000,000 of the \$100,000,000 that had been cut out of the tariff.

A third effort was made, and still the \$100,000,000 did not come. The volume of imports up to the present time, if the Republican tariff that was on the books in 1913 had remained on the books, would have given us about \$1,200,000,000 more in customs revenues than we have received, and without any increase in the cost of living. Thus we would have been \$1,200,000,000 ahead of what we are to-day.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. A Republican Congress has been in session since last May a year ago. Why did not the gentleman's party put that law on the statute book instead of the Underwood tariff?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. If the Republicans should write a tariff bill and send it to the White House, the gentleman can guess the result as well as I can—a veto.

Mr. GARNER. Why did you not try?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Why disturb the business of the country by making the attempt when it could have no good result?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield? Would your tariff bill disturb Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I decline to yield further. I have stated the fact, and you know it to be a fact if you can read the tariff.

Now, in regard to that income-tax provision, the amendment to the Constitution authorizing and empowering Congress to write the income-tax laws that have been written was introduced by a Republican Senator, the Hon. Norris Brown, of Nebraska, passed by a Republican Congress, ratified by Republican States under Republican leadership.

RESULTS OF DEMOCRATIC POLICIES.

A brief glance at the history of our present public debt will illustrate the superiority of Republican principles over Democratic policies.

Without recounting the financial cost of the Civil War (approximately \$7,000,000,000), we observe that our interest-bearing debt in 1865 was \$2,380,000,000, incurring an annual interest charge of \$143,000,000, at the maximum. In 1856 and 1861 the total expenditures, including everything except the Postal Serv-

ice, amounted to \$69,000,000 and \$66,000,000, respectively, and the democracy was borrowing a portion of the money to pay current bills. The rate of interest had advanced to 12 per cent with discounts approximating 11 per cent (10.97). But how could the Republican Party, standing there in the midst of the ruins of war, meet the demands of the hour with an annual interest charge which alone was more than double the total expenditures in 1861 and prior years?

Note the results. When the legislative and executive departments of the Government were transferred to the democracy in 1892, the interest-bearing debt of the Government had been reduced to \$585,000,000 and the annual interest charge correspondingly reduced to \$23,000,000 without borrowing a dollar to pay current bills, and on that date the available cash balance amounted to \$126,000,000 and the gold reserve to \$114,000,000.

Immediately after the accession of the democracy to power in 1893 it resorted to its old habits of borrowing money to pay current bills. Loans were ostensibly secured to maintain the resumption of specie payments under the law of 1875. They had a deficit at the end of their first full fiscal year of \$69,000,000, \$42,000,000 the next, \$25,000,000 the next, and \$18,000,000 the next, making a total deficit of \$154,000,000 in four years. They sold bonds, face value \$262,315,000, upon which they realized a premium of \$31,000,000. The total interest charge for the life of those bonds was \$244,000,000. Deducting the premium from the total interest charge we had a net interest liability of \$213,000,000. The amount of the principal and net interest was \$475,000,000. That was the tuition paid by the country to ascertain the impracticability of Democratic policies.

In 1898 the Republican Party issued \$198,000,000 in bonds to secure funds with which to feed, clothe, and equip the American Army in the Spanish-American War. Note the fact that the Republican Party fought a foreign war with a smaller loan than the Democratic Party was compelled to make to fight the evil results of its own policies for four years in time of peace.

Immediately after its return to power in 1913, in both legislative and executive branches of the Government, it proceeded to increase public expenditures. In order to avoid selling bonds as it did from 1893 to 1897 it resorted to the enactment of war taxes in time of peace to liquidate the increased demands upon the National Treasury. From that time forward to the date of our entrance into the World War the obligations of the Government were greatly enlarged. At the close of the World War the Republican Party is called upon again to take charge of the financial affairs of the Nation, liquidate the debt of the Democratic Party as it did at the close of the Civil War and at the close of the period of the dark ages, 1893-1897, in the financial and industrial affairs of the country.

During the first and second sessions of the present Congress we have reduced the Democratic demands for public expenditures by more than \$2,000,000,000. We have pared down their Army bill to save another billion dollars annually. When the people shall have given to the Republican Party full charge of the executive as well as the legislative branch of the Government we will open a record and recover at every possible point the tremendous waste of public funds during the period of the war amounting to billions of dollars. With courage and confidence we face the future and appeal to the country for adequate political power to accomplish these results.

But that is not the principal purpose for which I arose. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield to allow the committee to rise and the House to receive a message from the Senate?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Certainly.

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 agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13587) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield to me for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I want to inquire if there is any rule of the House which requires the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to take a gentleman off his feet every time a message comes over from the Senate?

The CHAIRMAN. There is not, but the Chair asked the gentleman if he would yield. The gentleman was about to begin a new subject, and the Chair asked him if he was willing to yield, and he said he was.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. That is all right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOOD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON].

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address myself in opposition to the adoption of a special rule by the House May 29 last, making in order H. R. 14089, the so-called soldiers' beneficial legislation, including a provision for a cash bonus. This bill is of such tremendous importance, and it has such a far-reaching effect upon hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, who are citizens scattered in all parts of the United States, that I was unalterably opposed to the adoption of this rule and the jamming through, without amendment, this legislation after a debate of only 40 minutes.

It is pertinent that I call to the attention of every Member of this House the care which has been exercised in the passing of all legislation affecting ex-service men and the opportunity which has been given to every Member of Congress to offer amendments to these bills affecting the welfare, care, and treatment of the disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines.

It has been the effort of Members of Congress to coordinate, so far as it is possible, all legislative matters affecting service and ex-service men and women.

An evidence of this can be found in the Sweet bill, which became a law on December 24, 1919. In the preparation of the so-called Sweet bill, H. R. 8773, extensive hearings were given, which included a careful review of all House bills affecting the service or ex-service men. It also included hearings affecting service or ex-service men who have been wounded and maimed by reason of their military or naval service; and, too, it included a hearing of the various departments and bureaus of the Government having recommendations to make regarding the proposed legislation.

One has only to refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published at the time the so-called Sweet bill was before the House to observe how active a part members of this House took in the final construction of the bill. And so it is that every possible consideration should have been given to the so-called Fordney bill, H. R. 14089—bonus bill. The Members of this House should not be denied the privilege of expressing themselves fully on the various items contained therein and should be given the opportunity of offering such constructive suggestions as they may choose to submit in the form of amendments in the final construction of this very important legislation.

I observe that the purpose of this bill is "to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, to provide revenue therefor, and for other purposes."

If it is the purpose of this Congress of the United States to pass further soldiers' beneficial legislation, it is the very definite obligation of each Member of the House to make certain that in fact the legislation is beneficial in every respect, and to make sure that if such legislation were enacted into law it would, in fact, be beneficial to all those service and ex-service men and women, as well as the dependent relatives who may be affected by it. Take, for instance, that section of the act known as "Title II—Adjusted service pay," starting with section 201, on page 7, and continuing over to the first two lines of page 13, section 206. It is the purpose of this part of the bill to provide a certain cash bonus—the camouflage name for which is "adjusted service pay"—to all those who have been in active military or naval service during the recent World War. The principle upon which this bonus is based is that these ex-service men and women are in immediate need of financial aid; therefore in order that they may be given immediate assistance in the readjustment of their affairs as civilians, this bonus program should not extend over a period covering several years or it would cease to accomplish the result for which it is at least theoretically intended.

If this be the reason, and if this reason is sufficient to justify the payment of a bonus, then why, may I ask, does the bill provide that this money, which is so urgently needed, shall be paid in 10 equal quarterly installments, beginning July 1, 1921?

It is self-evident, in my opinion, that this particular feature of the bill is quite inconsistent, for either there is an immedi-

ate need for financial aid or there is not. If there be a need for financial assistance, then it should not be extended over a period of 10 quarterly installments beginning with July 1, 1921, which is more than a year hence, and extending over 10 quarterly installments would make the final payment become due more than 3½ years hence.

This feature of the bill alone is of such grave importance that every Member of this House interested in the welfare of all service and ex-service men and women should make it his solemn duty to protest against the adoption of this rule and to jam through this very vital legislation without the privilege of amendment.

Already this House has passed several bills affecting the welfare of ex-service men and women, especially those who have been disabled by injury or disease as the result of their patriotic service. There is at present an important bill before the Senate which has been passed by this House within the past 10 days. In these several bills an effort has been made to provide liberally for the disabled men and women in the way of adequate compensation, hospitalization, care, and treatment. It is to these disabled men that we owe the greatest obligation. In all of the cases that have come to my attention where ex-service men and women are in need of financial aid, the men, if you please, are married men, or men having dependent father, or mother, or brother, or sister. Has it occurred to the Members of this House that if there be a need for financial aid, those most in need of such aid are those ex-service men who during the period of their service allotted a portion of their pay for the support of those dependent relatives, and to whom the Government paid a family allowance? I am informed that approximately 2,000,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines allotted a part of their pay during their active service in order to help support those relatives who were dependent upon them. Upon investigation I find approximately \$300,000,000 was deducted from the pay of these soldiers, sailors, and marines for the support of those dependent relatives, and that in addition to this amount the Government gave over \$300,000,000 as a family allowance.

I use this as an example to emphasize the importance of our giving careful consideration to this bill. I submit that if there are any, and I take it there are, who are in need of financial aid, is it not fairly reasonable to assume that it be the men who have relatives dependent upon them for support that are in need of the same, and not the man who is responsible only for his own maintenance and support?

How much more useful it would be for the Government to consider returning to each soldier, sailor, and marine the amount of money that he allotted during his service for the support of his dependent relatives? By such a program approximately 2,000,000 ex-service men and women would be affected, and there would be distributed throughout the United States the sum of \$300,000,000, which would be apportioned to each State according to the number of men in each State who during their service made allotments to their dependent relatives, and which allotments were supported by Government family allowance, giving evidence of the dependency of these relatives. I have given much thought and study to this problem and have compiled certain reliable statistics, which I will make a part of this record.

The men and women who have been disabled by reason of their active service would, I feel confident, be entirely in sympathy and accord with such a program, even though many of them have already expressed themselves in favor of those sections of the bill coming under Title II to which I have referred in the earlier part of my remarks. Gentlemen, these matters are of such grave importance that they should be given consideration without any influence of party lines. At least, I insist that there can not be, and should not be, any objection to a thorough discussion of this bill on the floor of this House, with the usual privilege of amendment, and therefore I opposed the adoption of this rule and the jamming through of the bill without amendment after a debate of 40 minutes.

The following important provisions are included in the bill which I introduced and has passed the House and is pending in the Senate and should be enacted into law immediately. It will materially extend the Government service to the disabled soldiers and to all ex-service men and women as well as to their dependent relatives. Certain other provisions of the bill will improve materially the Bureau of War Risk Insurance equipment in the administering of all the features under the original war-risk insurance act and its subsequent amendments.

This bill affects both the administration of the original war-risk insurance act and its subsequent amendments, liberalizes existing provisions and adds such provisions as are believed to be in the vital interest of former service men and women as well as their dependent relatives.

As affecting the administration the provisions included are—
 First. To authorize the establishment of a reasonable number of regional and suboffices for the purpose of expediting the handling of adjustments of allotment and allowance cases, compensation claims, physical examinations, medical treatment and hospital care, as well as insurance claims, in the various States where the ex-service men and women and their dependent relatives are now located.

The present method, compelling all cases to be handled by correspondence with Washington, is entirely unsatisfactory, and has caused the ex-service men and women, as well as their dependent relatives, to suffer much hardship, and they have registered bitter complaint against what they regard as the Government's neglect in giving proper consideration to their needs.

Second. To authorize the collection of war-risk insurance premiums through the United States Post Office Service in order that premiums for insurance, applications for reinstatement for lapsed or for converted insurance may be handled locally, and that a receipt for payments so made may be had immediately upon the payment of each premium. In the making of such collections, the Post Office Department would use postal money orders, postal notes, war-risk insurance coupons, or any other method of collection which the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General may deem most expedient and satisfactory. It is only right in the conduct of Government affairs that the present services of the various departments of the Government should be utilized to the maximum.

As to liberalizing existing provisions of the war-risk insurance act and adding new provisions, the following items are included in the bill:

Third. That the family allowance shall be paid to those dependent relatives who have established their right to such Government family allowance under article 2 of the war-risk insurance act, as amended, even though deductions from the pay of the enlisted man for compulsory allotment have not been made but the family allowance having been applied for during the service of the enlisted man, and notwithstanding the fact that such enlisted man has died in or has been discharged from the service, providing, of course, that the compulsory allotment has not been waived or that exemption therefrom has not been heretofore or shall not be hereafter granted.

There were a great many cases where men neglected to comply with section 2 of the war-risk insurance act, as amended, which made it compulsory to allot a part of their pay to a wife, children, or to a divorced wife to whom the courts have decreed alimony and who has not remarried. In many of these instances applications were made by these dependent relatives for the Government allowance, and upon receipt of the application an effort was made to reach the enlisted man through his commanding officer for the purpose of having the necessary allotment made from his pay or to give him an opportunity to make application for an exemption from such allotment. It was not always possible to reach the soldier, either before he was killed or died or before he was discharged from the service, by reason of the repeated transfer of men from one unit to another and from one part of the country to another. The original act provides, in section 5, "that family allowances for members of class A shall be paid only if and while a compulsory allotment is made to a member or members of such class." Great hardships have been suffered because of the man's neglect to comply with this feature of the war-risk insurance act and the Government's failure to secure such deduction from the soldier's pay, and it is for the purpose of remedying this condition that this feature has been included.

Fourth. To authorize payment to beneficiaries or other person or persons in whose name an action has been commenced or prosecuted, fees and mileage, at the same rate as is now paid and allowed to witnesses in the United States courts, in going to, remaining at, and returning from the place of trial, and without any regard to whether the action, if any, is brought or prosecuted in a court of the United States or some other court. Also, that in all cases of assignment or causes of action under this section, whether the assignment be heretofore or hereafter made, where it shall appear to be to the best interest of the beneficiary so to do, the director of the bureau, acting for and in the name of the United States, may assign the cause of action back to the beneficiary or to his personal representatives.

This proposal is made in order that the interests of service men may be fully protected.

Fifth. To authorize the waiving of payments of premiums on renewable term insurance. Those who are receiving hospital care, those who are receiving vocational training, and those who are temporarily totally disabled by reason of an injury or a disease entitling them to compensation. Experience has shown that men or women coming under these three classifica-

tions find it absolutely impossible to continue their premium payments for their war risk renewable term insurance, and, therefore, many of them have, much to their detriment, been obliged to let their insurance lapse and thereafter being without this added protection which it was the original intention of Congress, they should have. Since these persons coming within these three classifications are without any means of additional support, I believe it would be only common justice that the Government relieve them from the payment of premiums during such period, at the same time regarding their policies in full force.

Sixth. To authorize, without charge therefor, the furnishing of hospital, dental, medical, and surgical care and treatment and prosthetic appliances for all honorably discharged commissioned officers and enlisted men, disabled by reason of any wound or injury received or disease contracted while in the service of the United States and in the line of duty: *Provided*, That application for such care and treatment and appliances shall be made within one year from the date of the man's discharge or from the date the act may go into effect, whichever is the later.

At the present time, the Government provides hospital, dental, medical, and surgical care and treatment and prosthetic appliances to only those whose disability is rated at 10 per cent or more, and all those whose rating is less than 10 per cent are obliged to pay for such treatment as they may need or have such prosthetic appliances as they may require, or to go without if they are financially unable to afford such treatment, unless they choose to become charity patients and seek aid on that basis. I believe that it was the original intention of Congress that all men and women who became disabled by any wound received or disease contracted while in the service of the United States and in the line of duty should receive, without charge therefor, hospital, dental, medical, and surgical care and treatment, including prosthetic appliances, irrespective of the rating of their disability.

Seventh. To authorize the payment of total and permanent disability claims under the United States Government life insurance (converted insurance) contract (out of the military and naval appropriation) and to further authorize that where the insured has been relieved of the payment of premiums such premiums shall be paid by the United States into the United States Government life insurance fund out of said military and naval appropriation. Since the total and permanent disability feature under the war-risk term as well as the United States Government life insurance (converted insurance) policies has been included without any additional premium charge, therefore it is regarded as essential that these claims for total and permanent disability, many of which will be traceable directly to military service, shall be paid by appropriation and not charged against the premiums that are collected under the United States Government life insurance (converted insurance) policies.

Eighth. To authorize the payment of monthly installments of allotment and family allowance, compensation, or insurance which has accrued to one who is deceased to the executor or administrator of such deceased person, but if no demand in writing is made by the executor or administrator within 120 days after the death of such deceased person then, in cases where the amount is \$400 or less, the same shall be paid in the following order of precedence:

First, to the widow; second, if there be no widow, then to the children and their issue per stirpes; third, if there be no widow, child, or children, or issue of children, then to the father and mother in equal parts; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, child, issue of children, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and the children of the deceased brothers and sisters per stirpes.

This provision, however, shall not be construed as to prevent payment from the amount due the decedent's estate of his funeral expenses, expenses of his last illness, board, rent, or other household expenses for which the decedent was liable, provided a claim therefor is presented by the person or persons who actually paid the same before settlement is made by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Ninth. To authorize the director of the bureau, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary in order to promote good conduct on the part of persons who are receiving care or treatment in hospitals as patients of said bureau during their stay in such hospitals. Penalties for the breach of such rules and regulations may extend to a forfeiture by the offender of such portion of the compensation payable to him, not exceeding three-fourths of the monthly installment per month for three months, for a breach committed while receiving treatment in such hospital, as may be prescribed by such rules and regulations.

While it is hoped that there will not be much occasion for the application of the provision, yet experience indicates it is very essential that such authority be in force.

FURTHER PROPOSALS WORTHY OF SERIOUS CONSIDERATION.

1. A matter which should have attention without further delay is the lump-sum payment of term insurance during peace times, just as was provided in the Sweet amendments to the war-risk insurance act for converted insurance. It has not been thought practicable or desirable that the war-time policies should be payable in lump sums. On other occasions the great peril to the finances of the Government which would result from such payment has been pointed out. It would be an unthinkable draft upon the Treasury. But this objection does not apply to the optional payment in lump sums of term-insurance policies maturing hereafter. Since the peace-time risks are adequately covered by the premiums paid, these premiums will be entirely sufficient to meet any insurance payments, either in lump sum or otherwise, on account of the peace-time term insurance. Therefore not only is there no valid objection to the change, but there is a very grave consideration of justice and of effective administration of the Government insurance plan which calls for the extension of the privilege of lump-sum payment to this form of insurance. A very great number of the ex-service men and women are financially unable to pay the larger premiums necessary to support a converted insurance policy. This is particularly true at the present time and for the immediate future on account of their recent return to civilian life with its necessary period of personal readjustment. They can, however, more easily afford the smaller premiums necessary to insure under the term-insurance plan. The restriction placed upon this insurance which requires its payment in monthly installments over a period of 20 years is proving in practice a very active deterrent to the carrying of this form of insurance. The denial of the privilege of lump-sum payment of peace-time term-insurance policies works a discrimination against a great number of our former soldiers and sailors who are not as well situated financially as those able to hold converted insurance policies. This is discrimination against them and their dependents. It is not necessary to dwell upon the unfairness of this situation. Every effort should be exerted to urge the extension of the privilege of lump-sum payment to this class.

2. During the war the soldier was urged to make an allotment of part of his monthly pay in the sum of \$15 to either his wife and children or other dependent relatives, if he had no wife and children, and the Government paid an equal sum of \$15 to the wife and \$10 to dependent relatives as an allowance. The amount of allotment paid by the men was approximately \$290,000,000, and the amount of allowance paid by the Government was approximately \$290,000,000. When we consider the fact that these men with dependent relatives not only offered themselves in the service of the Government but were willing to deny themselves financially in order that those whom they left behind might be provided for and thus, in a way, stabilize the economic conditions of the country, does it not seem that the Government of the United States should return to these men this sum of approximately \$290,000,000 that they had allotted to their dependent relatives, which experience has shown to be by no means adequate for the support of those dependent relatives, and thus enable them to reestablish their own financial condition which, due to their self-denial during the war, has created for them a period of financial stress? It must be borne in mind that the allotments referred to were made by the enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and not by the officers; therefore the return of this allotment money would reach the men who received the least in financial value during the recent emergency.

In order to approximate the amount of money to be returned to the service and ex-service men and women of each State an estimate is given herewith, which has been based on the apportionment of the total sum allotted, \$290,000,000, according to the percentage of the total personnel of the Military and Naval Establishments furnished by each State:

State.	Number enlisted men Nov. 11, 1918.	Men making allotments through Bureau of War Risk Insurance to Dec. 31, 1919.	Per cent of men making allotment to total.	Allotment by States, December, 1917, to December, 1919, inclusive.
New York.....	493,892	171,215	10.3	\$30,217,420
Pennsylvania.....	370,961	128,617	7.7	22,589,722
Illinois.....	320,228	110,951	6.7	19,655,932
Ohio.....	243,548	84,369	5.1	14,962,024
Texas.....	198,228	68,684	4.2	12,321,667
Massachusetts.....	193,415	67,033	4.0	11,734,921

State.	Number enlisted men Nov. 11, 1918.	Men making allotments through Bureau of War Risk Insurance to Dec. 31, 1919.	Per cent of men making allotment to total.	Allotment by States, December, 1917, to December, 1919, inclusive.
Michigan.....	168,131	58,282	3.5	\$10,268,055
Missouri.....	163,700	56,796	3.4	9,974,682
California.....	154,930	53,660	3.3	9,681,309
New Jersey.....	138,691	48,046	2.9	8,507,817
Indiana.....	130,670	42,239	2.6	7,627,698
Minnesota.....	123,325	42,762	2.6	7,627,698
Wisconsin.....	122,215	42,432	2.6	7,627,698
Iowa.....	119,792	41,422	2.5	7,334,325
Georgia.....	102,788	35,498	2.2	6,454,205
Oklahoma.....	95,100	33,021	2.0	5,837,439
Virginia.....	93,499	32,361	2.0	5,837,439
Kentucky.....	91,821	31,855	2.0	5,837,439
Tennessee.....	91,386	31,700	1.9	5,574,087
North Carolina.....	88,168	30,545	1.9	5,574,087
Alabama.....	86,916	30,049	1.8	5,287,714
Louisiana.....	80,834	28,038	1.7	4,987,341
Kansas.....	78,733	27,243	1.7	4,987,341
Arkansas.....	71,862	24,931	1.5	4,400,595
Connecticut.....	67,092	23,280	1.4	4,107,222
West Virginia.....	65,127	22,620	1.4	4,107,222
Mississippi.....	64,758	22,454	1.4	4,107,222
South Carolina.....	64,739	22,454	1.4	4,107,222
Washington.....	63,775	22,124	1.34	3,931,193
Maryland.....	61,839	21,464	1.3	3,813,849
Nebraska.....	59,287	20,473	1.24	3,637,825
Colorado.....	44,802	15,520	.94	2,757,706
Montana.....	44,048	15,190	.91	2,669,691
Florida.....	42,301	14,694	.89	2,611,023
Oregon.....	41,671	14,364	.81	2,376,321
South Dakota.....	34,662	12,052	.73	2,141,623
Maine.....	31,887	11,062	.66	1,936,262
North Dakota.....	30,033	10,401	.62	1,818,913
Rhode Island.....	26,468	9,246	.56	1,642,851
District of Columbia.....	24,853	8,586	.52	1,525,513
Idaho.....	23,571	8,255	.5	1,465,855
Utah.....	22,571	7,760	.47	1,378,853
Porto Rico.....	18,477	6,459	.34	967,498
New Hampshire.....	18,404	6,459	.34	967,498
New Mexico.....	15,162	5,283	.32	938,794
Arizona.....	13,377	4,623	.30	850,119
Wyoming.....	13,209	4,623	.30	850,119
Vermont.....	11,929	4,128	.25	733,431
Delaware.....	9,379	3,302	.20	596,746
Hawaii.....	6,557	2,311	.14	410,722
Philippines.....	6,535	2,311	.14	410,722
Nevada.....	5,972	2,146	.12	352,019
No residence.....	3,334	1,321	.10	293,373
Alaska.....	2,381	826	.10	293,373
Samoa.....	2,211	826	.10	293,373
Guam.....	262	165
Virgin Islands.....	67
Total.....	4,764,071	1,648,531	100	293,197,031

3. Since much of the complaint made by ex-service men and women against the Government has been due to their total ignorance of the services that have already been made available by law, which was caused by the Government's inability to secure sufficient printed material—all of which must be printed by the Government Printing Office—to distribute to all of the discharged service men and women, of whom there are nearly 5,000,000, it is believed that much of the difficulty would be overcome if a reasonable appropriation were allowed for advertising, in order that even the community might be made intelligent as regards the services made available to all ex-service men and women by the Government.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

THE PARTISAN PLOT AGAINST THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, under plans formulated by the Republican majority in both House and Senate, this session of the Sixty-sixth Congress is about to adjourn. In four more days its records will be closed, its leaves folded, and its membership will depart hence to attempt an accounting with those who sent them here. This will be a difficult task for some from the standpoint merely of individual performance; but it will be infinitely more difficult for those who in the aggregate compose the Republican majority in both Houses of this Congress who have been responsible for the monumental vacuum which represents the sum total of its microscopic accomplishments. [Applause.]

If I may borrow an expression made famous by a very distinguished man now living, this Congress may be described as a "single-track" Congress. It has had but one consuming

desire. It has been fired by but one enthusiasm. It has responded to but one call. It has enlisted in but one great crusade. All its burdensome efforts and its painful anxiety to serve the Nation have merged into pitiful and fruitless wallings against the unmatched record of a great Democratic administration and the historic deeds wrought by him who has been the Nation's leader during the past eight years.

The Republican leadership in Congress has seemed to be obsessed with the belief that it could destroy the Democratic Party and undo its great record of service to the Nation by destroying the influence and standing of the President of the United States at home and throughout the world. And it has attempted to discredit the President, to undo his great work, to belittle his efforts to serve humanity, and to bedaub his escutcheon with the infamy of imputed wrong by methods more contemptible than any ever attempted by any similar organization of political buccaneers and freebooters in the history of the Republic. [Applause.]

The fact that these unworthy efforts were foredoomed to failure from the beginning did not deter those who planned them. But it is difficult to understand how men presumably sane could believe that they could destroy the Democratic Party, the only party whose existence has been coextensive with that of the Nation itself, by destroying one man, however great; or how they could expect to destroy or even temporarily injure a Democratic President by sniping assaults upon his record, his character, and even his integrity.

We have heard many times upon this floor—and the statement will, no doubt, be repeated throughout the country—that in the Great War in which we recently engaged, and out of which we had hoped and expected to emerge upon friendly terms with all nations, the Republican membership of Congress and those who led them upheld the President and sustained his efforts to lead the Nation in paths of victory and honor. I acknowledge with pride the great services rendered to the administration, to the country, and to the world by many eminent Republicans throughout the Nation, and by a still larger number in every walk of life whose names were never heralded. I acknowledge with deeper gratitude and admiration the fine Americanism of millions of the young men of the Nation, of all shades of political belief, who forgot the political complexion of the Government under which they enlisted and whose spirit and devotion to the cause of our country were not measured by the lines of political partisanship. To all these, both high and low, I offer a tribute of gratitude and comradeship. [Applause.]

But what of the conduct of some of those who pretended to represent these in the legislative halls of the Nation? When it was insultingly proposed that our Nation should haul its flag from the high seas, where it had floated in unmoled dignity for more than a century, and that we should surrender the highway of nations to the ruthless twilight assassins and the world's most brutal enemy, 111 Republicans in this House voted to haul it down.

When in the Sixty-fourth Congress we were seeking to pass a shipping bill that would give our Nation a merchant marine with which to send our commerce to the waiting nations and prepare us for the coming of our entrance into the Great War, 160 Republicans in this House voted against it.

When in that same Congress it became necessary for the Nation to raise revenue to sustain itself and to replace the loss of revenue due to the driving of commerce from our shores, 192 Republicans in this House voted against it.

When an attempt was made to prevent ships, which had armed themselves for protection against submarines, from carrying munitions of war to the struggling nations of Europe, which subsequently became our associates in the war, 76 Republicans in this House voted for the proposal.

When legislation was being passed to punish alien plotters against the peace of this Nation, who blew up our factories, crippled and murdered our people, 146 Republicans in this House voted against this punishment.

When the act was being passed to punish those who sought to interfere with our prosecution of the war with Germany, 88 Republicans in this House voted against it.

When, in the Sixty-fifth Congress, after war had been declared, it became necessary to pass a revenue bill to raise the funds necessary to carry on the war, to raise and equip our matchless Army and the great Navy which was to carry them safely to the other side and bring them back, 76 Republicans in this House voted against it.

When in the consideration of the revenue bill in the Sixty-fifth Congress it became necessary to tax great war profits accruing by reason of the existence of the war, 186 Republicans

in this House voted to strike that provision out of the bill and place that burden upon the consumers and toilers of the Nation.

When in the spring of 1918 the Germans had launched their great drive to separate the French and English armies and capture Paris; when the French and English were being driven back and Paris was being approached and bombarded; when civilization held its breath and eager eyes scanned the horizon of the Atlantic to catch a glimpse of approaching help and rescue from America; when Lloyd-George announced that it was a race between Hindenburg and Wilson—Hindenburg to win the war before the American Army could get to France and Wilson to get the American Army to France before Hindenburg could win the war—and when silent and darkened ships were racing like greyhounds upon the bosom of the seas carrying that Army, eager and impatient for the front, and all humanity stood on tiptoe to see whether it were too late to turn the tide, it was then that Republicans in this House and Republican leaders in the Senate sought to take from the President of the United States and his legally constituted advisers the management of the war and turn it over to a committee of malcontents to be appointed by themselves. It was then that Republican leaders sought to strip from the President the power conferred upon him by the Constitution as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and transfer it to a committee of self-chosen roundrobiners.

When we recall how in that War with Spain, fought at our doors, guns were fitted to improper carriages and sent useless to the field; how small quantities of medicine were shipped from point to point by freight instead of by express, and were not received where needed for months; how, even after the war ended, troops who had been in the field had never been supplied with sufficient clothing or camp or garrison equipments; how flimsy and worthless cartridge belts were furnished to the soldiers; how for months during and after the war the only medicines on hand at base hospitals were salts, quinine, and castor oil; how, as Gen. Miles himself testified before an investigating commission, the beef furnished to soldiers was unfit for animals, not to speak of soldiers fighting for their country; how soldiers were compelled to stay in tentless camps amid insanitary and disease-breeding conditions; how trainloads of soldiers, sick and dying, were sent through the United States without medical attendants; how the men in at least one camp went without meat for three weeks, and how the commissary of the Army was afterwards court-martialed for misconduct and neglect of duty; and how another famous "round robin," signed by men of the high character of Gen. Joseph Wheeler, Theodore Roosevelt, Henry W. Lawton, Gen. Leonard Wood, and many others complained of a lack of knowledge in Washington of conditions at the front and urged the War Department to take some action before it was too late or the whole American Army would perish from sickness and disease—when we remember that all these things happened in an army of little more than 250,000 men, only about 20,000 of whom were sent to the seat of war in Cuba, ought not the Nation to feel profoundly grateful that Providence did not commit to the tender mercies of a Republican administration the management of the Great War with Germany, in which we raised and equipped in the Army and Navy nearly 5,000,000 men and sent more than 2,000,000 of them more than 3,000 miles from our shores over a dangerous and treacherous ocean to add new splendor to the history of American arms?

And then, when this Army had driven the enemy back at Belleau Wood, at Chateau-Thierry, at Fismes, at St. Mihiel, in the Argonne Forest, and all the other immortal spots where American blood sanctified the soil of Europe, and that enemy with broken sword and flag of truce sued for peace on terms laid down by the Commander in Chief of that victorious Army, the President of the United States, we see these same Republican politicians, these self-styled sustainers and upholders, seeking to discredit the President of the Nation and the spokesman of their country in a foreign land, where he had gone amid the grateful acclamations of a burdened world to help restore the peace of nations and gather up again the fragments of civilization. We see them endeavoring to gratify their little minds by undertaking to humiliate him even before he reached the peace conference, which he had been urged to participate in by the responsible statesmen of the associated nations. We see them by every contemptible device which demagogues display seeking to hinder, to thwart, to intimidate, to belittle, and discredit the President of this Nation in the hope that his effort to vindicate the cause for which our Nation fought might come to naught. And when, after months of grilling toil and anxious deliberations among the representatives of those who had won the war, the greatest peace treaty penned since man

ascended from the depths of savagery was laid before the world and the United States Senate for approval, we see that same group of envious men seeking to emasculate it and tear its vitals to shreds while the world waits over a volcano for the return of peace. [Applause.]

At the close of the War with Spain Republican leaders boastfully proclaimed that we were no longer a provincial Nation; that we had become a world power; and that as such we must take our place in the world's great councils and have a voice in the concert of nations. That doctrine was vindicated by the American people. But when, as a result of our participation in the great World War, we saw our beloved country emerge not merely as a world power but as the moral, political, and financial leader among all the nations of the earth, and when politicians with short vision and dwarfed mentality awoke to the realization that this exalted position had been won for us by the lofty intellectual and spiritual leadership of our own President, the thought became galling to their jaded intellects, and they at once set about to tear down this magnificent structure of international confidence, inspiration, and good will, though in doing it the whole Nation might be humiliated. The prestige, the influence, the power, the example of this Republic in the preservation of peace, yea of civilization itself, became as nothing compared with the partisan determination to destroy, if possible, the one man who emerged from that great struggle as a world figure; and the crime which brought down upon his head these Republican anathemas was the fact that he was a Democratic President, and had led the Nation victoriously and triumphantly through one of the gravest and darkest periods of its glorious history.

But, Mr. Chairman, the havoc which has been wrought by this pitiful course of action has found other victims than those against which it was instigated. It is true that for the time being our Nation is an object of suspicion and derision in wide areas of the world because of the inconceivable littleness which has characterized the attitude of certain Republican leaders who have been in a position to fasten upon our Nation the stain of their mendacity. It is true that for the time being the splendor of our achievements for Christian civilization at home and throughout the world has been obscured by a flood of partisan deception and denunciation. But aside from these temporary humiliations which we must endure as a Nation, aside from the distrust which has been generated in the minds of those who are our friends throughout the world, the real victim of this miserable counterfeit for statesmanship will be the Republican Party itself and those who have been responsible for its conduct in both branches of this Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In the name of this record, I deny the statement, wheresoever or by whomsoever made, that either during or since the war the Republican Party, through its constituted leadership, has sustained or upheld the President of these United States. I deny that the present Republican Congress, in either branch, has done aught since it assembled but play cheap and miserable politics with the destiny of the world in order that it may seem to embarrass a great Democratic President. I challenge the spokesman of that party who will attempt to apologize for its record to point to a single instance in which it has kept its pledges made to the American people in the last election.

You came into control of Congress under false pretenses. You came self-heralded as the great constructive party of the Nation. But you have constructed nothing. You came self-heralded as the embodiment of the Nation's superior intelligence. But the product of that collective master brain has been barren beyond all description. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

While commerce and industry, torn and disarranged by the convulsions of a World War, await the readjustments and reassurances of peace; while capital and labor await the return of normal conditions which are vital to both; while nations hang in the balance, and newly liberated peoples wonder whether freedom is but a nightmare, Republican leaders defy the will of their constituents, flout the sentiment of the American people, and seek to crush the hope for which millions have prayed and other millions have given their lives that peace, through the instrumentality of a League of Nations, may be enthroned among the discordant nations of the world. Twelve months you have been in session. For nearly two years you have known that yours would be the responsibility in both branches of Congress. But you have floundered helplessly through an amiable incompetency never before believed possible or experienced in the Nation's history. Notwithstanding from every quarter have come insistent cries for relief from the intolerable conditions which press down upon the people, the sum of your labors in solving these great industrial and economic problems is represented by the appointment of a snooping committee

to circumnavigate the globe in sections to ascertain how under Heaven the great Democratic administration of Woodrow Wilson won the greatest war ever fought in history so quickly, so conclusively, and with such small loss of precious lives. [Applause.]

The people of this Nation are asked to place upon this tragic and ridiculous record the seal of their approval. They are asked, while listening to a voice that pretends to be Jacob's, to grasp the hand of Esau. Will they listen to that voice? Will they grasp that hand? Will they turn their faces against that current that runs through the hearts of men and women everywhere in behalf of a permanent peace? Will they forget the white faces of those who fell and now sleep on fame's eternal camping ground? I do not believe it. This Nation is a just Nation. It is a fearless Nation. It is an honorable Nation. It will not seal with the stamp of its approval a record of injustice, cowardice, and dishonor.

And so the record stands. And what if there be calumny? What if there be misrepresentation? What if there be slander and envious detraction? What if there be deliberate and unworthy falsity of statement? It has ever been so with those who served mankind.

When Washington was commander of the ragged soldiers of the Revolution a combination was formed in Congress to supplant and disgrace him. After he became President he became the object of the grossest slanders ever heaped upon the head of a great Nation. He was accused of deceiving and debauching the Nation, and after reciting a long list of similar accusations a newspaper of that period ask the following questions:

What will posterity say of this man who has done this thing? Will it not say that the mask of political hypocrisy has been worn by Cæsar, by Cromwell, and by Washington alike?

When Thomas Jefferson was President of the United States no abuse was too vile, no epithet too scurrilous, no criticism too unjust to be thrown in his face by his political enemies. He was accused of atheism, of fraud, and of robbery, and of having swindled his creditors by paying them in worthless currency. What mattered it to them that he was President? What mattered it to them that he was the author of the immortal Declaration of Independence? They were his foes and they sought to discredit him.

When Andrew Jackson was in the prime of his popularity as a soldier and as President he was the object of some of the bitterest attacks ever heaped upon an American statesman. He was charged with having suspended the legislative and judicial functions by military sway; with having insulted the Executive of the Nation, and with having spurned and transcended his orders. He was charged with having usurped the power of the State, with breaking every law known to nations, and with promulgating a new code of his own, conceived in madness or folly and written in blood. They were his enemies. They sought to discredit him.

And there was Lincoln! Sad-faced, patient Lincoln! Was any man ever so misunderstood, so vilified, so abused, and criticized? Even in his own party, even in his own Cabinet, he was ridiculed, sneered at, jeered, and mocked. He was called "The baboon at the other end of the Avenue." He was referred to as the "Idiot in the White House." By some he was called a usurper, a traitor, and a tyrant; by others he was described as "weak and vacillating," and his administration was described by "leading Republicans" as being "imbecile." They spoke of his "treachery," and of his having sacrificed the "honor and dignity" of the Nation. It is no wonder that in an hour of despondency he cried out against his fate and wished that he had never been born.

But where are the traducers of Washington? Where are those who maligned Jefferson? Where are the defamers of the character of "Old Hickory" Jackson? Where are those who, with leering look and sinister smile, sought to besmirch the record of Abraham Lincoln? They lie in unmarked and unhallowed graves. They have all descended into the stillness of a deep oblivion from which they will never emerge. But the figure of Washington grows more imposing as the years go by, and each year pilgrims by the thousands tread softly near his tomb. Jefferson's memory and his great deeds are enshrined in the hearts of a grateful posterity. The heroic courage of Jackson as soldier and statesman inspires each new generation of American patriots. And the tragic career of Abraham Lincoln gives hope to every struggling boy in this fair land, and in his honor we build monuments and cities. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is not my task to assign to Woodrow Wilson the place which he will occupy among the great statesmen of America and the world. Impartial history will perform that

duty. No word of mine can add to the fullness of his stature. No word or act of yours can detract from it. But if I may be permitted to indulge in a prophecy, it is not difficult to foresee that those who now snap at his heels like hungry jackals will take their places among the forgotten register of the Nation's malcontents, while he will stand with Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln as one of the few great figures of this era.

Let me in conclusion adopt as a fitting motto for the Democratic Party and its great President a sentence uttered by the great Lincoln in his famous debates with Douglas over the senatorship from Illinois. When complaint was made that the course he was pursuing would defeat him for that high office, he uttered this immortal sentence: "I am not bound to win; but I am bound to be right." In being right, he lost the senatorship, but he gained the Presidency and a premiership among the world's great statesmen. In being right, Woodrow Wilson has lost the support of a narrow, partisan, and slothful Republican Congress, but he will have gained a prize infinitely greater in value and in honor, a high place among the meager list of the world's real statesmen and benefactors. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, is the time for general debate limited by a rule or by agreement?

The CHAIRMAN. No limit of debate has been fixed.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I do not think we ought to let this debate run on here for 10 hours in this way, and I move that all general debate be now closed.

Mr. BLANTON. That motion is out of order.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. We have got important legislation that ought to come up here.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman withhold his point for a moment?

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I withhold it for a moment, but we have legislation that ought to come up. The time ought not to be wasted in speeches when we are about to adjourn; and there is no excuse for it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members present, a quorum.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, much has been said by different persons as to who or what won the war. One will assert that food won the war, another that it was ships, and still another that it was guns, and still another that it was money, but not any one or all of these agencies won the war, although all contributed their essential part. But certainly in the last analysis it was the American soldier who won the war. Every other branch of the military service has been criticized, many departments at times were on the verge of collapse, but no criticism has ever been nor can be directed against the American soldier. His department never broke down, it never failed, it was always 100 per cent efficient. I have said and I say now that the American soldier is incomparably the bravest and most efficient fighting man the world has ever produced. After a few weeks or months training at most he entered the lists beside the Allies, whose soldiers were the veterans of a hundred battles, equaling them in courage and surpassing them in efficiency. They met that world renowned fighting machine which had been a half century in building, and with irresistible power they delivered the assault that left it a hopeless ruin; they destroyed that Prussian militarism that threatened the liberties of mankind. And in doing that they rendered militarism unnecessary in the great western republic. And the Kaiser, high, but wicked dream of world dominion, went out in rayless night and pitiless oblivion. These men are the Nation's defenders, the preservers of all that is great and beneficent in civilization. We are and will always be their debtors.

But the war is past and the great thought of the public mind is readjustment. A thousand remedies are recommended for every public ill, whether real or fancied. Many of the difficulties are being remedied through the general application of old-fashioned common sense. In many instances we find it more sensible and practical to adapt ourselves to the circumstances than to seek to bend the circumstances to our will. One set of reformers persistently raise the cry, "Back to the farm."

But the cry of "Back to the farm" is a far-off prospect. I see little likelihood of such a movement. Wages are much higher and the attractions much more impelling in the city than in the country; and that condition alone, while it continues, will effectually preclude the big "Back to the farm" drive. This fondly cherished dream of the social and economic sentimentalist will only be realized when the commercial or price equilibrium is adjusted on a scale that gives the farmer a price for his products which, taking into consideration the investment and cost of production, shall bear a fair comparison to prices in other lines of production. In the great disparity now existing between the prices of farm products and of manufactured products is found the explanation for a condition that some writers and publicists have been pleased to refer to as the decadence of American agriculture. Personally, I do not admit that it is relatively decadent.

Eighteen months ago it was thought by many forward-looking men that the demobilization of the four millions of service men would at once produce a great surplus of labor. As prominent a national figure as Franklin K. Lane held so strongly to this belief that he urged that prodigious public works should be undertaken in order to absorb this predicted oversupply of labor, but we have been surprised and gratified that, although the great schemes of the Secretary were not carried out, yet the exact reverse of his prediction is and has been the labor situation throughout the country every day since the signing of the armistice, thus making it unnecessary, from the viewpoint above stated, to inaugurate those great Government undertakings in order to give employment to the returned service man, or, for that matter, to anyone; and to-day it is generally true that there are more jobs looking for men than men looking for jobs.

A morning paper states that of all the boys who left the farms of America to enter the war only 10 per cent have returned to take up agricultural life, and the reason for this I have already stated. If this statement is approximately correct, it furnishes the answer to the problem of the shortage of farm help.

Gentlemen say there is a dissatisfaction among the agricultural population. Well, that is undeniably true, and the cause is not far to seek. There must be an underlying cause for the situation to which I have called your attention. The farmers of the United States do not believe they are getting a square deal. From the day the armistice was signed to this good hour the tendency of the cattle and hog market has been downward. In the past 12 months the decline in the value of stocks of hogs and cattle on hand in the United States, as compared with one year ago, exceeds the enormous figure of \$2,500,000,000; and at the same time almost every article that the farmer must buy and pay for from the proceeds of the sales of his low-priced crops are higher, many of them much higher, than at the signing of the armistice.

In order to more especially direct attention to this inequality in prices I quote from authentic statistics that from April, 1914, to April, 1920, best beef steers advanced in price 56 per cent, but the more common grade of corn-fed beefs advanced less than 48 per cent; cows and heifers showed an advance of 52 per cent between the same dates; hogs showed an advance of 75 per cent. But over against this is set down the fact that the prices of the manufactured articles which the farmer buys has in the same period referred to—1914 to 1916—advanced in most instances 100 per cent to 150 per cent, and in some instances as much as 225 per cent. For an example, the price of men's shoes has advanced 150 per cent to 184 per cent. Women's and misses' shoes, 150 per cent to 218 per cent. An even greater advance is shown in the price of clothing. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentlemen of the House to understand that I am discussing more especially the relation of the farmer to the present economic industrial and financial situation; the instances I have cited clearly indicates. No better summary of the situation can be made than that made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. EVANS], found on page 7855 of the RECORD of May 28:

The farmer is getting, on the average, less than 65 per cent advance on the price he received for his product in 1914, but he is paying an average of 185 per cent in price on what he buys, as compared with 1914.

It proves nothing to the advantage of the farmer to say that potatoes are selling in Washington for 40 cents for a quarter of a peck or \$7.20 per bushel, and other things at relatively high prices. But it does serve to call attention to the outrageous criminal profiteering to which the consumer is being constantly subjected. These potatoes that are being sold in the markets of Washington for \$7.20 per bushel were purchased from the Michigan farmer for 85 cents to \$1.25, and I say when the producer and consumer of food is subjected to such conscienceless exploitation as that "There is something rotten in Denmark." The Volstead bill providing for collective bargaining

which passed the House on yesterday proposes remedies which, let us hope, will lead to a more efficient system of distribution. Let us hope that it shall develop a situation whereby the producer may secure a better return on his labor and investment and at the same time the consumer may in a great degree be relieved from the cormorants of trade who now absorb almost his entire earnings. In some way there should be, yes there must be, some efficient, just system of distribution worked out to supplant the present inefficient and expensive system—when a bushel of potatoes for which the farmer receives \$1 is sold to the consumer for \$7 or \$8; when a carcass of meat for which the farmer receives 9 to 11 cents on foot is sold to the consumer from 20 to 60 cents per pound; when the wheat in the barrel of flour costs the miller \$10 and the same barrel of flour after undergoing but two processes, that of grinding and baking, costs the consumer \$40.

I again say that every one knows "There is something rotten in Denmark." I welcome the initiatory step that promises some relief for this situation. The minds of both producer and consumer are aroused as never before in the history of this country, and in that fact lies the hope of an improved condition in the days that lie before us.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to address myself to the cost of the participation of our Nation in the World War, not only in men, money, and materials, but as well in the morale and contentment of our people, and also to the duty of the American people in meeting the extraordinary conditions now existing.

We entered the war by resolution of the Congress on April 6, 1917, and ceased active hostilities upon the declaration of the armistice on November 11, 1918. During the period intervening between these dates, not only the entire man and woman power of the Nation, but all of our acquired wealth and natural resources, as well as all means of production and transportation, were devoted to the one great purpose of winning the war. All of us recall the patriotic fervor which filled the hearts of the people, without reference to their racial extraction, creed, or social or economic situation. Young men flocked to the colors, older men offered their services wherever suitable and needed, and the women rendered most valuable aid in the work of the Red Cross and other charitable organizations, through which they provided for the necessities and comforts of the soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators who were actually engaged in the combat for national security and honor. Since the armistice the natural reaction has ensued, and in some measure the great ideals and objects involved in the conflict have been forgotten, while the burdens of taxation and of the increased cost of living have borne down heavily upon the people. It is imperative that all of us should continue to remember the pledges which we made during the war, not only to the fighting men, but also to ourselves and to the Nation, that we would pay the price of victory and willingly bear the cost for the preservation of free institutions and for the glory of the flag.

The record of our achievement in the war fills one of the most wonderful and glorious pages in all history. The total number of men who served in the armed forces of the Nation from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and other services was over 5,041,000. In the Army alone the latest available figures show 205,130 officers and 3,897,194 enlisted men, making a total of 4,102,324. Of this number 2,086,000 went overseas and 1,390,000 actually fought in France. In a single month as many as 306,000 men were shipped overseas, while since the armistice the number returned in a single month reached the total of 333,000. During the war we shipped 7,500,000 tons of supplies from America to France. Through the operations of the selective-service law 24,234,021 men were registered, out of which the total inductions into the service numbered 2,810,296. In a single month 400,000 selective-service men were inducted into the Army. The various line officers' training schools graduated 80,468 men, prepared to assume various commands.

American troops fought in 13 battles of the war during a total of 200 days. In the first distinctly American offensive at St. Mihiel 550,000 Americans were engaged. In the Meuse-Argonne battle, which occupied the last 47 days of the war, 1,200,000 Americans participated.

The American soldier, by his heroism and intrepidity, struck the final, decisive blow in the desperate conflict and achieved victory for the allied cause, but our people paid a large price in killed and wounded, though, for obvious reasons, our losses are not comparable to those sustained by the other nations engaged in the war. The latest reports for the Army show that we lost 1,554 officers and 32,537 men killed in action, and 1,678 officers

and 41,020 men who died of wounds, diseases, accidents, and other causes, making a total of 76,789 known dead. We lost in prisoners 296 officers and 4,124 men, and the wounded numbered 8,122 officers and 212,061 men, making a total of 301,395 casualties in the Army, including 3 enlisted men found missing in action. Of the United States marines, 109 officers and 2,509 men lost their lives, and 361 officers and 9,774 men were gassed or wounded. In the Navy, 416 officers and 7,228 enlisted men were killed, and 20 officers and 331 enlisted men wounded or poisoned by gas. So far as ascertained up to the present time, the casualties in all branches, during the war, numbered 3,757 officers and 83,294 men who lost their lives, 8,503 officers and 222,266 men who were wounded or gassed, and 296 officers and 4,124 men taken prisoners, and 3 men reported missing in action, making total casualties of all kinds aggregating 322,243 officers and men.

The cost of the war in man power, however, is not confined to those actually killed or incapacitated by the immediate results of engagements with the enemy. The full number of those who will suffer disability can not yet be ascertained. The cruel artillery fire and the venomous gas attacks of this war, caused conditions which will develop diseases for many years to come. It has been particularly noticeable that mental and nervous disorders and pulmonary and other tubercular troubles appear long after the shocks of shells and gases have passed from the vivid recollection of participants in this most awful of wars. The Bureau of War Risk Insurance estimates the number of men discharged from the military service with some degree of disability at 641,900, of which 155,000 applicants have already been examined and found entitled to treatment. Of these 15,000 have been found seriously afflicted with mental diseases, 15,000 with tubercular troubles, and 81,000 with other disorders causing general disability. The certifications for treatment on account of disabilities occasioned by the war are increasing at the rate of 1,200 per month.

Appropriations so far made for allowances and benefits on account of soldiers, sailors, and marines who participated in the World War aggregate the enormous sum of \$1,132,594,926. Of this amount \$639,558,506 has been set aside for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance for the payment of allowances to dependents, compensation for death and disability, insurance, and expenses of administration. For vocational rehabilitation \$130,000,000 has been assigned to the Federal Board for Vocational Education. The United States Public Health Service has received \$76,796,520 for hospital construction and care of patients. The bonus allowance under the act of February 4, 1919, has cost \$256,239,900, and for bringing home or segregating in France the remains of deceased soldiers \$30,000,000 has been appropriated. These amounts must be increased from time to time as the necessities may require.

Not only has the war cost the men who were disabled the comforts and pleasures to which they were entitled with other citizens, and not only did this carnage of destruction take the lives of those brave heroes who will never return to their friends and firesides, but the Republic has also lost the fruits of the labor and genius of these hundreds of thousands of the flower of our youth who would have added greatly to the material and intellectual wealth of the Nation if they had been permitted to live out in full vigor their allotted span of life. The loss in production and progress thus sustained through the war can not be computed in millions or in billions of dollars. It can be regained, in part only, by the industry and frugality of those who were spared the sacrifice which all citizens were equally obliged to make. Those who fought were merely selected to render the service to which all citizens were alike liable.

In money the war cost the United States the tremendous sum of \$22,625,252,843 expended by ourselves and \$9,455,014,125 advanced to the Allies, making a total of \$32,080,266,968. Our national debt was increased from \$1,208,000,000, on March 31, 1917, to \$24,974,963,026.79, on May 31, 1920, and our per capita national debt from \$11.33 to \$234.17. Our annual interest charges on the public debt increased from \$23,000,000 in 1917 to approximately \$980,000,000 in 1920, exclusive of the sinking fund which must be established for the retirement of outstanding obligations and which for the next fiscal year is estimated at \$260,800,000, and will increase as bonds and certificates mature. There is at present a floating indebtedness of over \$3,000,000,000. The internal revenue and customs receipts of the United States Government have increased from \$725,887,874.41 in 1916, the year before our entry into the war, to \$6,249,077,578 in 1919, showing the enormously increased expenditures of the Federal Government.

During the war the Government took over the operation of the telegraph and telephone companies and the railroad systems

of the country. This Government operation of the telegraph and telephone lines created a deficit of over \$14,000,000, while the operation of the railroads created an excess of operating expenses and rentals over operating revenues for 26 months of \$715,500,000, and the total loss from Federal operation of the railroads will be not less than \$1,025,000,000. The war brought the expenditure, out of the Federal Treasury, of three and one-half billion dollars for the building of merchant ships to meet the submarine menace. This has proven a fortunate investment for the upbuilding of our merchant marine, but the increased cost during the war of materials and labor will doubtless bring a large loss in the sale of this fleet to private ownership.

The foregoing are direct and tangible costs and expenses of the war. The indirect and incidental losses to the entire Nation as well as to the people of the country can not be estimated. The people donated hundreds of millions of dollars to charitable purposes directly connected with the war, and millions of men and women diverted their labor and energy from the production of the useful and necessary implements and conveniences of peace to the manufacture of munitions and supplies for war. In other words, for over two years the American people were engaged in producing methods and machines for destruction of life and property instead of conserving and increasing the products of industry, science, and art which make for advancement and progress. As a direct consequence, also, have come the inflation of credits and currency and the increased prices of labor and commodities, resulting in the high cost of living, which, in turn, has brought on a spirit of unrest and dissatisfaction which threatens not only the peace and quiet but the very life of the Nation. These are, indeed, as were the days of the Civil War, times that "try men's souls," but the patriotism and good sense of the American people will meet every issue and overcome every obstacle in these days of reconstruction, as did the patience and loyalty of the people in the equally dark days that followed our internal dissension. The remedy lies very largely in the increased production of the real needs of society and in the return to the simpler and lesser requirements of other days. The factories, like the farms, must devote themselves to the production of necessities, rather than luxuries, and merchants and middlemen must content themselves with reasonable profits. Extravagance and profiteering go hand in hand. It is equally as harmful to purchase wastefully as to sell exorbitantly. The profligacy of war must yield to the frugality of peace.

But the Government must lead the way. The American people will cheerfully and patiently carry all the necessary and reasonable burdens cast upon them as the price of victory. They will cherish and revere the memories of those who made the supreme sacrifice for the security and honor of the Republic, and will furnish sacred shrines for their remains on the battle fields abroad or in American soil, as their loved ones at home may elect. They will provide generously and amply for those who returned to their homes broken in health or divested of limbs or faculties. They will make fair adjustment of recompense to all who suffered losses and opportunities by reason of their patriotic services in the armed forces of the Nation. They will do all that good faith to the Nation's defenders and the continued public safety may require. But the people will not, and should not, be required to assume any burdens of taxation or discomfort by reason of continued extravagance and reckless expenditure after the war has ceased.

This Congress has made earnest efforts to reduce the people's burdens, as witness the reductions in appropriations by this and the preceding sessions amounting to \$2,414,115,144.13 below the estimates of the departments and the appropriations which passed the House of Representatives but failed of passage in the Senate of the Sixty-fifth Congress. Amidst the chaos and extravagance developed by the war, this Republican Congress, by hard labor and wise counsel, has succeeded in bringing outlays within the available income, and even to lay the foundation for savings which in another year are expected to absorb a considerable part of the floating debt hanging over since the Sixty-fifth Democratic Congress. But Congress must have the assistance and cooperation of the executive department in reducing expenditures and effecting economies. Such help has hitherto been given grudgingly, when at all. The enormous establishments created and enlarged during the war must be reduced to as nearly normal and prewar proportions as may be possible. Adequate salaries should be paid to all employees who are needed in the service, but the number of persons employed and the supplies purchased should be reduced to actual necessities.

For a generation to come the principal and interest on the public debt, amounting annually to not less than a billion and a half dollars, will have to be paid out of the Federal revenues. Ample provision for the dependents of the lamented fallen

heroes of the war as well as for the dependents of the diseased and disabled survivors and generous treatment of those survivors themselves must continue to receive the attention and solicitude of the Government. But all the administrative departments and agencies should require and receive only such allotments from the National Treasury as are necessary and essential for their efficient and economical management. The people have paid, and are willing to continue to pay, the price of victory chargeable to the war, but they will not pay, and should not be required to pay, the price of extravagance and waste in times of peace. For years to come economy and retrenchment should be the conscious and conscientious aim and goal of both the legislative and executive departments. The willing and harmonious cooperation of these branches of government is essential to that end. In public and in private life economy must be the watchword until the full price of our victory in the war has been paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the chairman of the Irrigation Committee a question.

Mr. GOOD. I can not yield for that. We want to close this debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Then I will have to make the point of no quorum.

Mr. BLANTON. Let him ask the question, he has not taken up much time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I made the reservation in order to ask the chairman of the Irrigation Committee a question.

Mr. GOOD. I am about to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point that no quorum is present. [After counting.] A quorum is present. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois to extend his remarks in the Record?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID].

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss the subject matter of the high cost of living, and connected with it how far the administration of the Federal reserve law is responsible for the high cost of living. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the Irrigation Committee, Mr. KINKAID, whether or not it is his purpose to call up the Senate bill 3477, which is now on the calendar, before the adjournment of this Congress?

Mr. KINKAID. In answer to the gentleman from Mississippi, I will say yes, and a special rule has been agreed to for that purpose. This bill is also listed for a suspension of the rules. It should surely become law this session.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I am in sympathy with the movement.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BURROUGHS].

Mr. BURROUGHS. Mr. Chairman, I can not sit here and allow this session to come to an end without raising my voice in protest against the action of the House last Saturday in passing the so-called "soldier-bonus bill." I had no opportunity to do that in what has been aptly called the "bellowing bedlam" that prevailed when, under a "gag rule" that was really a suspension of all rules, with only 40 minutes of farcical debate and no opportunity whatever for amendment, the bill was jammed through the House. I voted against the rule and I voted against the bill. I now protest against the passage of the bill. I protest even more against the "strong-arm" methods employed to accomplish that result.

The bill itself ought to be entitled "An act to raise the cost of living for every man, woman, and child in America." It might also properly be entitled "An act to impose upon an already overburdened people nearly two thousand million dollars in taxes, in order to offer a cheap bribe, a miserable scullions' tip, to four or five million American soldiers, as the general elections approach."

That, I believe, to be an accurate statement of some of the things the bill would accomplish if it should be written into

law. But, of course, it will not be written into law. Gentlemen who supported it do not expect or hope or intend that it shall now, or ever, be written into law in its present form, or in anything like its present form. They know that is impossible; hence they make this hypocritical gesture to the soldier and at the same time wink the other eye as they vote to adjourn and allow the bonus bill to be gently chloroformed in a Senate committee.

Mr. Chairman, if I knew of some way by which huge profits made out of the war might now be reached and used equitably to adjust in some measure the compensation paid the soldiers, sailors, and marines without at the same time doing grave injustice and putting additional burdens on the American people, including the service men themselves and their families, I would gladly support such a plan. I know of no way to do that. No plan that will do that has yet been suggested. Certainly the bill referred to is very far from such a plan.

I am strongly in favor of a broad and liberal policy toward the ex-service men. We conscripted them, took them from their homes, took them from office, field, and factory, took them from remunerative employment, and for a dollar a day sent them to face death and disease in the mud and water of the trenches. I saw the splendid spirit in which they put on the uniform of our country. I saw the boys of my own State sleeping in the mud at Camp Greene and I saw the boys from all the States come home—those that did come home—bearing aloft the starry banners of the Republic which their brave young hands had carried to glorious victory.

I hope I am not unappreciative of this noble service. It has been a very real satisfaction to me that in my service here I have been able in some degree, not only in word but in action, in practical fashion, to be of some help to them and to their loved ones at home.

I should be glad, indeed, if I might see my way clear to grant any request that these boys might ask. My inclination is, and I hope always will be, in that direction; but I can not avoid the conclusion that the passage of this bill at this time, containing, as it does, the much discredited land-reclamation scheme and the blanket bonus provisions, will work a grievous wrong not alone to my country but to the men themselves in whose interest it is proposed.

I know that these men would not have me do an act that I honestly felt was against the best interests of the country in whose defense they offered their lives, and which I, too, have taken an oath to serve. I know they expect me to put "America first," even as they have put "America first."

They say this bill provides "adjusted compensation" to the ex-service men. As a matter of fact, it does nothing of the kind. It is impossible to "adjust the compensation" of these men to make it at all commensurate with the compensation of those who remained at home. In the first place, such service as they performed is impossible of compensation in dollars and cents. In the second place, as between the men themselves, no equitable adjustment can be made. Even if we attempt to compensate the men in money for their services and their sacrifices, using as a standard of comparison the wages paid in war time to workers in the munition factories and the shipyards, we are making a pitiful failure when we offer them a dollar or a dollar and a quarter a day, knowing all the time that the munition and shipyard workers received \$8 and \$10 a day.

How is it possible to adjust the compensation between the young unmarried boy who left a position in a store or factory to enter the service and a man, for example, who gave up his business or lost his home because of the foreclosure of a mortgage? Everybody knows that thousands of these men suffered heavy financial loss because of their being called into the service. Do you think it fair to offer them a dollar a day or a dollar and a quarter a day for a part only of the time they served and call that "adjusted compensation"?

Remember, if this bill becomes law on the basis that it is "adjusted compensation" it will be said by many that the Government's obligation to the ex-service man has been met and that the books are closed. That would not be true, and I for one am unwilling to put the service man in that position.

From the standpoint of the Government there is even less argument in favor of the bill. Already the debt growing out of the war amounts to more than \$30,000,000,000. Already, in spite of every effort on the part of Congress to cut expenditures to the very bone, we are told by the chairmen of the Appropriation Committees that there is bound to be a deficit at the end of this year of more than \$3,000,000,000. Some way must be found to pay this debt. Already our people are groaning under the heavy burdens of taxation. Our currency and credit have been greatly inflated on account of the huge borrowings of the Gov-

ernment. These are still going on, and the Secretary of the Treasury only a day or two ago said:

It is a matter of serious concern to have the Government appearing in the market every few weeks for loans. Certainly nothing ought to be done to add to existing credit expansion that can possibly be avoided. * * * The first thing to do, I am sure you will agree, is to keep Federal expenditures down to the minimum. * * * I beg to submit to your committee for its serious consideration the question whether, all things considered, it would not now be advisable to seek out additional sources of revenue to meet the current requirements of the Government.

Later he said:

It would be highly unfortunate for any new obligations to be placed on the Treasury through the enactment of the bonus proposal in any form, however financed.

It is a notorious fact that the Government has been issuing its certificates of indebtedness by the wholesale in order to meet current bills, and the Secretary has stated within a week that these certificates and the Victory notes within three years will amount alone to approximately \$8,000,000,000.

Everybody, from one end of the country to the other, is calling upon Congress to reduce the present high living costs. Everybody is calling upon Congress to reduce taxation. Do you think this bill is going to do either the one or the other?

You know it will not. You know it is inevitable that the result will be to increase taxation and give another boost to the price of every necessity of life.

But you say the boys want it. How do you know that? How many of them have ever asked a single Member to vote for this bill in the form in which it now appears? No one has ever asked me to vote for it in this form. True enough, some of them—perhaps most of them—were in favor of the fourfold plan suggested by the executive committee of the American Legion. But does this bill embody that plan? I venture to say in most important particulars it is not that plan at all. The plan which the legion presented, so far as the so-called cash bonus is concerned, contemplated a payment in bonds or in cash. If in bonds, they were to be delivered at once. If in cash, it was not contemplated that the payments were to be strung out over a number of years. But this bill does neither the one thing nor the other. True, it provides for cash payments, but they are not to begin until July 1, 1921, which is more than a year from this date. No man will get a dollar from this bill if it becomes a law in this form for more than a year. How is it then? Will he then get all that is due him at a dollar a day or a dollar and a quarter a day if he served overseas? Not at all. The payments are strung along from July 1, 1921, for two and a half years. Instead of getting a lump-sum payment, either now or at any time, these men are going to have this money doled out to them in dribbles, in 10 quarterly payments, at the rate of about \$16 per month, payments to extend over a period of two and a half years, beginning July 1, 1921.

The plan for land settlement provided in the bill seems to me very far, indeed, from the plan which the service men desired. This is the so-called Lane land-settlement scheme, which has been kicking around Congress for the last six or eight years, and which has been about as thoroughly discredited as any proposition I know of. At bottom it is nothing but a gigantic reclamation scheme, which would benefit the ex-service men incidentally, if at all, but would be primarily in the interest of a few land sharks and speculators in a few States containing vast tracts of worthless desert and swamp lands. If once entered upon, it would cost this Government an enormous amount of money. Nobody knows how much, but it is estimated by those in position to know at from two to five billion dollars.

Now, I venture to say that is not what any service man wants. I venture to say if you pass this bill in this form it will not satisfy one of them when they find out what it means. So far as I am concerned, not until I have stronger evidence than I now possess will I believe that the ex-service men of this country desire to have their splendid service in the great war commercialized in this way at the expense of their country in times like these.

We might as well strip for once and all the camouflage from this word "bonus," already much discredited, and appearing in this bill under the more euphonious term of "adjusted compensation." We might just as well call things here by their right names and not attempt to deceive ourselves or anybody else. This whole proposition of "cash bonus" or "adjusted compensation," or under whatever other name it may appear, is nothing at all but a "service pension."

If you enact this bill into law you are going to start this country on a system of service pensions which will never end as long as a single one of these men or his dependents is alive.

By the terms of the bill itself, these payments are going to extend for two and a half years after July 1, 1921. When that time has expired another presidential election will be impending. Will any man in this House have the temerity to say that under those circumstances those payments are going to be allowed to cease at that time? You know better. I tell you now that if you pass this bill and it becomes a law the youngest man in this House will never live to see the day when these payments will cease. They will go on and on and on. They will increase more and more with the passing years. The drain upon the Treasury, the burden upon the taxpayers on account of them, will be enormous.

And the pity of it all is that the boys themselves and their families will pay the bill—or, at any rate, a good share of it. They will pay it in the increased cost of every suit of clothes and every pair of shoes and every loaf of bread. They will pay for it in a still further depreciation in the value of every Liberty bond. Do not think for a minute that the corporations and the wealth of the country will pay these taxes. They will simply pass them along to the consumer. He pays the tax, and you may be sure that by the time it reaches him it will have been multiplied two or three times. So far as I am concerned, I decline to have any part in any hypocritical scheme like this—any sham, any fraud—that seems to do something substantial for these boys but in reality makes them pay for it themselves.

I do not believe the young, red-blooded, able-bodied service men of this country are asking or desiring to become pensioners upon the Government at this time. The veterans of the Civil War did not receive a service pension until the war had been ended for 55 years—not until the infirmities of age had substantially taken away their ability to earn a livelihood. There may come a time in the life of these men when a pension based upon their service will be justified, but, in my opinion, that time has not yet arrived.

Let us put first things first. The primary duty of this Nation at this time is to its wounded and disabled service men. There are approximately 200,000 of them that have already registered for rehabilitation under the vocational rehabilitation law. The total number of death and disability compensation awards up to and including May 13 of this year is 208,496. On these awards the Government of the United States each month is making payments for death and disability compensation of approximately \$6,000,000. To date the total amount paid for death and disability compensation awards is more than \$97,000,000. Besides, we are paying each month for insurance on account of death and disability awards \$5,800,000, and at this minute we have a total financial liability for insurance on account of death and disability awards already made amounting to \$1,151,160,673.48. These figures are furnished me by the Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. Chairman, very many of these wounded and disabled men have not yet been cared for. Many of them are still in hospitals and many are waiting for hospitals to be provided. It is to them and to their dependents that we owe our first duty. Can there be any doubt about this? Can there be any doubt that up to date that duty has not been fulfilled?

According to House Document No. 481, there is a total of 641,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines who were discharged from service with some degree of disability. Of this number, 155,000 have been analyzed carefully. They include 15,000 cases of serious mental trouble, 15,000 cases of tubercular trouble, and 81,000 cases of general disability. The balance of the 641,000 cases still remain uncared for, although certifications are increasing at the rate of 1,200 per month. Appropriations made by the present Congress approximate \$300,000,000 for compensation, vocational education, medical and hospital care and treatment.

For weeks I have been sitting as a member of a House committee investigating charges against the Federal Board for Vocational Education in its work of rehabilitation for disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines. For weeks I have been listening to testimony of men who have appeared and told of neglect and suffering and failure on the part of somebody to do his plain duty and what the Congress of the United States expected was being done. I firmly believe those conditions are being righted. I firmly believe things are much better now than they were a while ago. The fact remains, however, that just as long as there is a single disabled man suffering for want of care and attention; just as long as a single one of his dependents is in need, as very many of them are now in need, and no special provision made for them in this bill, the Government of the United States, in my view, may well postpone action on its general program of soldier-aid legislation. Especially at this time, with Liberty bonds in the hands of 20,000,000 patriotic

Americans quoted at 84; with the whole country calling upon Congress to reduce the high cost of living and wherever possible to reduce taxation; with the Treasury Department working its printing presses overtime issuing its I. O. U.'s, which it is wholly unable to redeem at maturity from current revenue; with sugar selling at 23 cents a pound; and press dispatches announcing the likelihood that bread may soon sell for 25 cents a loaf, I can not avoid the conclusion that it is our plain duty, as responsible Representatives here, to take an account of stock to see where we are coming out.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not now, and I never have been, opposed to any reasonable and proper soldier-aid legislation. On the contrary, I have been, and am now, strongly in favor of it. I think I have voted for and worked for every proposition that has come before us during my service here that has been for the real benefit of these men. I shall continue to do so, so long as I remain in public life, and so far as I can do it, having in view the interests of our common country. There are many features of this bill that I would like to support. They seem to me admirably designed and to be in the interest of the whole country as well as the ex-service men themselves. But for the reasons stated I could not support the bill as it came before us, and there was no opportunity whatever to amend it. It was brought in here under rules that allowed only 40 minutes for debate and no opportunity whatever for amendment. We had to take it as it was, or vote against it. To pass, in this manner, upon a proposition of such tremendous magnitude, involving, as it does, a certain expenditure of billions of dollars, at such a critical juncture in the affairs of the country—to cram this bill down our throats in this fashion—is, to my mind, little less than monstrous. Much as I desire to aid in the passage of some legislation that shall be in the real interest of the ex-service men, much as I desire to cast my vote here in recognition of their noble service and sacrifice, I utterly refuse to aid in any manner whatever the passage of this bill.

For the brave men who upheld the Nation's honor in the dark days of war, and for the loved ones dependent upon them, I would do all in my power to do, except only a wrong to their country and mine; that I know they would not have me do, and that I will do for no man. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY].

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. KING. Is the gentleman going to talk on the bonus bill?

Mr. DAVEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to talk again on the subject of postal salaries, and I trust that the gentleman from Illinois and his colleagues on the Republican side will agree with me as to the importance of the question. I understand that a bill has been reported which seeks to increase the salaries of the postal employees to a moderate degree. As I understand it, the proposed increase amounts to \$150 to \$200 per annum for clerks and carriers. The present salaries run from \$1,200 to \$1,650, and, if I understand the pending bill correctly, the proposed salaries will run from \$1,400 to \$1,800. If you figure it out on a basis of 26 days per month, 8 hours a day, you will see that \$1,400 a year is only 56 cents an hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman knows that these men get 16 days' leave with pay. The gentleman must know that they get 10 days' sick leave with pay. He must know that they get every national holiday and that the working-days of the year for these men are 291 days.

Mr. DAVEY. That may all be true, but the gentleman knows that the dollar of the postal clerk will not go any further than the dollar of anyone else.

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman ought to tell the truth when he is talking about the number of days work they perform.

Mr. DAVEY. I am talking about the income of these men, the money with which they have to buy the necessities of life.

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

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. I did not quite understand the gentleman. How much are the salaries of the carriers raised per annum?

Mr. DAVEY. The present salaries run from \$1,200 to \$1,650.

Mr. HUSTED. That is the base pay?

Mr. DAVEY. No; the complete pay.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. That includes the bonus.

Mr. DAVEY. The proposed salaries run from \$1,400 to \$1,800.

Mr. HUSTED. Including the bonus?

Mr. DAVEY. Including everything. Every man in this country knows the vital importance of the Postal Service. If that service disintegrates because of the incapacity of this Congress to deal properly with the question, then the vital interests of the Nation suffer. Every business interest, every social and industrial interest will be sacrificed. I can not understand the niggardly policy that seems to be applied to this great instrument of the Government. We talk about being generous to them, and hand out an increase of \$50 or \$100 once in a while. We compare the present salaries with salaries in the past, and because the figures are larger we think we have done something great for the postal employees, meanwhile ignoring the relative buying power of the dollar. No business could be conducted upon that basis. Why deal justice out to these men by piecemeal?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know that this report fixing the compensation about which the gentleman complains is the unanimous report of five Republicans and five Democrats? Does he know that?

Mr. DAVEY. I believe that is undoubtedly true, and I will take the gentleman's word for it, but that does not make it any better.

Mr. MADDEN. What would the gentleman do?

Mr. DAVEY. There is only one reasonable and proper thing to do, and that is to fix salaries that are commensurate with the cost of living and the requirements of the Postal Service, and if the gentleman is unwilling to do that simple justice by these postal employees, then it seems to me other hands ought to deal with the problem.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt further?

Mr. DAVEY. If the gentleman will kindly desist for a moment, I wish to remind him that I am trying to make a speech and not he.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that, but the gentleman ought to be willing to put some facts into his speech, and I would be glad to give them to him.

Mr. DAVEY. I am talking about a great vital fact. And that is the impending disaster to the Postal Service if we fail to do our duty. It may be that the gentleman from Illinois has not been moving around the country much of late. He may not know what is going on and does not realize how fast these men are leaving the Postal Service because of the inadequate salaries. He may not realize how many of them are hanging on in the desperate hope that this Congress will do its duty.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that this bill, which proposes these very small increases, is to be brought in shortly under a special rule prohibiting amendment, one of these peculiar devices by which Congress is gagged and the Members prevented from expressing their own real wishes and judgment. We will then be placed in the position of voting against any increase or of accepting the meager amount which has been provided by the august gentlemen who assume all the prerogatives of determining this vital question. It seems to me that we ought to approach this subject with a little more business consideration. Every man who has watched the course of events knows that the cost of living has mounted and mounted. It seems to me that this Congress alone of all of the elements of America has assumed that prices are going rapidly back to the old level. Every business man of my acquaintance has assumed that a new price level has come to stay, and I think there is no doubt of it. We can not hope to go back to the old price level of wages or the price of commodities. There probably will be some recession in prices, but we shall never see the old level of costs again. We must accept the fact that a new level of prices is here, and that every man who works for a living is affected by those new prices. If we expect high-class, intelligent, dependable men in the Postal Service, either to come in or to stay there, we must deal with them with consideration. We must treat them as human beings and pay them a living wage.

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

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman from Ohio has not made any suggestion as to the maximum amount. I would say that clerks in the Canton post office were in my office yesterday and said that a maximum of \$2,000 is the least amount they would consider; that they would leave the service in the event the compensation was not raised to a maximum of \$2,000.

Mr. DAVEY. I shall not attempt to say what is the proper amount, but I do say that the amounts fixed in the pending bill are absolutely inadequate.

Gentlemen, I appeal for justice for the postal employees. I appeal for the protection and upbuilding of the Postal Service and against the neglectful and niggardly policy that has prevailed of late regarding the salary question. I appeal for fair and full consideration of the vital public interest in this matter. The American public demands fair play, and is entirely willing to pay the price of fair play. This Congress can not, without a confession of weakness and incapacity, fail to meet the crisis in the Postal Service and deal full justice to these splendid public servants.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to dwell upon the shortcomings of the Republican Party nor the great achievements of the Democratic Party, although the subject might seem most enticing and prolific.

I wish particularly to call the attention of this House to the transportation and terminal facilities of the country. At no time in our history, unless perhaps for a short period during the war, has there been greater congestion upon the railroads and at the terminals of the great centers of population. It has been demonstrated clearly that even in the face of vast appropriations and credits granted by the Government to the railroads and favorable legislation of every nature, they are unable, at this time, to carry the vastly increasing freight and passengers. The country is rapidly increasing in population and in business and commerce at a pace never before equaled. The present census, which is nearing completion, will show a population around 110,000,000 souls. Business and commerce have increased even more rapidly than the population. Prosperity abounds on every hand. Never in the history of the world has labor received such high salaries as to-day. From the chimneys of the millions of factories of the country smoke curls heavenward with a vigor which shows the mills are at high-tension operation. The farmers have enjoyed prosperity as never before. The mines and factories pour forth their wealth in abundance, and find ready and willing buyers at great profit. The whole Nation has been able to enjoy luxuries which have become quite common indeed.

Is it any wonder, with all this prosperity, energy, and progress on every hand, that the railroads should find themselves absolutely unable to care for the business? The natural relief for this congestion of freight is over the waterways by water-borne commerce. Water-borne commerce can transport those products safely handled by this economical mode of transportation to the relief of railroads and their terminals. Other countries have rapidly developed their rivers and harbors, and have used them not alone to the relief of the railroads, but to the economy of transportation.

In this land of ours we have expended large sums for this purpose. We have not, however, expended money for this important service at a ratio in anywise comparable to that we have expended in other lines not as essential. To-day there is locked in conference committee a rivers and harbors bill, which passed the House carrying \$12,000,000 and passed the Senate carrying double that amount. Even the amount of \$24,000,000 would not be sufficient to do any considerable amount of work at present prices. If the bill comes from conference at all it will not carry more than fifteen millions, and more likely not more than twelve millions, which sum can do no more than maintain present improvements and to somewhat continue the projects which the Government has already under operation. Such is the parsimony dealt out to rivers and harbors, that most important safeguard for the present and future.

The progress of the country demands more and better harbors and harbor facilities. This is highly essential and in a few years it will become absolutely necessary that the rivers be further developed that they may relieve the railroads. They must be developed, but in their development it is just as essential to have water terminals as it is to have railroad terminals. There must be some cooperation between the railroads and the steamship lines, certainly some working agreement by which shipments can be rapidly transferred from one to the other.

Another cause I assign for this congestion is the centralization of too much of the business at the port of New York. It has been well said that other ports of the Atlantic seaboard have heretofore been unable to compete with that city, through which port about 80 per cent of the Atlantic foreign trade and 66 per cent of the total foreign trade of the United States passes; nor, indeed, have they in the past even been able to

realize a fair proportion of the business promised by the modernization and enlargement of their facilities. Habits of shippers, the centralization of the big railroads, and the influence of the greatest financial center have kept New York the premier port, though some of her rivals have better wharves, more efficient handling, and superior railroad connections.

The results of the war, however, while they have not yet materially affected this superiority, will certainly more closely approximate the performance and the promise of development in the other ports. The tremendous congestion of freight at New York and the enormously expensive toll in transmission there adversely affect the interests of the entire country. The cost of handling freight in New York, located as it is on the wrong side of the Hudson River, separated from the bulk of continental America by a formidable barrier which imposes an additional handling expense of from 50 cents to \$1 or more per ton on 90 per cent of the cargoes entering or leaving that port, is an unnecessary expenditure of money to overcome purely artificial defects and is a satirical comment on our boasted American efficiency. Needless to say, this burden of useless handling does not come out of the pockets of the transportation companies, as it is passed on by them to the ultimate consumer.

The people of this country have been largely educated to believe that New York is the only port along the Atlantic seaboard through which they can make shipments to foreign ports or for distribution. The result has been that too much freight has been piled up at that port. The great facilities which the city of New York offer have been flooded and congested so that quick operation is practically impossible. It is my desire to impress upon the people and particularly those of the Central West that along the Atlantic coast there exist many harbors and many ports which can give them quick, accurate, and economical service; that the division of their shipments between the ports along the coast will largely relieve the congestion through New York. It is not my desire to say anything against New York nor its wonderful facilities and its great business men, but I do believe that in the interest of the general public, in the interest of the shipper and consumer, more time should be devoted to a study of the other ports along the coast and their advantages.

There is plenty of business for all, without congestion to any. I am, of course, more familiar with my home port of Baltimore. It would seem unnecessary to call the attention of this House, and through them the public, to the fact that Baltimore is so much closer to the great centers of population back of the Atlantic Seaboard than is New York, Philadelphia, or other ports. One can scarcely realize that Baltimore is nearly 200 miles closer to St. Louis than New York and 63 miles closer than Philadelphia; that it is 109 miles closer to Chicago than is New York and 118 miles closer to Indianapolis; that it is closer to Detroit, and even closer to Buffalo, in the State of New York, than is the city of New York. This means that freight can be carried cheaper by just that many miles to Baltimore than it can to New York, Philadelphia, or other more distant points.

I have distributed to the Members of Congress data upon the port of Baltimore, that they may disseminate the information among their constituents, and particularly among their great business organizations. I have just read a circular in which a comparison of the difference in handling a 5,165-ton steamer with general cargo in the ports of Baltimore and New York. Every item of expense and each item itself itemized is given, and it is definitely shown that this same ship, with the same cargo, can be handled through the port of Baltimore at a saving of \$4,177.81, and in addition, procure quickness and dispatch without congestion.

Another circular depicts the difference in cost of a shipment from Pittsburgh to Baltimore or New York, in which every item is likewise given, and there is shown to be a saving of 19.7 per cent through the port of Baltimore. Another comparison of a shipment from the same city to the same points via warehouse shows a saving in favor of Baltimore of 47 per cent. I might continue giving data and conclusions. I realize, however, that those interested in the subject will seek further information. That the country and the world is beginning to realize the importance of Baltimore is shown from the fact that the imports of that city increased from 1912 to 1919 from \$26,000,000 to nearly \$39,000,000; that the exports increased from \$92,000,000 to \$353,000,000.

That the people of Baltimore realize the future of their port is demonstrated by the fact that they have already expended millions upon harbor and terminal facilities, and are just now authorized to expend \$52,000,000 additional by act of the recent legislature. A very eminent engineer of the War Department

said Baltimore was destined to be one of the greatest ports along the seaboard and even compete with New York for supremacy. That she is fast realizing this great prediction is thoroughly demonstrated by the activities and energy of her 733,000 people and their willingness to spend such vast sums for further development and improvement.

During my years in Congress I have devoted every effort and opportunity in advocating development of the waterways of the country, increased port facilities, and deeper channels. It has been my good fortune to convince Congress of the advantages of Baltimore and to secure through large appropriations and the adoption of different projects a completed channel of 35 feet from the city to the sea. By the adoption of another project, which I submitted to Congress a few years ago, our channel will be widened; the channel into Curtis Bay—now a part of Baltimore—will be widened and dredged to 35 feet and a new, wider, and deeper channel constructed into Spring Gardens. In addition to this, we have also been able to obtain a larger anchorage basin, and by recent act of Congress this basin is to be surveyed for extension until it meets the widened channel into Curtis Bay. These projects have been adopted, and will be completed by the Government whatever they may cost. Certainly not less than \$2,000,000.

If one will but pay a visit to the harbor of Baltimore, viewing it on both sides of the Patapsco, he will find arising a vast number of factories with their towering stacks indicating the progress which has been made in the last few years. That great section of Canton and Curtis Bay have developed so rapidly one can scarcely believe they are the same places which he beheld only a few years ago. They have come because of the water facilities, deep channel, low taxes, and transportation advantages.

Just so long as we continue to improve our harbor and its facilities, just so long will factories continue to seek locations in our midst. I have always stood and worked for the harbor of Baltimore. It is one of its great—if not its greatest—assets. The future destiny of Baltimore is tied up in its water transportation. Its location is superb; its climate equable; its people most hospitable and businesslike.

There is to my mind nothing the Democratic Party has done during its control of Congress which will redound more to the interest and benefit of the great mass of people than its appropriations for improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country, even though that party has been prolific in the passage of much constructive legislation, such as the Federal reserve act, which has prevented panics, enabled us to carry on the biggest war ever engaged in, and established a financial system the best in the world. The establishment of the Shipping Board has restored to the seas the American flag and given to America a place in the sun. The treatment of the soldiers and sailors by liberal legislation and bountiful provision has demonstrated the gratefulness of the American people for this heroic body of young men. I might mention a vast amount of valuable legislation, but my purpose is to demonstrate how highly I prize the great advantages of river and harbor improvements. That great party of Jefferson and Jackson has demonstrated to the world its capacity for doing big things. Never has the responsibility of a greater war rested upon a people than during its control.

More constructive legislation has been placed upon the statute books during its incumbency than was placed there during half a century previous. Never before has the country been more prosperous and developed more rapidly in personal and material gain. Certainly the party may feel proud of its great achievements. Its loyal supporters have every reason to stand erect and look with pleasure and pride to the future. There may at times be adversities, but the sun of democracy is still radiant with beauty and glory.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use some time myself—10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields himself 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to discuss this bill, because it is the desire of the House, I know, that we should complete the consideration of it this afternoon, and this general debate has continued much longer than we ever anticipated. The gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, will explain in detail the provisions of the bill. I desire to refer only to one of the many subjects mentioned during this general debate. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] referred to the sugar situation. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] asserted that the Hon. Herbert Hoover had urged upon the President last year the purchase of the sugar crop and quoted Mr. Hoover as having said before the Committee on the Judiciary that had

his recommendation been complied with we would not be to-day suffering from the great increase of the price of sugar. The fact is as disclosed by the cablegram of Mr. Hoover, which was placed in the RECORD by Mr. TINKHAM, that Mr. Hoover never did recommend to the President the purchase of this sugar crop except upon conditions. He recommended it upon the condition that we extend credit to European nations at a time when this Congress and this Government had determined to stop advancing money to European Governments, and the other condition upon which Mr. Hoover recommended the purchase of the sugar crop was that the Congress give further power to the Equalization Board to control the distribution of the sugar purchased. In his cablegram he stated:

Any continuation of control will require action by Congress, and it must embrace appropriations, the continuation of power and embargo, control of speculations, profiteering, and distribution.

The strange thing is that Mr. Hoover never sought to create the impression that he disapproved of the conduct of the President in this matter until within the last few weeks when he became an active candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency.

Mr. KING. That was not our fault.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; the gentleman says it is not his fault. It certainly was not our fault. The fact remains that when the President did not act upon Mr. Hoover's recommendation he complied with the recommendation of Mr. Hoover that it should not be done unless "control be extended, appropriations made, and speculation curbed." I have no objection to gentlemen making political speeches, and on both sides of the House they have indulged in them for the last 8 or 10 hours, but I am calling the attention of the House to this fact, that when gentlemen criticize the President of the United States for not having purchased the sugar crop, they thereby commit themselves to a continuance—

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am sorry I can not. I have but 10 minutes—they thereby commit themselves to a continuance of the war acts and of the war legislation which Members of this House time and again have urged should be repealed, as without this power there could be no regulation of the distribution of the sugar purchased by the Government.

Mr. HUSTED. Will not the gentleman yield for one question right there?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not, because I have but 10 minutes. The Government should not have continued in the sugar business or in any other business, in my opinion. If the President of the United States under the war legislation had purchased the sugar crop last August, 10 months after the cessation of hostilities, and there had been a good crop in Louisiana and sugar had decreased in price, the very gentlemen who now criticize him for not having purchased sugar would have criticized him for going into the grocery business under war powers long after hostilities had ceased. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And gentlemen would have been justified in it, in my opinion, because I do not believe the President of the United States would have been any more justified in exercising his war powers to purchase sugar than he would have been justified in going into the State of the gentleman from Massachusetts and purchasing shoes, an actual necessity, and provided for their sale by the Government of the United States for a less price than they are now being sold to the people.

Had he done that I would have criticized him, and I would have criticized if he had gone into the sugar business or any other branch of the grocery business and attempted to put this Government in business for all time. Now, that is the fact. Why indulge in politics about it? Why not tell the people the truth? The truth is that neither the Congress nor the Executive is responsible for the greatly increased price of sugar. The truth is, according to the Statistical Abstract, that in 1865 the per capita use of sugar was 18 pounds per person. In 1905 it had increased to 75 pounds annually, and last year it increased to 93 pounds per capita. Then wonder that sugar is high!

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know to what that is attributable?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will tell you to what it is attributable in a moment. This year, according to the Treasury Department, we spent \$1,000,000,000 for candy in this country; we spent for soft drinks \$350,000,000. We spent for ice cream—not made in the home, but ice cream sold over the counter—\$250,000,000. We spent for confectionery \$350,000,000. We spent for cereal drinks in which sugar is used \$230,000,000, making a total expenditure by the people of the United States this year for articles in which sugar is used \$2,180,000,000. This, of course, does not include any expenditure for sugar used in the home.

And then, to complete it, the people of America invested \$50,000,000 in chewing gum. Then people wonder at the increased price of sugar. When Louisiana has a one-third crop; when Cuba has a short crop; and there is a total shortage this year of 2,000,000 tons, and the per capita use of sugar increases from 18 pounds per person in 1865 to 93 pounds per person this year, can you expect anything but an increase in price? Under these circumstances, can you, by any legislation on earth, by any sleight of hand, accomplish a reduction in price?

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman permit me to answer the question at that point?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will.

Mr. KING. You can do that very easily if you will have the Federal Reserve Board call the reserve banks on financing the sugar hoarders who are controlling tons and tons of sugar.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. But instead of hoarding, the facts are that you and I and the other citizens of America consume 93 pounds per capita, as against 18 pounds in 1865 and 75 pounds before the war.

Mr. KING. I do not think the gentleman ought to lay it on the people.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Well, it is the people who are consuming the sugar, and they are consuming more than ever before in the history of the country at a time when we have a shortage of 2,000,000 tons of sugar. It is useless to talk about legislation or Executive action when we have a reduced crop and we consume 93 pounds, as against 75 pounds a few years ago. Why not be honest about it? Unless the people of America will come to their senses and realize that unless they cut down the extravagant use of sugar no legislation of this Congress and no action of any executive department can ever bring relief to them. [Applause.]

In so far as the conduct of the President is concerned, the Sugar Board did recommend to the President last August that he should purchase the Cuban sugar crop, provided Congress would grant the power necessary to regulate the distribution of the crop. The only power to exercise such control is contained in the Lever Act, which expires with the proclamation of peace. It was presumed at that time, August, 1919, that this proclamation could soon be made, and whenever the Lever Act expired there would be no way to control the distribution of sugar this year. On August 8, 1919, the President asked for the extension of the Lever Act. Later, in October, representatives of the Sugar Board appearing before the Senate Agriculture Committee requested legislative power to control the distribution of sugar. This was not granted until some time in December, when it was too late to purchase the crop, had he desired to do so.

Personally I want to reiterate that I do not believe the Government should go in the sugar business or any other business. If we are justified in entering the grocery business because sugar is high, we should enter the shoe business, the clothing business, and every other line of industry in which there has been an increase. But we should not do it under the guise of exercising a war power when hostilities ceased a year and a half ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield to himself?

Mr. GOOD. I will not use over 20 minutes in which to explain the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries \$52,892,016.93. It does seem in presenting a bill of this character, where we have had about 8 or 10 hours of general debate, that at least a few words ought to be spoken in explanation of the bill. I believe that the action of the House yesterday in finally determining the policy of Congress with regard to the enactment of appropriation bills will put a stop forever to a system that is so archaic and that ought to have been stopped long ago. I refer to the practice of permitting general debate upon appropriation bills, the debate reaching into all of the activities of the Government and into the activities of other governments and into private affairs of individuals, and most of it having nothing to do with the financial affairs of the Government of the United States. In the future, when the appropriation bill or the budget is presented to the House, around that bill there will center the great financial debates of Congress, and those debates will not only give the membership an intelligent idea of the whole financial scheme of the Government but will sober the judgment of Congress and will stop the enactment of legislation that will in the future mean still larger drafts upon the Treasury of the United States.

The total estimates submitted for the deficiencies amounted to \$59,946,751.25. The bill carries \$52,000,000, or a net reduction of \$7,946,751.25 over the estimates. There are also esti-

mates to be reappropriated of \$68,582,291. The bill carries reappropriations of \$56,600,000, practically all in the War Department.

There was estimated for the Federal Board for Vocational Education, \$8,000,000. The bill carries \$7,000,000. The Chief of the Division of Rehabilitation stated before the committee that the estimates had been made several weeks prior to the hearings, and that we could safely reduce the estimates by \$1,000,000. And the committee, realizing that we are about to adjourn, felt that we could not cut this estimate much, if any, below what the Chief of the Division of Rehabilitation actually estimated would be required. Previously there had been appropriated for this year \$30,000,000 for the rehabilitation work. I know the membership of the House will be interested to know what Congress has done since 1918 for the soldiers of this war. When you consider the rehabilitation work, the money expended for that, the compensation and family allowances, and the hospitalization of the soldiers of this war, with the appropriations carried in this bill and the appropriations carried in the sundry civil and other bills for next year, we will have appropriated since 1918, for and including the next fiscal year, \$1,200,000,000 for the soldiers of this war.

There is included in the bill an item of \$14,000,000 to pay for the loss of Federal control of the telephone and telegraph and cable systems. The Federal control of the wires extended from August 1, 1918, to July 31, 1919. During this period the revenues received amounted, in the grand total, to \$446,117,390.86, and the expenses and taxes amounted to \$377,834,425.96. It has netted an income of \$86,282,964.90, or \$11,453,566.84 less than the compensation under the terms of the settlement which has been agreed upon. In addition to this deficit, it is estimated that it will require \$1,850,000 to settle the claims that are still pending, and the Postmaster General estimates that it will require \$700,000 to pay the interest and costs on the amount from August 1, 1919, to the date of settlement. Of this total sum, \$9,290,000 has been agreed upon.

And in this connection I think I should say the administration of the wire systems of the United States was a splendid administration of those systems. There was a billion or two of property involved, and the Postmaster General took over those properties and handled them in a manner that I think reflects great credit upon his executive ability, and he turned back the properties, not as we turned back the railroads, but he turned them back with only an increase of about 10 or 11 per cent in rates. But he turned them back in a condition so that those systems can now carry on their work without an additional increase in rates. But he did it, not by yielding to every demand for an increase in wage, whether it was necessary or not, but by following a business policy that ought to have been followed in every department of the Government. The Postmaster General is to be commended in the conduct of this wire system, for he carried on its operation in a manner that was satisfactory, I think, to the public, to the employees in the main, and without cost to the owners of the systems whose property he held. [Applause.]

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

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does this item carry anything for the settlement of claims for judgments against these wires during the time they were under the control of the United States? The reason I ask that is that I am told by lawyers that no provision was made in the act that turned the possession of the wires back to their owners for suits for damages occurring during the time the Government was in control of the wires.

Mr. GOOD. I think there is some complaint, but there has been complaint made by only one of the companies, and that is by the Postal Telegraph Co. There is some complaint made with regard to that company, but that company has the possession of the money, and this amount that is estimated for here and appropriated has nothing at all to do with the controversy. That matter is still pending, and will have to be fought out in the courts, as I understand it.

Mr. McKEOWN. I refer particularly to the claims by third parties. There is no provision, as I understand, in the act to turn the wires back by which private persons, having suffered damages when the wires were under the control of the Government, can bring action, because there is no provision for service on the United States.

Mr. GOOD. That matter was not brought to the attention of the committee, and my understanding is that of this amount \$9,290,170 has already been agreed upon in settlement with wire companies, and the Postmaster General expects to get agreements with the remaining claimants, the total of whose claims he expects to settle for \$1,850,000. According to his testimony he expects to reach an amicable settlement with them all.

Now, it was estimated last winter that the Internal Revenue Service would collect about \$1,500,000,000 of excess profits and income taxes in addition to what was estimated originally by the Secretary of the Treasury. When it was discovered that such collections were being made on back taxes, the Secretary of the Treasury created a deficiency in order that a greater number of expert accountants could be put to work to examine the books of corporations and of individuals.

Quite a large additional sum has been brought into the Treasury, and there was a deficiency created by the employment of 500 or 600 employees—additional men in the field and some additional clerks in Washington—in order to bring that work up current. At least \$250,000,000 additional taxes was brought into the Treasury in that way. It entailed a cost of about \$1,250,000. The Internal Revenue Department has about \$765,000 of an unexpended balance that was appropriated for the enforcement of the prohibition act that might be used for this purpose, and the bill carries authorizations to permit the department to use that for the payment of these salaries and also appropriates \$535,000 additional.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Of the \$52,000,000 embraced in this bill, will the chairman kindly tell us about how much is there that is unauthorized by law?

Mr. GOOD. I think it is all authorized.

Mr. BLANTON. My question is about how much of that sum is unauthorized by law?

Mr. GOOD. I do not think there is very much, if any, that is not authorized. I think it is a negligible amount. Certainly these principal amounts are authorized by law. Certainly the Secretary of the Treasury, if he found there were hundreds of millions of dollars that had escaped taxation and that by the employment of men he could bring that money into the Treasury, would be derelict, I think, in his duty if he did not hire the necessary men and require the taxpayers owing those taxes to pay them.

In the case of the Public Health Service we are undertaking the hospital treatment of our soldiers. No amount is fixed by law. They can expend any sum of money necessary to take care of them, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the service would not be justified in doing otherwise, so long as the money is economically expended.

And that brings me to this item: We had an estimate of \$3,000,000 for the Public Health Service for the hospitalization largely of the disabled and sick in the service. We found this to be the case: Of that \$3,000,000 we estimated \$1,000,000 for equipping certain hospitals, which had been turned over by the War Department to the Public Health Service, with beds and hospital equipment, and \$500,000 to equip with beds, furniture, and hospital equipment the Speedway Hospital in Chicago. While the Secretary of War has the right to turn over surplus of such material to the Public Health Service, he claims that he has turned over all such surplus. But before arriving at what is the surplus, he set aside the war reserve for an army of a million men; and on investigation we found that that would require hospital beds and hospital equipment for 150,000 men and for officers sufficient to officer an army of a million men, which meant about 200,000 beds and other furniture and hospital equipment. It seemed to the committee—and we submit it to the judgment of the House—that in these times when the people are frowning upon hoarding the Government should not hoard to the extent of putting in warehouse beds and hospital equipment for an army of a million men, but that we should take 5 per cent of that or less and equip these hospitals and not be compelled to go into the market and buy this expensive furniture and equipment at these prevailing high prices. So in the bill we authorized the Secretary of War to allot out of his reserve not in excess of \$1,000,000 of hospital furniture and supplies, and we give them the other \$2,000,000, which practically makes provision for all that they ask in that regard.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Before you proceed, I would like to have you answer this question, if agreeable: There is pending in Congress a bill appropriating \$175,000 to provide the means and machinery and facilities for paying the Civil War soldiers monthly. The bill only authorizes an appropriation. How soon could the gentleman's committee make an appropriation in the event that this bill passes under suspension of the rules this week? In other words, how soon could we get it into operation?

Mr. GOOD. We concluded the hearings on the bill about 10 days ago, and since that time we have been sending everyone to the Senate, because the House hearings were closed; and if the bill that the gentleman refers to should be agreed to to-day or to-morrow, there would be plenty of time to go before the Senate committee, where all items of that kind, items that we could not hear because they came in after we closed the hearings or where subsequent legislation requires an additional appropriation, can be taken care of. It is understood that the Senate committee is to put on those appropriations.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. The gentleman knows of no opposition in the committee to making this appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. No; I know of none at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. Perhaps the gentleman from Iowa will yield for a question there?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I wish to inquire as to whether the gentleman has any hope of this bill leaving the House before we adjourn to-night?

Mr. GOOD. This deficiency bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, I think so. So far as I know there is nothing in the bill that will raise very much, if any, controversy.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is the desire of the gentleman?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that is the intention of the committee.

Now, there is one item with regard to the loss in transportation facilities on inland waterways. Section 201 of the transportation act provided that the inland waterways and such equipment as had been acquired by the Railroad Administration should be transferred to the Secretary of War and that the Secretary of War should provide for the operation of the inland waterways. That refers to the New York State Barge Canal, the Warrior River, and the Mississippi River.

The losses in operation on the inland waterways during the four months are estimated at \$270,000. An additional amount was asked for, but the committee simply held down the item to the actual amount of loss, so far as we could ascertain it. Of course, practically one month remains of this fiscal year, and to that extent the losses have been predicated upon the amount of the loss for the preceding three months.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has used 20 minutes of his time.

Mr. DUNBAR. Can the gentleman state the amount of the deficit for the entire year?

Mr. GOOD. I do not recall the amount for the entire year. The first eight months of the year the deficit came under the Railroad Administration. It is estimated that next year the losses will amount to about \$750,000,000.

Mr. DUNBAR. That is on the Mississippi River and the Black Warrior?

Mr. GOOD. And the New York State Barge Canal.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is the New York State Barge Canal to be operated under the system, as before, under which permission was refused to make rates low enough to attract traffic?

Mr. GOOD. That will be operated under section 201 of the transportation act. All of these waterways that were turned over will be operated under that provision. So far as I know there is no difference in the law governing the three projects.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman will remember that a large portion of the loss on the New York Barge Canal resulted from the fact that the rates were so manipulated that they could not take freight both ways.

Mr. GOOD. I can not give the gentleman the details. That item for next year as carried in the sundry civil bill was put on in the Senate. The House did not have an opportunity to investigate it closely, the estimates having come in after we had closed our hearings, and, in fact, after the bill went through the House. But in going through the letter of the Secretary of War I observed that the estimated loss for next year on the total project was about \$750,000,000. The total loss in the operation of the New York Canal for March, April, May, and June is estimated at \$50,394.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HUDSPETH. What is the amount carried in this bill to pay the deficiency in the telephone and telegraph operations?

Mr. GOOD. The amount carried in the bill is \$14,000,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is that the amount asked for by the Postmaster General?

Mr. GOOD. The Postmaster General asked for \$14,005,564, but of that there was \$700,000 interest, and we knew the Postmaster General well enough to know that at least \$5,000 would be

saved out of that appropriation. I think likely he will not need it all.

Now, there is also an estimate of \$8,000,000 for the transportation of the mail by the railroad companies.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has made its report with regard to increase in the pay of railroad companies for carrying the mails. That increase will amount to something around \$25,000,000 a year. For the balance of this year the total amount estimated was \$8,000,000. It is a matter over which the committee can exercise no judgment. It is a matter absolutely fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Postmaster General must pay this award.

There is \$1,600,000 carried in the bill for increase in the star routes for inland transportation.

Last year the contracts for transportation on star routes were made in the West, and this year they were made in the South. It was found that the Post Office Department could not get men to carry the mail on the star routes at anything like the amount of their former contracts.

The amount carried in the Post Office appropriation bill was the amount estimated on the basis of former contracts, but in many of these cases it was found necessary to increase this amount by all the way from 25 to 50 per cent. The Postmaster General says that the very least he can get along with for the rest of this year to pay for the contracts and the increases in contracts on inland transportation of mail by star routes is \$1,600,000.

There are some other minor items. There is also one large item for transporting and recruiting the Navy in 1919 and 1920, amounting to \$9,735,000.

As I recall, at the beginning of the fiscal year there was quite a force in the Navy that was being demobilized. The transportation of those boys to their homes created a deficit somewhere between \$9,000,000 and \$10,000,000. That is an actual deficit and must be paid.

If any question is raised as to other items, I shall explain them as we reach them in the bill. I will ask the Clerk to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND.

To enable the American Printing House for the Blind more adequately to provide books and apparatus for the education of the blind in accordance with the provisions of the act approved August 4, 1919, \$10,000.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not exceeding 10 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes out of order. Is there objection?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, I would like to proceed for 10 minutes out of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope gentlemen will withhold that request. We have had nine hours' debate, in accordance with an understanding between the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and myself. When we get to the end of the bill, I shall not object to gentlemen proceeding out of order, but I hope that gentlemen will withhold that request at this time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I understand the chairman to mean that from now on there will be no extraneous debate.

Mr. GOOD. I hope to hold the debate strictly to the items of the bill. We must do that if we are going to adjourn in accordance with the resolution, and I hope the membership will bear with us while we have the bill read as quickly as possible consistent with proper procedure.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. SALARIES.

District of Columbia employees' compensation fund: For carrying out the provisions of section 11 of the District of Columbia appropriation act, approved July 11, 1919, extending to the employees of the government of the District of Columbia the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, \$500.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, after line 10, insert a new paragraph to read as follows: "For increased compensation to 2,073 teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia who have been employed as teachers in said schools for the period from January 1 to the end of the school year in June, 1920, the sum of \$405,468: *Provided*, That payment of said

sum is hereby directed to be made to the teachers in the following grades and in the following sums: (1) Three hundred and fifty-nine teachers in group A of class 6, including 7 principals of grade manual schools, the sum of \$228 each; (2) 152 teachers in class 5, the sum of \$120 each; (3) 511 teachers in class 4, the sum of \$180 each; (4) 543 teachers in class 3, the sum of \$204 each; (5) 374 teachers in class 2, the sum of \$204 each; (6) 92 teachers in class 1, the sum of \$204 each; (7) 42 teachers in class 6 B, the sum of \$180 each.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and not authorized by law.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Will the chairman reserve his point of order for a moment?

Mr. GOOD. I will for a minute.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia are grateful and appreciate the financial relief provided by the District of Columbia appropriation bill, but the relief is not available for the teaching force until October, 1920, and the cost of living has so increased, even during the past winter, that many teachers have been unable to meet expenses and now under a burden of debt are facing several months which bring no remuneration.

The primary reason for granting an immediate temporary relief to the teachers of the District of Columbia is in the interests of the 60,000 school children of the District. Unless such relief is granted many of the best teachers can not remain in the schools another year, and those who do remain must work under the depressing influence of feeling that their services are not appreciated and that as compared with teachers in other cities and those in other vocations they are not getting a square deal. [Applause.]

The highest degree of efficiency can not be maintained in any line of service unless the proper spirit is maintained among those who perform the actual work involved. This is true with respect to those who deal only with material things, but it is infinitely more important with respect to those who deal with the impressionable minds of children. A competent, successful teacher who is happy and contented in her work is an invaluable asset to any school. The same teacher depressed, discouraged, and discontented is a liability.

The teachers will get their last pay checks for the school year in June and will not draw their next pay until the 1st of October. It will be impossible for very many of them to bridge over until next fall without engaging in other work in order to meet living expenses. This will necessitate their beginning another school year tired and worn out, instead of being well rested, as they should be, for the severe nervous strain incident to teaching the children committed to their charge.

The arguments in support of the granting by Congress of an immediate temporary relief to the teachers of the District of Columbia are the same as have influenced boards of education in a score of the cities of the United States to grant an increase. The economic conditions existing in Washington are similar to those existing in other cities. The salaries paid in other cities during the past year have, as a rule, been larger than the salaries paid in the District of Columbia. Congress should do as well by the teachers of Washington as has been done by boards of education in other cities. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the committee went out of its way in the hearings in increasing the teachers' pay. We were in sympathy with the teachers and realized that during the war they had not had the increase in wages that other Federal employees had had; that their wages did not compare with the wages of clerks paid in the various departments. There were clerks that could not teach school because they did not have the mental capacity to teach who were receiving much larger wages than the teachers, but it was not within the province of the Committee on Appropriations to bring out any appropriation in this bill for a deficit. The total amount provided for teachers as authorized by law has already been appropriated. There was not an estimate from the District Commissioners, or a single person connected with the District government, for a penny in this bill for the teachers. Therefore I am constrained to insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Municipal court: For contingent expenses, including books, law books, books of reference, fuel, light, telephone, blanks, dockets, and all other necessary miscellaneous items and supplies, \$1,200.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I intended to make a point of order to the paragraph on page 8, but with the speed of the reading clerk it got by without my notice. I want to call the attention of the chairman to this fact: I notice in this deficiency bill of 64 pages that 12 pages are devoted to the District of Columbia. It impresses me with the fact that either the District authorities are peculiarly unfortunate in their ability to foresee what their needs will be for a few months in advance or they deliberately with-

hold from the District Committee a part of their needs, with the idea of going to the deficiency committee after they have got all they can from the District subcommittee.

In the bill before us the only District item that seems to be available for 1921 is the item on page 8, which the Clerk has passed. I want to take this opportunity to call it to the attention of the chairman, with the hope that he may care to give some expression as to how he would look upon adding a great number of important items for the year 1921 for the District to this deficiency bill. I assume that the chairman of the committee would make a point of order against any large number of items for 1921 that might be offered to the District portion of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman means in regard to items that might be put on at the other end of the Capitol?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is what I refer to; they would be subject to a point of order if offered here, but if the bill should come back with a large portion of the District appropriation bill on it, how would the chairman of the committee view it?

Mr. GOOD. I think it would be an unwise thing for the other body to do. I think that the other body ought to act on the bill that is in conference, and this bill should not be loaded down with anything of that kind.

Mr. CRAMTON. It would hardly be in harmony with our new budget system.

Mr. GOOD. It would not, and I would not look with favor upon anything of that kind.

The Clerk read as follows:

Industrial Home School: For maintenance, including the same objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$1,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky rose.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rose to move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARD. I was about to inquire whether the Clerk is reading the bill. He apparently jumped to paragraphs on the top of page 11 and then to one on the middle of the page.

Mr. BLANTON. That is scientific reading.

Mr. GARD. If it is being read for amendment, the bill ought to be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who is in charge of this bill, what is meant by the three words "and so forth," in line 12, page 11. The language reads:

For board and care of all children, and so forth.

Who is to be included in that care other than children?

Mr. GOOD. Nobody at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. But this says, "children and so forth."

Mr. GOOD. It refers to the District of Columbia act— including the same objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia appropriation act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think the gentleman is wrong about that.

Mr. CRAMTON. The "and so forth" does not apply to the word "children," but to the board and care.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It does not say that. It says:

For board and care of all children, and so forth.

Mr. WALSH. Then what is the comma there for?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would like to know what it means.

Mr. GOOD. The way that was originally written was—

For board and care of all children committed to the guardianship of said board by the courts of the District and for temporary care of children pending investigation, while being transferred from place to place.

The commissioners in submitting their estimates simply shortened it up and had the estimate read "for board and care of all children, and so forth."

The words "and so forth" refer to the language that was carried in the former appropriation, and were intended to shorten it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No doubt it is intended to do that, but inasmuch as it does not do it—

Mr. GOOD. It is further described in the three remaining lines.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It does not mean that anybody other than children may be supported with this fund?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, not at all.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Authority is granted to pay, in addition to the sum of \$1,500 heretofore authorized, a further sum not to exceed \$5,000, during the fiscal year 1920, to institutions adjudged to be under sectarian control.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of inquiring of the chairman with reference to the language in lines 18 and 19, "to institutions adjudged to be under sectarian control."

Mr. GOOD. That is the Board of Children's Guardians.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Do they render judgments?

Mr. GOOD. They determine the institution to which the children shall be assigned, and the present act provides that only \$1,500 could be expended in caring for children in sectarian institutions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The language is "institutions adjudged to be under sectarian control."

That means they are adjudged to be, I imagine, by some court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. GOOD. I think that word "adjudged" means they are found to be such. It is the judgment of the Board of Children's Guardians that is referred to rather than the judgment of a court.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And it means those that are found to be under sectarian control and not adjudged to be.

Mr. GOOD. I think, perhaps, that would be a better wording, but this is the way the appropriation has been carried for years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It occurs to me that this fund, under this language, can not be used until some such institution has been adjudged to be under sectarian control. That word "adjudged" has a well-defined meaning in all proceedings.

Mr. GOOD. They can pay it now to any institution that is not under sectarian control. This is the situation: Only \$1,500 of the appropriation that has been made for the current year can be used for the purpose of caring for children that are in institutions that are under sectarian control. That amount has been found to be inadequate, because there are not enough institutions not under sectarian control with sufficient capacity to take care of these children. They must place them somewhere, and they are placing them in institutions under sectarian control, and they need authority for \$5,000 more for that purpose.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am quite familiar with all that the gentleman has said, but if he leaves the language in there as it is, that none of the sectarian institutions can get any of this money until it has been adjudged to be a sectarian institution, I think they can not get the money without being so adjudged by a court.

Mr. GOOD. It does not have to be adjudged by a court.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think it does. It says so. It says they must be adjudged to be under sectarian control.

Mr. GOOD. I think the word "adjudged" is an unfortunate word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think so.

Mr. GOOD. It would be better if the commissioners had said—

institutions found to be, by the Board of Children's Guardians, under sectarian control.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. So that these institutions may get this money over the quibble of anybody, would it not be well to strike out the three words "adjudged to be," so that the \$5,000 would go to institutions under sectarian control?

Mr. GOOD. This is the exact language that the appropriation has carried for years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. But that does not cure the difficulty.

Mr. GOOD. Unless I am assured that there would be some abuse, I would not be inclined to change it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. But how does the gentleman know that before this money is dealt out to one of these institutions some pestiferous fellow is not going to enjoin its being paid out?

Mr. GOOD. Well, they have never been so far.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Then the question will arise that it can not be paid to any institution until adjudged to be under sectarian control.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEGG. Can not the word "adjudged" be used only in connection with a court?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Not on a legislative matter it can not be. I say that only to invite the attention of the chairman to it. I feel in doubt if the question is raised but that the money appropriated will fail to reach its purpose.

Mr. GOOD. There has been no trouble in the past, and I think there will be no trouble in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There can be no trouble in the future if you strike out those words.

The Clerk read as follows:

One-half of the foregoing amounts to meet deficiencies in the appropriations on account of the District of Columbia shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and one-half from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Before leaving this section relating to the District of Columbia deficiencies I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. I notice from the report of the committee that the committee has failed to make an appropriation for repairs of the suburban roads in the District, for which the District Commissioners asked some \$20,000, and I would like to ask the chairman why some provision was not made for taking care of the roads which are in bad repair in the District of Columbia?

Mr. GOOD. There is no question but what the District suburban roads are in bad condition. There is no question but what the District Commissioners have adopted a very poor system of making repairs. It is the opinion of some members on the District Committee that a great deal of the money that is appropriated for this very purpose is wasted. Take the road out to Chevy Chase. The District of Columbia keeps the road repaired on both sides of the street car track and they let the street car company do just as it pleases, and it dumps rock in the center, and after every rain the rock is washed over in the road that the District of Columbia keeps in repair, and by permitting the street car company to dump rock between the tracks they keep the automobiles off from that portion of the road. It seems that the District Commissioners allow the street car companies practically to control them with regard to these suburban roads where there is a street car running. We called their attention very sharply to it, and until they show some disposition to spend money in a businesslike way with regard to these roads and make the public utilities corporations do their part we are going to hold them down somewhat if we can. [Applause.] Now, with regard to the roads leading to suburban roads we gave them \$35,000 for the rest of this year.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Does the gentleman think that is sufficient?

Mr. GOOD. I am afraid that is not as much as they ought to have in accordance with the price of material, and I hope that next year they will have more, but a great deal is going to depend on the attitude of the District of Columbia. The trouble with the District of Columbia is that it wants the improvement of existing property without the payment of taxes. [Applause.] They want their roads and they want the people of the United States to be taxed to build the roads. Maryland has some good roads and everywhere a road from Maryland meets a road from the District of Columbia there is somebody there ready to arrest a man who has lost his tag and has an automobile, and on the most of their roads the repairs are paid for because the State of Maryland does not do the humane and sensible thing by recognizing, as other States recognize, the right of a person who has an automobile and has a license in one State to go over the roads of Maryland. [Applause.] Let Maryland and the District of Columbia do what is fair and honest and right in regard to the repairs of roads and with regard to taxes and there will be no difficulty in getting all the money you need to make the roads of the District of Columbia ideal roads, just as they ought to be.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman took up most of my time and I ask for five additional minutes.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield for this further observation?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes; but I would like to answer the gentleman from Iowa first.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is just a brief suggestion, that the suburban roads, and I travel them considerable, in the District of Columbia are not in such a condition as to constitute such an emergency as would justify an item for their improvement in a deficiency bill.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will touch on that. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am rather surprised at the statement made by the distinguished chairman of this committee. I voted yesterday to concentrate in a committee of 35 all the power of making appropriations, but I am frank to say that if the committee of 35 displays such a lack of knowledge of conditions as has been displayed here to-day by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I believe that the concentration of this enormous power in this committee will be ill advised. Now, as to the statement made as to the public-service corporations ruining the roads by washing stone from the middle of the track, that is not the trouble with the suburban roads in the District. The trouble with Connecticut Avenue, to which the gentleman refers, is that it is the most heavily traveled road in the District of Columbia; and under the appropriations that have been made the District Commissioners have been spending 20 cents per square yard for road maintenance each year, and the District Commissioners came before the Committee on Appropriations and asked for an appropriation to pave Connecticut Avenue at a cost of \$1 per square yard, so in five years the road would pay for itself. This great Committee on Appropriations did not give a cent to repave, and when the matter got over to the Senate the Senate appropriated sufficient money to pave one side of Connecticut Avenue only; and then they come in and ask for the small sum of \$20,000 to put these suburban roads in repair, and the committee turns them down and make a report that they have saved \$20,000 for the District of Columbia.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. In just a moment. I do not agree with what the distinguished gentleman said about the people of the District of Columbia not wanting to pay for these roads or for the expense of government.

I believe that the people of the District of Columbia would be satisfied to pay a fair tax rate and have these repairs made, notwithstanding the statements that have been made to the contrary. As a matter of fact, the reference the gentlemen made to the State of Maryland is certainly not well founded. According to the statement made by the chairman, he wants the State of Maryland to allow the residents of the District of Columbia, in return for the privilege of riding over a few miles of roadbed that is to-day equivalent to riding over the roadbed of a mountain stream, the privilege of riding over our 1,400 miles of modern highway which are maintained by the automobile fees which he complains about. I make the statement that you can travel from Washington to the Maryland line near Uniontown, Pa., a distance of 200 miles, and that the worst road in all that distance you will find is located here in the Nation's Capital, and I say it is a sad reflection on the committee that makes appropriations for this purpose that such a condition exists.

Mr. GOOD. The people of Maryland come into the District of Columbia, and ride over paved streets, and they pay no license.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. They pay for a license tag, the same as we ask of the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I have one on my own machine. If you come into the District of Columbia from Maryland without a tag you are immediately apprehended by a policeman and asked where your District tag is. The same relation exists between the District and the State of Maryland as the State of Maryland maintains toward the District.

Mr. CRAMTON. One-half of Connecticut Avenue is provided for in the District bill which is now in conference, and the gentleman knows and will admit the fact that the bill is held up in conference because of the local opposition here to the increase in taxation that will enable the necessary improvements to roads and schools to be made.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I do not agree with that. It is the influence of the United States Senate and not local influence.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows there is intimate connection there.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows that the Appropriations Committee will be delighted to appropriate all the money of the District, with a fair amount from the Federal Treasury, for improvements in the District, but there is a large and influential element in the District that insists they must never pay any more taxes than in the days when it was a village.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have two more minutes.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that the reason the District of Columbia requires the automobiles from Maryland to have a District license tag on them is for the very reason mentioned by the chairman a moment ago—that there is no reciprocity with the State of Maryland?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Would you have reciprocity with 1,400 miles of improved highway in return for the privilege of riding over a few miles of rough roads here in the District?

Mr. BLANTON. It is true in every other State. They can come down to the State of Texas and never be stopped. There is reciprocity between the State in which I live and every other State of the Union, and there should be in every State.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say that the State of Maryland maintains reciprocal relations with the great State of Texas and every other State in the Union. It does not maintain them with the District of Columbia, because the District of Columbia, under the system that has been built up, does not provide any roads for the use of automobilists, and we have a license fee in Maryland now that we collect from the residents of the District, and every dollar is spent in the maintenance of roads; not the construction. The construction has been entirely by bond issues, on which the people pay both the interest and into the principal for a sinking fund.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Adams County, Pa., in which Gettysburg is located, has not improved roads, but they run up to the fine roads of your State. Do you require them to have a license when people come into Maryland in automobiles?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. We do not.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Then why do you ask it of the people of the District of Columbia?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Pennsylvania has many miles of good roads of its own.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MACCRATE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate No. 7 to the bill (H. R. 406) amending an act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., certain public lands in California; and granting rights in, over, and through the Sierra forest reserve, the Santa Barbara forest reserve, and the San Gabriel timberland reserve, California, to the city of Los Angeles, Calif.," approved June 30, 1906.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Vocational rehabilitation: For an additional amount for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1918, as amended, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, funeral and other incidental expenses (including the transportation of remains) of deceased trainees of the board, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, law books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$7,000,000: *Provided*, That the salary limitations placed upon the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation by the sundry civil appropriation act, approved July 19, 1919, shall apply to the appropriation herein made.

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

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

Mr. GARD. I want to obtain some information as to this blanket appropriation. How much of this appropriation for vocational rehabilitation is paid out for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere?

Mr. GOOD. Quite a large sum is paid out for personal services. Just what proportion of it is paid out for personal services in the District of Columbia I do not know that I can tell the gentleman. All the facts are printed in a table in the hearings on the sundry civil appropriation bill, but I do not have that before me now. My recollection—and it is only a hazy recollection—is that about nine months ago, when the appropriation was about \$12,000,000, the expenditure for personal services was on the basis of about 30 per cent, but since the number that

comes under the control of the Board for Vocational Education has been increased my understanding is that the percentage is very largely decreased, so far as concerns the expense of officers and clerical help, so that I should say that of the \$37,000,000 that will be available for this year perhaps 10 or 15 per cent would be available for officers and clerical help.

Mr. GARD. I realize, of course, that a very large part of this must be paid for some sort of clerical help, and the particular sort of clerical help that I referred to in seeking information was the office clerk and organization help, because I think everybody would very willingly join in very great expenditures for teachers and everybody who was capable of affording vocational rehabilitation to disabled persons discharged from the military and naval service. But there is an increasing desire, apparently, on the part of the departments here in the District of Columbia to expand, and I was wondering whether the gentleman had, without any undue research on his part at this time, information to give to the committee as to how much was now spent in the District of Columbia by this organization in the maintenance of the clerical force and officers in the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I am sorry that I can not give the gentleman an exact statement.

Mr. GARD. I am not finding fault. I am just seeking information.

Mr. TOWNER. I do not accuse the gentleman of finding fault, but I do not think the board should be subject to criticism in that regard, because they have made a very drastic reduction in the total amounts paid to personal help of all kinds as compared with the total expenditures. Within the District of Columbia, although the work has very largely increased, I think there has been within the last six months or so no increase whatever in the personnel.

Mr. GARD. What is now the total appropriation, including the \$7,000,000 deficiency?

Mr. GOOD. Thirty-seven million dollars for the year.

Mr. TOWNER. But it will have to be largely increased, I will say to the gentleman, for the next year.

Mr. GOOD. The amount carried in the sundry civil bill for the next year is \$90,000,000, and that amount has been agreed to by the conferees on the part of the Senate and on the part of the House.

Mr. GARD. Can the gentleman state what proportion of that goes to overhead charges, office help, and clerical assistance?

Mr. GOOD. I can not say.

Mr. TOWNER. It will be very largely reduced in proportion, because most of the expense goes to the compensation of the men and the increased cost of hospital service and the service of examining physicians and matters of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CONTROL OF TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE SYSTEMS.

For payment of the deficit incurred in the operation of the telegraph and telephone systems during the period of Government control and to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution approved July 16, 1918, and the act approved July 11, 1919, with reference to just compensation to the owners of the telegraph and telephone systems for the supervision, possession, control, and operation of their properties by the United States during the period beginning midnight, July 31, 1918, and ending midnight, July 31, 1919, \$14,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1921.

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

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

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I have no information about the item under consideration, except that I have just been handed a telegram from an officer of the Postal Telegraph Co., which discloses a very extraordinary situation, one which, it seems to me, calls for a pretty full and satisfactory explanation before we agree to this item. I will read the telegram:

NEW YORK CITY, June 2, 1920.

HON. JAMES W. HUSTED,
Washington, D. C.:

There is included in the general deficiency bill now being considered by House an appropriation of \$14,000,000 to make up the losses incurred by Postmaster General Burleson during his control of telegraphs and telephone. The very large part of this \$14,000,000 goes to Burleson's favorites, the Bell Telephone and Western Union Cos., and does not represent losses, but merely the difference between what they earned and what Burleson awarded them as compensation. We claim that those companies should be satisfied with what they earned and in these times have no right to call on the Treasury of the United

States to pay them more than they earned, especially as Burleson increased their rates for them by about \$41,000,000 per annum. The Postal Telegraph-Cable Co. on the other hand, is satisfied to keep merely what it earned, but Burleson says he proposes to sue that company for \$2,000,000 of its earnings. By what principle of justice and equity the Postal Co. is to be sued for \$2,000,000 of its earnings while the Bell and Western Union are to be paid more than their earnings we can not understand. We respectfully suggest that no action be taken by Congress in this \$14,000,000 appropriation until the matter is examined into further and until this apparent injustice to the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co., which was singled out by Burleson for persecution, is cleared up. I would appreciate it if you could oppose the above appropriation on the floor of the House.

EDWARD REYNOLDS,
Vice President and General Manager
Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.

I would like to ask the chairman if he can throw any light on this controversy?

Mr. GOOD. Practically all of the wire lines in the United States were taken over by the Government, and the Government exercised control over them from the 1st day of August, 1918, to the 31st day of July, 1919. The wire companies were allowed to keep all of their revenue and to pay out of that the expense of operation. They practically were left in the control, in a sense, of their own property, the Federal Government exercising supervisory control only. Now, each company kept its own money; that is, money received from operation. It happens that the Postal Telegraph Co. has lines in a few large cities and in comparatively few small towns. It goes to very few of the small cities or towns or villages. Its earnings are very large as compared with the miles of lines. It happens that under the rate fixed by the Postmaster General under the act passed by Congress the receipts of the Postal Co. were largely in excess of the operating expenses and the amount due it for compensation by the standard established; but the rates fixed under the law for the other lines were not sufficient, largely because of injunctions that prevented an increase in rates. Now, what the Postal Co. wants, as I understand it, is that we shall withhold payment from the Bell Co. and other companies because they did not earn enough to pay expenses of operation and rentals agreed upon until Congress says that the Postal Co. shall be permitted to keep all it received during the war. That is the controversy. As to the merits of the controversy, I am not sufficiently informed to pass judgment. I can understand just how it feels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUSTED. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Now, the committee did not see how it could take jurisdiction of that controversy at all. It is in the courts. The Postmaster General has caused suit to be brought against the Postal Co., or intends to do so, to recover from it the excess of receipts over the amount which it is claimed it is entitled to under the law and the amount allowed. I know very little about the controversy.

Mr. HUSTED. Did the Committee on Appropriations go carefully into the details of this arrangement between the Postmaster General and the Western Union and Bell Telephone Co. lines, so as to determine with any reasonable degree of certainty that the Government justly owes this amount of \$14,000,000 to these companies?

Mr. GOOD. We went into the matter as carefully as the time would permit. Of course, if we went into all these properties, involving a total investment of \$1,000,000,000 or \$1,500,000,000, we would be here for months, and maybe for years, if a single committee were to do that. We went into it to the extent that the Postmaster General put in the figures of the various amounts—the amount they had received for conducting the business and the shortage. Now, whether those accounts are correct I have no knowledge at all, and, of course, we could not have unless we spent months of time. We adopted the same course followed by the last Congress as well as this regarding the railroads.

Mr. MONDELL. There is no question about the Postmaster General having the authority to make the contract.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that, under whatever regulations or statutes the Postmaster General made these arrangements, it is apparent that gross injustice might easily be done. It strikes me that it is a most extraordinary situation that one public-service corporation should be asked to pay \$2,000,000 into the Treasury of the Government and the other corporations be given \$14,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield to me, I think I can give him some information.

Mr. HUSTED. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. When the question was up before the Post Office Committee with a view of returning the control of the wires to their owners, a thorough investigation was made. That investigation disclosed that the Postmaster General entered into a contract with the Western Union and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. under which the Government guaranteed the payment of the dividends that were then being paid by the companies or that had been paid prior to Government control. This was without respect to the value of the property. But when it came to the Postal Telegraph Co.'s lines, the Postmaster General fixed a value on the property in connection with which he directed the payment of a 6 per cent dividend, if I recall, leaving the Postal Telegraph Co. to draw only \$1,800,000 of the \$4,000,000 which they had earned, and the other \$2,200,000 was used to pay the losses of the Western Union Co.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I have not heard any very satisfactory explanation, and I think the explanation should be complete before we agree to turn over \$14,000,000 to the treasury of the Western Union Telegraph Co. and the Bell Telephone Co., when we are credibly informed by an officer of the Postal Telegraph Co. that the Postmaster General proposes to take \$2,000,000 out of the pockets of that company; and as this explanation has not been very satisfactory—at least it does not satisfy my mind—I move to strike out the paragraph.

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

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Did the gentleman state by whom that communication was signed?

Mr. HUSTED. The communication is from the vice president and general manager of the Postal Telegraph & Cable Co. His name is Edward Reynolds.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it not a fact that in the operation of the railroads some railroads earned money and others lost money?

Mr. HUSTED. That is true; but does not apply to this situation. Here both companies apparently made money.

Mr. OLIVER. And that the excess earnings of one company were used to pay the losses of other companies.

Mr. HUSTED. The Western Union Telegraph Co. made money while they were under the control of the Government. They did not lose any money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUSTED: Page 13, beginning with line 22, strike out the paragraph ending with line 9, on page 14.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 23 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 23 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, I should like to proceed for 10 minutes out of order.

Mr. GOOD. I shall have to object to that.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Then I will object to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can give the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED] the information he desires, but certainly the hearings will disclose some very interesting facts in connection with the case of the Postal Telegraph Co. If the gentleman will refer to pages 239 and 240 of the hearings, he will see that the statement of the Postmaster General is that under Federal control there was allowed to these companies an award of 5.64 per cent of the investment in plant, while the aggregate net revenues of the same companies were 6.69 per cent for the year 1916 and 5.98 per cent for the year 1917.

Unlike the railroad bill, which provided specifically the basis upon which the compensation should be fixed, the act providing for the taking over of the telephone and telegraph companies simply provided for "just compensation," which "just compensation" was to be fixed by the President under the act of Congress. In ascertaining the amount of the awards to be made the net earnings on invested capital for three or four years prior to the war had to be ascertained. In ascertaining the net revenue an investigation was made as to each company involved. An effort was made to ascertain the invested capital of the Postal Telegraph Co., and the Postal officials refused to allow the Post Office Department to examine

their books. Resorting to the sworn statement of the Postal Telegraph Co. before the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Post Office Department found that the net earnings of the 39 companies constituting this system are represented as being \$332,000 in 1916 and only \$117,000 in 1917.

Now, having sworn to that statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission, in response to a questionnaire of the Post Office Department asking for data to enable them to make an award in this matter the Postal Telegraph Co. furnished a sworn statement claiming that the net earnings of the company for the same period was \$4,157,670.44 instead of \$332,000. And they claimed it was \$4,485,000 for 1917 instead of the \$117,000 that they had sworn to before the Interstate Commerce Commission as the earnings for 1917.

The sworn statement of the Postal Telegraph Co. before the Interstate Commerce Commission placed upon their property a valuation of \$6,647,472. The best information available to the Post Office Department estimated the value of their property to be approximately \$28,000,000, and they based their awards on that estimated valuation, more than four times the valuation placed upon it before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It was difficult for the Post Office Department to make an intelligent award, realizing that the sworn statement before the Interstate Commerce Commission was only one-quarter of the amount sworn to in response to the question, and they asked permission to examine the books of the telegraph company. That permission was refused. The Department suggested that if the Postal Co. was dissatisfied with its award that a friendly suit be brought to determine whether it was "just" compensation, and they refused this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman from South Carolina be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks that the time of the gentleman from South Carolina be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, I wish to be recognized for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That can not be coupled with the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I object.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I simply want to call attention to the appropriation of \$14,000,000 for the Western Union Co., and to emphasize the fact that there is an apparent willingness on the part of the House to pass this appropriation without protestation from anybody, particularly from the Democratic side of the House. I remember last Saturday we had a regular bedlam over the fact that we wanted to appropriate about ten times the amount for the American soldiers, or one and a half billion dollars, to pay a bonus. Here comes a proposition to pay one-tenth of that amount to the telegraph company in one lump sum.

Mr. GOOD. I think the gentleman had better get his percentages correct.

Mr. TEMPLE. It is one hundred times as much.

Mr. BEGG. One hundred times is right.

Mr. MAPES. The principle is the same.

Mr. BEGG. The principle is identically the same. It does not make any difference. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the very men who are the proponents of this proposition are the men who fought most aggressively the proposition for a bonus for the soldiers.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the amendment.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised at the gentleman's protest. He is one of the men that I am speaking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the gentleman from Ohio will confine himself to a discussion of the amendment.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I think I am close enough to the amendment. It is close enough at least to cause some Members to protest vigorously. So far as I am concerned, I do not believe that we can do a worse thing than to continue to do just what we have done time and again, and that is to appropriate millions and hundreds of millions of dollars when the chairman of the committee asking for the appropriation comes out and makes the statement to the House that he does not know whether the facts are accurate or not beyond the statement of a department head, who does not give the details. We do not have any protests from outside interests to-day on this bill, save one, while on the other bill of similar nature they came in here by the hundreds, according to some people. It seems to me it is a

clear case, a bona fide case, of a willingness on the part of the Postmaster General who made this contract to give something for which he did not receive any value. I for one, so far as my vote goes or so far as any influence or any word that I can say is concerned, protest against that kind of legislative action, after listening for a whole year to the statement that the Treasury of the United States is almost in a defunct condition financially, after having letters read from different department heads asking us not to make this and that kind of appropriation.

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

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Is the gentleman in favor of passing this bill under suspension of the rules?

Mr. BEGG. No; I am not.

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

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. I know nothing about the merits of this proposition. It may be absolutely all right for all I know, but it has not been satisfactorily explained. It is a very extraordinary proposition. It looks to me as if the Postal Telegraph Co. were being penalized simply because it is a well-managed corporation, and that the Western Union Telegraph Co., probably because it has a very large debt, is being remunerated by the Government of the United States to the extent of \$14,000,000, although it suffered no losses. If it had suffered some losses during the war, I would feel differently about it, but it has not suffered any loss. This is simply an addition of \$14,000,000 to its profits, and why one company should be remunerated \$14,000,000 and another company penalized \$2,000,000 simply because it is well managed and well organized and on a sound business basis I do not understand, and I do not believe any gentleman can explain it.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in the Postal Telegraph Co., and I do not care to say very much about the controversy of the Government with the Postal Co., except this: If the Government takes over the business of a corporation and fixes the rates which it can charge, and which are presumably reasonable rates, and then the matter goes to the courts, the courts will take care of it, and I think the Postal Telegraph Co. will be taken care of.

Consequently, I am not much interested in the Postal Co. But here is an item of \$14,000,000 that is to be paid to the Western Union Telegraph Co., about which our friends on the Appropriations Committee, who told us yesterday they would like to take on a little more business than they have now, do not seem to be able to give us much information. Apparently the Postmaster General made a contract with the Western Union Telegraph Co. He had authority so to do, but he did not have authority to make any kind of contract he wanted to. That is perfectly plain, and it does not need any explanation. What kind of contract did he make? I do not know, and the gentleman does not seem to know, and he does not seem to know whether they had any authority to make it, and nevertheless—

Mr. GOOD. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I stated that it was made in pursuance of an act of Congress that both of us voted for.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No such contract as has been stated here was made in pursuance of any act of Congress. The act of Congress that provided for taking over the telegraph did not specify what kind of contract could be made.

Mr. GOOD. That is exactly what was done.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I insist it is not, nor can the gentleman find any such law.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman can find the information stated time and again, that it is based on the net income of the companies for the three fiscal years, just as it was in the case of the railroads.

Mr. TEMPLE. Fixed by law.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Fixed by act of Congress. It gave to the President power to fix just compensation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman had better look at the law. There is no such act or statute. I insist that the Postmaster General had no authority to make a contract based on the earnings of the companies for the last three fiscal years. Such an assertion simply shows how little the Appropriations Committee know about what they are appropriating \$14,000,000 for. Apparently they have not given the matter any proper attention, and I support the motion of the gentleman from New York to strike out the paragraph.

Incidentally, I want to call attention to the fact that this loss is caused by the administration taking over the lines after the war was over. Government operation may cost us \$14-

000,000 without causing the slightest benefit. In fact, it seems to have been done merely that the President might control the cables. It is merely another item of Democratic waste.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, this matter of the Government control of telephones and telegraphs came before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in the last Congress, and we had extensive hearings on it when we considered the resolution requested by the Post Office Department to continue Government control. I want to say that I am not satisfied with this appropriation. In the first place, the Postmaster General, I believe, was in some sort of an understanding with these big telegraph and telephone companies—the Western Union and the American Telegraph & Telephone Co.—to take them over. The evidence of that is that Mr. Vail had for many years been preaching the unification of all the telegraph and telephone companies. He claimed it was a business that should not have competition in it. The Postmaster General, for a long time, had been ardently advocating Government ownership and control, exclusive control, of all these facilities of communication, and behold, when the war was nearly over, in July, 1918, they secured the passage of this resolution, without any reason being given, to take over all these telegraph and telephone companies. It was recited in the resolution that they should have just compensation, but there was no provision like there was in regard to railroad control that they should be adjusted on a prewar basis of earnings at all. That was adopted simply because they chose to do so. Now, why did they adopt it? Because the Postmaster General selected as his advisers Mr. Vail and Mr. Bethel and Mr. Carlton, president of the Western Union, the men who got \$10,000,000 out of this \$14,000,000. They were what are called dollar-a-year men, patriotically, as is claimed, serving the Government. They were his advisers. It so happens, however, that the course followed under this advice was very profitable to the advisers. Now, it is true that they did not fix the compensation themselves.

Prof. Adams and Prof. Friday fixed the compensation. But it was done under certain rules and principles which were laid down to them, and they were the principles laid down by the Postmaster General, presumably after consultation with the principal beneficiaries, such as Vail and Carlton, who are getting \$10,000,000 here out of the Public Treasury, in addition to the \$40,000,000 that they received for increased rates imposed by the Postmaster General upon the public. That is what they are getting out of the operation, and it is the most unfair and unjust and indefensible claim that has ever been brought before the House of Representatives. [Applause.] It is true that they entered into these contracts without any specific statutory authority to do so, but they did it because of the analogy, they say, with the railroad act, which said they should have pay based upon prewar earnings for three years. The resolution simply stated that they should have just compensation, and if they did not get it they could go to the Court of Claims. These principles under which they gave this allowance were prescribed by the beneficiaries or through their influence. I say I believe that if a case could be brought before a court of justice the award would be set aside as a fraud upon the public.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. HUSTED. Does not the gentleman think that if the Postal Telegraph Co., which was also under Government control, ought to be compelled to go into the court to secure its rights that the Western Union Co. should be compelled to go to the courts and get its money also?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; but I am not defending the Postal Telegraph Co.; they are amply able to defend themselves.

Mr. HUSTED. Neither am I, or any other company.

Mr. STEENERSON. They showed before the Post Office Committee that there was absolutely no justification for this arbitrary taking of their earnings. Everybody else was allowed their earnings, but they were not given their earnings. They received \$1,680,000 of their earnings, and the other \$2,000,000 was taken to pay in part the deficit created by the Western Union and American Telegraph & Telephone Co.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. REAVIS. Does the gentleman believe a court would be justified in rendering judgment of \$14,000,000 against the United States on the information that is given to us here?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; I do not believe so, if all the facts surrounding the contract were shown up. I believe a court of justice would, upon the testimony, set aside this award of compensation, because circumstances indicate it was obtained directly by influence of the beneficiaries of the contract, Messrs. Vail and Carlton.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And without any legal authority?

Mr. STEENERSON. It was simply an arbitrary act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I call for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 68, noes 5.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hold no brief for the American Telegraph Co., nor do I represent in any way the Postal Telegraph Co. nor any of the 12,000 telephone companies whose lines were taken over in pursuance of the act approved July 16, 1918, which authorized the President to take over such lines and enter into contract for just compensation.

The contracts that were entered into for just compensation was the average compensation for the two years prior to Federal control. Now, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] reported out a bill from his committee, and it has become a law, and was approved on July 11 last. Section 3 of that act provides:

SEC. 3. That the first proviso of said joint resolution prescribing the just compensation to be paid for and on account of said supervision, possession, control, or operation therein specified shall continue in full force and effect until such just compensation shall be fully adjusted and paid in the manner and according to the terms and conditions therein set forth.

That the first proviso of the joint resolution referred to is as follows:

Provided, That such compensation shall be made for such supervision, possession, control, or operation, to be determined by the President; and if the amount thereof, so determined by the President, is unsatisfactory to the person entitled to receive the same, such person shall be paid 75 per cent of the amount so determined by the President and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as, added to said 75 per cent, will make up such amount as will be just compensation therefor, in the manner provided for by section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code.

In view of the legislation reported by the gentleman from Minnesota, I do not and can not understand his present position.

Now, there would have been no need for a deficiency except that the courts in 18 States of the Union enjoined the enforcement of rates established. The gentlemen say we have no information. The gentlemen have not read the hearings before the committee. We had full hearings on the matter. It is not the Bell Telephone Co. One hundred and nine companies had compensation contracts approved before the signing of the armistice and awards have since been made and accepted by 36 companies. Claims for 282 companies are pending, and it is estimated that it will take \$1,850,000 of this appropriation to settle with this latter class of companies. Mr. Stevens, who represented so ably and so long a great constituency from Minnesota in this House, appeared before the committee and commended the splendid work of the Postmaster General in his administration. And now because one company, the Postal, earned more than the amount fixed, it is suggested here that we shall keep all of these independent lines—and they are in practically every State of the Union—out of their money until the suit that is now pending or is about to be commenced by the Postmaster General against the Postal Telegraph Co. for its excess of earnings shall be tried and determined. In the meantime who will pay the interest on the awards? The appropriation carries \$700,000 for interest on such claims.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman knows these companies have been making this money right along.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman knew anything about the provisions of the bill, if he knew anything about the real situation as developed in the hearings, he would not make such a statement. I have no interest in this matter except to keep the appropriation just as low as it can be kept. But, Mr. Chairman, when my Government enters into a contract to pay a debt in these times of unrest, when bolshevism is abroad in the land, I shall insist that it discharge its obligation. [Applause.] That is the only way we can maintain a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED].

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

Mr. HUSTED. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CANNON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on June 2, 1920, approved and signed joint resolution and bill of the following titles:

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; and

H. R. 12044. An act to accept the cession by the State of California of exclusive jurisdiction of the lands embraced within the Yosemite National Park, Sequoia National Park, and General Grant National Park, respectively, and for other purposes.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sixth International Sanitary Conference: The President is authorized to appoint or designate two officers of the United States connected with the Public Health Service to represent the United States in the Sixth International Sanitary Conference of American States, to be held at the city of Montevideo, Uruguay, in December, 1920. For the expenses of such representatives in attending the conference, including the assembling of necessary data and preparation of a report, \$2,000, to be available during the fiscal year 1921.

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 15, after line 25, insert the following: For salary of chargé d'affaires ad interim, \$8,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

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 the following resolution:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 13587) entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes."

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of assessing and collecting the internal-revenue taxes, as provided by the revenue act of 1918, including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$535,000; and the unexpended balances of other appropriations for the Internal Revenue Service for the fiscal year 1920 may also be expended for this purpose.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to speak out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to speak out of order for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to object. I want to finish the bill to-night. I dislike to object, but we can not discriminate.

Mr. HUDSPETH. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Not to exceed \$2,000 of the sum paid to the Secretary of the Treasury by the American Fidelity Co., sureties for the H. L. Brown Co., defaulting contractors for the construction of the extension, etc., of the post office and courthouse, Harrisburg, Pa., is appropriated and made available for completing the extension, remodeling, etc., of said building.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: Page 21, line 11, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Columbia, S. C., post office: For completion of the building, \$95,000."

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of this, I desire to say to the committee that after the hearings upon this bill had been completed, the Treasury Department

forwarded to the Congress an estimate for this appropriation. The city of Columbia, where the building is located, is not in my district, but is in the district of my colleague, Mr. MANN. The contractor who had the contract for the construction of the post-office building defaulted in March of this year. The building is 72 per cent completed. Because of the defaulting of the contractor no further progress can be made upon the building unless this appropriation is made. The bond of the surety company is liable for the amount necessary to complete the contract. Under the contract with the surety company, however, no suit can be brought by the Government upon this bond until the Government shall make another contract to complete that building, because the Government must be in a position to prove the amount of damage to the Government by reason of the default of the contractor.

The estimate of the department is that it will take \$95,000 to complete it. When this appropriation is made the Treasury Department will give out the contract for \$95,000, and will immediately bring suit on the bond of the contractor for this \$95,000. The bond is ample and the money will be recovered, so that it does not involve any additional expenditure by the Government, but it is absolutely essential that this be done to prevent deterioration in a building now more than 70 per cent completed. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, that matter came up after the committee had concluded its hearings. The statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina is in exact accordance with the facts as I understand them. As I understand the Chair—and I have looked into them very carefully—I am sure if the matter had come to the attention of the subcommittee the item which the gentleman now asks to be inserted would have been carried in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS.

The taxes imposed by the Philippine Legislature in section 1614 of the act No. 2657, enacted by that body on February 24, 1916, are legalized and ratified, and the collection of all such taxes made under or by authority of such act of the Philippine Legislature is legalized, ratified, and confirmed as fully to all intents and purposes as if the same had by prior act of Congress been specifically authorized and directed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. May I inquire if these are the export taxes that were levied by the Philippine government without authority of law?

Mr. GOOD. That is my understanding. They were levied under a law enacted by the Philippine Legislature.

Mr. WALSH. How does it come to get into a deficiency bill? Just what deficiency is it?

Mr. GOOD. There is no deficiency. There may have been a little deficiency in the laws, but this is to legalize those laws. My colleague from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has given considerable attention to this matter, and perhaps he could enlighten the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I do not think this is a matter that ought to be put into a deficiency appropriation bill at the end of a session. If the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], whose committee has jurisdiction of the matter, would report a bill we could consider it in the usual way.

Mr. TOWNER. I would be very glad indeed to make a statement regarding the matter—a statement that I think will explain perhaps the necessity of the action at this time. I would make a complete statement, but I must not now take the time. Briefly the conditions are these in regard to this matter: Under the law as it exists the question of exports and imports is within the regulatory power of the United States Government. In the first place, conditions arose as to whether or not this tax, which was a tax laid against merchandise and manufactures on the gross value of commodities, goods, and so forth, sold in barter. Now, the question arose as to whether or not those laws would be in contravention of the laws of the United States affecting imports. That question was up for discussion for quite a length of time. Finally it was decided by the validation of that act.

Then the question arose as to whether or not the law in question affected exports from the islands. On this question

there have been four cases decided by the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands. In these cases the Philippine Supreme Court has decided that they are an infringement of the proposition that the law prohibiting a tax on exports applies.

Here is the situation in regard to our relations to the Philippine Islands: We gave them the right of legislating, but we have the superior right of legislating. Whenever we think that either the interests of the Philippine Islands or of the United States are directly involved, we legislate and have legislated as we think conditions justified.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman any legislation pending before his committee on this subject?

Mr. TOWNER. No; because of the fact that these cases have but recently been called to our attention.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the matter has been decided, and the question has been under consideration for four years.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; the question in some form has been under consideration, but it has been in dispute. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the proposition is just simply this: The sum of \$500,000 is involved in this matter. Unless we take this action we do not know how many of these cases will be decided before we can have any regular legislation. Certainly it must appeal to the gentleman that we ought to act expeditiously regarding it.

I will say to the gentleman that we might have acted upon his suggestion, but the matter was not brought to our attention until within a very few days. This provision has been approved by the Bureau of Insular Affairs and by the War Department, and it involves such an emergency as I think justifies action in this manner. It is within our power, and we ought to do what we can to help the Philippines; not to hurt them.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the validating acts which the gentleman mentions were, I think, also put on in appropriation bills. Now, I do not think matters of this importance, which involve ratification of the acts of the Philippine Legislature, ought to be dumped in here at the end of a session on a deficiency bill. I have no criticism to offer of the distinguished chairman of the committee, because gentlemen come before him with a statement of the case and of its great urgency and make an appeal to him. But I am going to make a point of order against this provision. It ought to be a matter of distinctive legislative consideration by the Committee on Insular Affairs, of which the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is chairman, and we should have separate legislation. We ought not to establish the precedent of putting important legislation of this sort into deficiency bills and appropriation bills, particularly at this time in the session.

I make the point of order that it is legislation and not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a separate paragraph.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. COLLIER: Page 23, after line 1, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For restoration and repair of storm damage to the Vicksburg, Miss., national cemetery and roadways thereto, \$10,000, to remain available until June 30, 1921."

Mr. GOOD. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up much of the time of the House on this amendment. I simply want to say that during the last year we had over twice as many heavy rains as had ever been known in that vicinity since the Weather Bureau was established, according to the report of that bureau. These heavy rains have continued up to the present time. I have before me the statement of the officials of the War Department, who declare that the beautiful cemetery there at Vicksburg has been very greatly damaged. I also understand from them that a small expenditure now will save a very large expenditure later on.

I know this paragraph is subject to a point of order, but it would be a short-sighted policy on our part to allow the roadway and the approaches to that cemetery to continue in such condition as they now are. Many of you Members of the House have perhaps visited that national cemetery at Vicksburg, situated upon the bluffs overlooking the mighty Father of Waters, in whose terraced heights, rising one above the other, there sleep over 16,000 Union soldiers. A great many others connected with the Federal Government have been buried there, and that cemetery is now waiting to receive the bodies of our soldier dead who lost their lives in the last Great War.

This roadway, which is in very bad condition, is between a road of Warren County and the city of Vicksburg. The Warren County road is as good as one of the avenues of this city. We brought the novaculite stone from the State of the gentleman from Illinois to pave that road, and for 5 or 6 miles leading from the cemetery we have a magnificent novaculite road kept up by the citizens of Warren County.

Adjoining that is this road belonging to the Government, which is in the worst state of repair. Then adjoining that is one of the paved streets of the city of Vicksburg.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I will.

Mr. CANNON. Is there an estimate for this appropriation?

Mr. COLLIER. The estimate was \$15,000. Gen. Lord and Maj. Lemly have been before the committee, and Maj. Lemly says:

This was a special estimate that was put in and it was included in this deficiency estimate. We put in a special estimate at that time, and the Quartermaster General, on February 3, wrote to the Secretary of War as follows:

"Due to heavy rainfall at Vicksburg, Miss., the national cemetery at that place has been seriously damaged, as well as the approach roadway to the cemetery. It is reported that the estimated cost of repairing the damage to the cemetery is \$10,000 and to the roadway \$1,425. It is the opinion of this office that the total cost for making these repairs will not be less than \$15,000; and as there are not sufficient funds available for the purpose, it is recommended that authority be given to submit a special estimate to Congress for an appropriation to meet this expense in the deficiency bill now being prepared."

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order, and I move to amend by inserting the words immediately preceding the amendment "national cemetery."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of the amendment: Insert before the amendment the words "national cemetery."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the original estimate was for \$15,000. The estimate was made about the beginning of the calendar year. It was evident when the matter reached the committee that even if we granted the amount it could not be expended this year. The gentleman has offered the amendment in a manner which will make the amount available next year, and by reducing it \$5,000 I think there will not be any objection, because in the sundry civil bill we increase the amount for repair of national cemeteries by \$100,000, and they will get some additional care out of that fund. The serious condition of some of the graves has been called to the committee's attention, and I believe that the Congress would not refuse a reasonable appropriation for the purpose of making the repairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSPORTATION SERVICE.

Transportation facilities on inland and coastwise waterways: For payment of expenses of operation of boats, barges, tugs, and other transportation facilities, on the inland, canal, and coastwise waterways acquired by the United States in pursuance of the fourth paragraph of section 6 of the Federal-control act of March 21, 1918, \$270,000.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EAGAN: Page 24, after line 11, insert:

"The War Department shall pay out of any moneys received by it as rentals for the use of the docks, piers, warehouses, wharves, and terminal equipment and facilities on the Hudson River at Hoboken, N. J., formerly owned by the North German Lloyd Dock Co. and the Hamburg-American Line Terminal & Navigation Co., and now owned by the United States under the proclamation of the President dated June 28, 1918, to the proper officer of the city of Hoboken, in the State of New Jersey, a sum equivalent to the amount levied and assessed but uncollected by such city on account of taxes on said properties for the calendar years 1918 and 1919."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may be subject to a point of order, but in view of the unusual circumstances in which the city of Hoboken finds itself, in view of the tremendous financial burden which has been placed upon Hoboken by the taking over by the Government of these very valuable pier properties, resulting in the loss of several hundred thousand dollars each year in taxes by the little city of Hoboken, I hope the chairman may see fit not to make the point of order.

These steamship piers in Hoboken formerly were owned by the German steamship companies. They were seized by the military forces of the United States at the outbreak of the war with Germany. Under the urgent deficiency act approved March 28, 1918, the President was authorized to acquire the

title to the piers and the terminal equipment and facilities formerly the property of the German steamship companies. Subsequently, on June 28, 1918, by proclamation of the President, title to these pier properties and facilities was vested in the United States. Since that time, and, in fact, since the beginning of 1918, the city of Hoboken has received no taxes from this property. The property represents about one-twelfth of the taxable property of the city. It embraces one-third of a mile of the water front of the city and is most valuable property for the purpose of taxation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has not the State of New Jersey received in positions under the Alien Property Custodian more than enough to make up the loss of taxation?

Mr. EAGAN. The city of Hoboken is not the State of New Jersey; and, of course, the question has no reference to the justice of this claim.

Mr. MACCRATE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EAGAN. Yes.

Mr. MACCRATE. I have understood that this property amounted to nearer one-seventh of the taxable property of the city than one-twelfth.

Mr. EAGAN. It is about one-twelfth. The total ratables in the city of Hoboken are approximately \$87,000,000 for the year 1920, and the amount of taxes on this property for 1920 is about \$7,500,000; that is, the taxes levied and assessed but not collected.

Mr. MACCRATE. The same situation arises in Brooklyn where the Government is expected to lease the property to the city of New York.

Mr. EAGAN. I submit that, although objection may be urged against paying taxes on Federal property, the situation in regard to this particular property in the city of Hoboken, from which the Federal Government is now receiving a large income, is radically different from the situation with reference to an ordinary Federal building from which it would derive no revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EAGAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes more.

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

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I shall have to object.

Mr. EAGAN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Pay of the Army: For pay of the Army, including the same objects, except mileage, specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$55,000,000.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman how many officers are provided for in the additional compensation for pay of the Army?

Mr. GOOD. The \$55,000,000 does not provide anything on account of the increased pay of officers. That was carried in the increased-pay bill. The deficiency estimate originally was \$67,000,000, and it was found that the increased-pay bill recently passed carried an appropriation of about \$12,000,000, to be taken out of the appropriation for "Pay of the Navy" and used for the increased pay of the Army for the current year. Therefore we were able to reduce the amount asked in this bill by that \$12,000,000.

Mr. CRAGO. Is this \$55,000,000 in addition to the amount appropriated by the Military Committee for the year ending June 30, 1920?

Mr. GOOD. It is.

Mr. CRAGO. Is there any estimate for it?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; the estimate was \$67,000,000. The statement of Senator WADSWORTH at the time that bill was before the Senate—that is, the Army appropriation bill for 1920—that statement being made on July 1, 1919, is as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. WADSWORTH.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to one thing in connection with that very matter. This bill carries an appropriation of \$215,000,000 for the pay of the Army, supposedly an Army of 325,000 men. It will not pay an Army of 325,000 men for 12 months. That is conceded by the House conferees; it is conceded by the Senate conferees;

and we have our information from the head of the Finance Division of the War Department, who states that with an appropriation of \$215,000,000 they will manage to get along for a portion of this fiscal year, but that eventually they must come to Congress and ask for a deficiency appropriation; that they will either have to get such an appropriation from the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate, or else in the preparation of the next annual Army appropriation bill, which will be brought up next winter before, of course, this fiscal year is over, a provision will have to be put in making the appropriation for the pay of the Army immediately available. (P. 2294.)

Then Mr. KAHN, when the conference report was laid before the House with regard to the same bill, stated as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. KAHN.

The House bill provided for pay of the Army \$198,000,000. The bill as it now stands provides for \$213,000,000. As a matter of fact, the Senate bill, without the lump sum of \$100,000,000, provided \$215,000,000 for pay of the Army, so that your conferees really have saved \$102,000,000 on that one item. But it is only fair to say that Gen. Lord, the Director of Finance of the War Department, announced to Senator WADSWORTH and me that there would undoubtedly be a deficiency appropriation by the 1st of January next. (P. 2334.)

Mr. CRAGO. The explanation is satisfactory. I called attention to this more particularly in order that I might bring to the attention of the House the fact, what will be the direct result of our action yesterday. The truth of the matter is the great confusion and the great mistakes that have been made in the matter of appropriations is in not having a rule of the House compelling every department of this Government to go to the committee making the original appropriation for that department for any deficiency.

Mr. GOOD. But that is not the law.

Mr. CRAGO. I know it is not the law, but I say it could easily be made the law, and it should be made the law.

Mr. GOOD. We made that the law yesterday.

Mr. CRAGO. You made it the law yesterday in this way: You have taken away from the committees who have made a particular study of the subject in hand the power of appropriating and turned it over to a committee which may in time, I admit, be so organized and filled up with men who have technical knowledge of the subject that it will accomplish the purpose.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman can well see that if you would have three deficiency bills from each department each year that would make 27 deficiency bills coming into the House, and the gentleman would not ask that the Military Affairs Committee handle its deficiencies without giving the same privilege to all of the other committees.

Mr. CRAGO. No; I would not do that; under my plan we would have but few deficiency appropriations asked for; but the trouble has been that after the Military Committee has determined on a policy and limited that policy by reason of its appropriations, while we were debating the subject, the War Department would go before the Committee on Appropriations and ask for a deficiency.

Mr. GOOD. But you do not determine the policy here. This all depends on the number of men.

Mr. CRAGO. I am not questioning this particular appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For mileage to commissioned officers, warrant officers, members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, contract surgeons, expert accountant, Inspector General's Department, Army field clerks, and field clerks of the Quartermaster Corps, when authorized by law, \$1,600,000.

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 bill H. R. 14335, the deficiency appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SIERRA NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (S. 2789) for the conservation of forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes, for printing under the rules.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

AMENDING THE PENAL LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my signature H. R. 7629, entitled "An act to amend the penal laws of the United States." I direct attention to the fact that in embodying in the present amendatory act the opening portion of existing section 245 of the Criminal Code an obvious error has occurred. The phrase, "to any other State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof" which immediately follows the words "jurisdiction thereof" in line 12, should be taken out of its present position and inserted immediately after the words "jurisdiction thereof" in line 10. I have had the change definitely indicated by appropriate pencil marks.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 2, 1920.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the veto message of the President be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which embodies the correct language of the section which was attempted to be amended, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. Speaker, the veto message of the President relates to an amendment of the penal laws which prohibits the transportation in interstate commerce of indecent, lascivious, or lewd motion-picture films. The bill was passed through the House and went to the Senate and was there amended. The Senate amendment, when it was reported to the Senate, was put in the proper place, but when the amendment was engrossed and sent back to the House it was put in an improper place, and it does not make correct English or a proper reading of section 245 of the penal clause. Therefore the President has vetoed the bill because it does not make section 245 read correctly. Now, the bill which I have offered is a correct reading of section 245, but includes in the amendment of the motion-picture film; but I desire to state that the mistake was made in the other branch and there is no criticism or blame to be attached to the enrolling clerk of the House. The fault is probably my own in not discovering the mistake when I moved to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. And if there is any criticism or any penalty to pay, I am willing to pay it. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. There is nothing improper in the President of the United States correcting the English of the House or Senate, is there?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all; not when their English is incorrect.

Mr. BLANTON. That is all that the President has done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest that the proper penalty to be visited upon the gentleman from Massachusetts would be to prohibit him from objecting to anything for the next six months.

Mr. BLANTON. Do not do that; he will be in an awful fix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14384) to amend the penal laws of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 245 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 245. Whoever shall bring or cause to be brought into the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, from any foreign country, or shall therein knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited with any express company or other common carrier, for carriage from one State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, to any other State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place noncontiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or from any place in or subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to a foreign country, any obscene, lewd, or lascivious, or any filthy book, pamphlet, picture, motion-picture film, paper, letter, writing, print, or other matter of indecent character, or any drug, medicine, article, or thing designed, adapted, or intended for preventing conception or producing abortion, or for any indecent or immoral use, or any written or printed card, letter, circular, book, pamphlet, advertisement, or notice of any kind giving information, directly or indirectly, where, how, or of whom, or by what means any of the hereinbefore-mentioned articles, matters, or things may be obtained or made; or whoever shall knowingly take or cause to be taken from such express company or other common carrier any matter or thing the depositing of which for carriage is herein made unlawful, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WALSH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13108. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1024. An act 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, Colo.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3867. An act authorizing the State of New Mexico to apply the proceeds of the grant to said State of 1,000,000 acres of land made by section 7 of the enabling act, June 20, 1910, for the reimbursement of Grant County, Luna County, Hidalgo County, Santa Fe County, and the town of Silver City, N. Mex.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

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

An act (S. 3865) providing for the officers in the Russian Railway Service Corps the status of officers of the United States Army when discharged; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills and joint resolutions:

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. 3212. An act for the relief of legal representative of George E. Payne, deceased;

H. R. 5807. An act for the relief of John T. Adams;

H. R. 4927. An act for the relief of Nancy A. Parsons, C. M. Parsons, D. F. Staggs, Ollie Staggs, Roas Staggs, Lena Birchfield, Alice Birchfield, Bertie Gwin, Greely Gilbert, Linville Gilbert, and Nelson Gilbert;

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 office at Minneapolis, Minn., commonly known and described as the traffic station, and located at Nos. 621 and 623 First Avenue North, in said city;

H. R. 9048. An act for the relief of Catherina Rea, administratrix of the estate of John Rea;

H. R. 6198. An act authorizing payment of compensation to Swanbild Sims for personal injuries;

H. R. 11030. An act for the relief of the Woodford Bank & Trust Co., of Versailles, Ky.;

H. R. 1309. An act for the relief of Perry L. Haynes;

H. R. 10115. An act for the relief of Harvey R. Butcher;

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. 9783. An act to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes;

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; 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;

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following message from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 13587) entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is agreed to. There was no objection.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair also lays before the House the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

A communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting notice for contest of a seat in the House of Representatives for the Sixty-sixth Congress in the fifth district of the State of Wisconsin and transmitting original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto.

The SPEAKER. Referred to Committee on Elections No. 1.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES' BILL.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed a copy of the bill H. R. 14388 so as to include certain additional amendments recommended by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. These were not included—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that there may be printed a copy of the new postal employees' bill with the amendments. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ASSIGNMENT OF COAL CARS.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for unanimous consent.

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

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas the railroad companies are making assignments of freight cars; and

Whereas the said railroad companies, or a part of them, are making such assignment in a manner alleged to be discriminatory and prejudicial to the common public welfare; and

Whereas authority for making assignments of cars by said railroad companies is predicated upon an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which order is known as order No. — of the Interstate Commerce Commission, dated April 15, 1920, and entitled "Notice to carriers and shippers," and is in the following words and figures:

"The commission recommends that until experience and careful study demonstrate that other rules will be more effective and beneficial, the uniform rules as contained in the Railroad Administration's Cars Service Section Circular CS31 (revised) be continued in effect, except that rule 8 as contained in said circular should be amended to read:

"8. Private cars and cars placed for railroad fuel loading in accordance with the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in RR. Com. of Ohio et al. v. H. V. Ry. Co., 12 I. C. C., 398, and Tracer v. Chicago & Alton Railroad Co. et al., 13 I. C. C., 451, will be designated as "assigned" cars. All other cars will be designated as "unassigned cars."

Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be directed to inform the House upon what authority, if any, said order was issued.

During the reading of the resolution the following occurred:

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this at this time for the purpose of saving time. This matter was objected to a few days ago in the House. This is the same matter, is it not?

Mr. McCULLOCH. The resolution was not read. There was a point of no quorum made, and the majority leader moved to adjourn. All this resolution does is to ask for information. The same resolution has passed the Senate, and all we ask for is information from the Interstate Commerce Commission in regard to the assignment of these cars and on what authority this order was issued.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What order?

Mr. McCULLOCH. An order by the Interstate Commerce Commission permitting assigning cars to mines by the railroad companies.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Why ask for this information and omit information in regard to cars for the lumber industry, and for sand and gravel, and all the others that are getting about 15 or 20 per cent of the freight cars that they need?

Mr. McCULLOCH. The reason is that this assigned car order relates only to coal cars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What does it amount to if passed by Congress?

Mr. McCULLOCH. It amounts to just this, that the Esch bill, which passed the House, in section 12 provided against what is called the assigned car evil. The Interstate Commerce Commission has issued an order which permits the railroad companies to continue the assignment of cars to mines.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. I may have misunderstood, but I think that in one of the whereases there was a criticism of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Not at all.

Mr. GARRETT. Was it a criticism—

Mr. McCULLOCH. Perhaps of the railroad companies, but not of the Interstate Commerce Commission, so far as the wording of the resolution goes.

Mr. GARRETT. Of course, I do not mean to indicate that I hold any brief for the Interstate Commerce Commission by asking that question, but I was just going to suggest that if it did carry a criticism I did not think it was a polite thing to do to ask them for information and criticize them at the same time.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me? I get many letters from Illinois, especially from my district, where they are building good roads and have to transport gravel and stone and all kinds of material for the roads. These kicking letters are written to me, and all I can do is to refer them to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I expect this is of the same nature, is it not?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Not exactly.

Mr. CANNON. Would the gentleman accept an amendment that would cover the whole thing? In other words, all my folks want their share of cars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The trouble is that there are not enough cars. There were only 100,000 freight cars built during the period of the war, or ordered under the governmental administration. And all industries must suffer alike. Resolutions do no good.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The distinction I hope the gentleman will keep in mind is that coal is necessary to keep the people warm, and by reason of the assignment of these coal cars in a discriminatory way by the railroads only a small percentage of the coal has been moved, because a considerable number of the mines are running only 10 to 25 per cent capacity. Coal is a raw material for all industries.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Where are the cars assigned?

Mr. McCULLOCH. They have been assigned by railroad companies to coal mines in the State of Ohio at the ratio of 100 per cent to one mine and to other mines 10 per cent, according to information we regard as reliable, so that the favored mine is running 100 per cent and the other mine, right alongside, is running only 10 to 25 per cent capacity. We claim that this is a discrimination and the carrying out of this order is contrary to the provisions of the Esch bill, now a law. Now, we want the Interstate Commerce Commission to give its reason for the order referred to and furnish us with complete information upon the subject.

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will.

Mr. GARRETT. I assume that this has not been considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. McCULLOCH. No.

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the gentleman if he has discussed it with any of the members of that committee?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I have. I have discussed it with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I can say that he said to me that he would not object to the resolution. I do not care to quote him further.

Mr. GARRETT. Can the gentleman say any more than that?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I can only say this, and probably I should not quote the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce more than to say—and I think that my statement will be borne out by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. FOSTER]—that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce expressed this opinion, that the provisions of the Esch bill did eliminate the so-called assigned-car evil, and that was the intention of the conferees on the railroad bill. I think I can say further to the gentleman from Tennessee that I have been informed that Senator KELLOGG, who, if my information is correct, approved of the resolution passed by the other body, was of the same opinion. Now, we are seeking to have the Interstate Commerce Commission give to the House of Representatives information in regard to the order authorizing the assignment of these cars, with a view to remedying a condition in Ohio which is causing great suffering among the miners, and a condition that we claim is resulting in the coal supply not being moved as it should be moved, and which in the end, unless it should be remedied in some way, will result in the great consuming public being seriously affected this coming winter.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not this similar to the proposition covered by the paper drawn up last week and signed by 110 Members of

this House and presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. McCULLOCH. It is.

Mr. FOSTER. The coal output is 500,000,000 tons per annum, and 170,000,000 of it go to the railroads while the rest goes to the factories and the homes. If the assigned car order continues, coal will continue to increase in price.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes. I understand that is correct.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The object is to ascertain if the existing law is being violated, and if so, why?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I do not see that there should be any objection to an inquiry of that character.

Mr. CANNON. I get these letters containing complaints. During the war we had to hold off on the construction of roads. Now, as the cars go to the coal mines they might be loaded up with cement or gravel or sand. The gentleman is an "early bird," and zealous to please his constituents and show them that he is alert. I do not want to be subject to the criticism that I was sitting idly by, seeing my constituents be neglected.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman's State has asked for the same thing.

Mr. CANNON. I am not going to object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk completed the reading of the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thought this was a concurrent resolution.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The Senate has passed it.

Mr. GARRETT. Then what is the use of the House passing it?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In that case I object. If the Senate has already passed it, I do not see any reason for the House passing it. It is just a criminal waste of time.

Mr. BLANTON. We are halfway through with it now.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from South Carolina object?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

REORGANIZATION, ADMINISTRATIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate joint resolution 191.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 191. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 191) to create a joint committee on the reorganization of the administrative branch of the Government.

Resolved, etc., That a joint committee is created, to be known as the joint committee on reorganization, which shall consist of three Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President thereof and three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker thereof. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the joint committee on reorganization to make a survey of the administrative services of the Government for the purpose of securing all pertinent facts concerning their powers and duties, their distribution among the several executive departments, and their overlapping and duplication of authority; also to determine what redistribution of activities should be made among the several services, with a view to the proper correlation of the same, and what departmental regrouping of services should be made, so that each executive department shall embrace only services having close working relation with each other and ministering directly to the primary purpose for which the same are maintained and operated, to the end that there shall be achieved the largest possible measure of efficiency and economy in the conduct of Government business.

SEC. 3. That the committee shall from time to time report to both the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its inquiries, together with its recommendations, and shall prepare and submit bills or resolutions having for their purpose the coordination of Government functions and their most efficient and economical conduct, and the final report of said committee shall be submitted not later than the second Monday in December, 1922. The committee is authorized to employ such assistance as it may require, at such compensation as the committee may determine to be just and reasonable, and to make such reasonable expenditures as may be necessary for the proper conduct of its work, such expenditures to be paid in equal parts from the contingent funds of the House of Representatives and the Senate as from time to time may be duly authorized by resolutions of those bodies.

SEC. 4. That the officers and employees of all administrative services of the Government shall furnish to the committee such information regarding powers, duties, activities, organization, and methods of business as the committee may from time to time require, and the committee or any of its employees, when duly authorized by the committee, shall have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any administrative service for the purpose of securing the information needed by the committee in the prosecution of its work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word on this resolution, but we are about to take a recess in order that Members may go home and get a bite to eat and then come back. But I will not object to the consideration of this resolution if it is called up later.

RECESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House (at 8 o'clock p. m.) resumed its session.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GOOD. I think the report is considerably shorter than the statement. The statement has been printed in the Record, and I will ask the Clerk to read the report.

The Clerk read the conference report on the bill H. R. 13870, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13870) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government 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 5, 11, 14, 27, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 47, 50, 52, 54, 56, 62, 63, 71, 79, 80, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 118, 119, and 124.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 39, 41, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 55, 58, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 81, 83, 86, 87, 88, 89, 100, 101, 102, 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 121, 125, and 126, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Lighthouse Service shall cooperate with the Coast Guard in marking anchorage grounds in the harbors of New York and Hampton Roads by furnishing and maintaining buoys necessary for such purposes. Appropriations for the Lighthouse Service for the fiscal year 1921 are made available therefor."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "in" and insert in lieu thereof the word "to"; and the Senate 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 lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

"To carry out the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, including personal services in the District of Columbia, stationery, printing, purchase of books, office equipment and other supplies, \$50,000, of which sum \$4,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,740 per annum except 1 at \$2,000 and 4 at \$1,800 each."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "except that there may be employed during the fiscal year 1921, in addition to this limitation, employees at annual rates of compensations as follows: One at not to exceed \$6,500, 1 at not to exceed \$5,000, 2 at not to exceed \$4,000 each, 10 at not to exceed \$3,500 each, 10 at not to exceed \$3,250 each, and 10 at not to exceed \$3,000 each"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 9 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: "not to exceed \$7"; 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: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$183,000"; 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: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Medical and surgical history of the War with Germany: Toward the preparation for publication under the direction of the Secretary of War of a medical and surgical history of the War with Germany, including printing and binding at the Government Printing Office and the necessary engravings and illustrations, \$50,000: *Provided*, That the total cost of such history shall not exceed \$150,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$4,436,297.60" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BUREAU OF PENSIONS.

"To enable the Bureau of Pensions to perform the duties imposed upon it by the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, including personal services, purchase of books, office equipment, stationery and other supplies, printing, traveling expenses, and expenses of medical and other examinations, \$50,000, of which sum \$4,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,740 per annum except one at \$2,000 and four at \$1,800 each."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,302,642"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for drainage except in irrigation districts formed under State laws and upon the execution of agreements for the repayment to the United States of the costs thereof: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be construed as an expression of opinion by the Congress upon the litigation pending between the Government and the settlers on such project or in any manner prejudice such litigation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,463,000"; 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 line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$278,000"; 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 the sum proposed insert "\$300,000"; 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 amendments as follows: In line 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$525,326" and insert in lieu thereof "\$510,797"; on page 135 of the bill, in line 12, strike out "\$121,600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$104,000"; on page 135 of the bill, in line 15, strike out "\$280,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$255,570"; on page 136 of the bill, in line 13, strike out "\$147,100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$134,560"; on page 136 of the bill, in line 16, strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,550"; on page 137 of the bill, in line 8, strike out "\$579,800" and insert in lieu thereof "\$524,280"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$308,270"; 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 the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Bureau of Standards is authorized and directed to make an investigation as to the standard, quality, and cost of production and distribution of gas furnished the Government and private consumers in the District of Columbia and report the result of such investigation to Congress on or before the first Monday in December, 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "\$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$4,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$9,281,851, to be available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "discontinued," in line 8, down to and including the word "advertisements," in line 16; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 123: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Add at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment the following paragraph:

"The loans for equipment authorized by section 210, transportation act, 1920, may be made to or through such organiza-

tion, car trust or other agency as may be determined upon or approved or organized for the purpose by the commission as most appropriate in the public interest for the construction, and sale or lease of equipment to carriers, upon such general terms as to security and payment or lease as provided in this section or in subsections 11 and 13 of section 422 of the transportation act, 1920."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES W. GOOD,
WM. S. VARE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS;

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
LEE S. OVERMAN,

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. 13870) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Inserts the authority proposed by the Senate for additional salary of \$1,000 for the Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

On Nos. 2, 3, and 4, relating to the Coast Guard: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the detail of not more than 10 enlisted men at any one time for duty in the District of Columbia. Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, changing the titles of commissioned officers of the Coast Guard so as to make them conform to titles of commissioned officers in the Navy holding corresponding rank. Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, for marking anchorage grounds in the harbors of New York and Hampton Roads, modified so as to eliminate the appropriation of \$31,150 and to require the Lighthouse Service to furnish and maintain from their appropriations the necessary buoys for that purpose.

On Nos. 5, 5½, 6, and 7, relating to the appropriation for medical and hospital services for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance: Provides that the appropriation shall be disbursed by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as proposed by the House, instead of by the Secretary of the Treasury, as proposed by the Senate. Makes the appropriations available for allotment to the Navy and War Departments for the care of war-risk beneficiaries and provides that such allotments, when made, shall be available for expenditure by those departments under their usual appropriation accounts.

On No. 8: Appropriates \$400,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$375,000, as proposed by the House, for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes.

On Nos. 9, 10, and 11, relating to the Customs Service: Appropriates \$11,300,000, instead of \$10,300,000, as proposed by the House, and \$12,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, for collecting customs revenues. Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the matter contained in the House bill requiring the Secretary of the Treasury, in the expenditure of customs appropriations, to allot to the customs districts on the Mexican border, such amounts as are necessary to enable them to perform adequately the duties required by law. And strikes out the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, granting general appraisers of merchandise, when traveling on official business, the same expenses of subsistence as are granted to judges of United States district courts.

On No. 12: Appropriates \$1,000,000 instead of \$1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for guarding intoxicating liquors in warehouses and preventing violations of the national prohibition act.

On Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16, relating to the Public Health Service: Makes the appropriation for maintenance of patients in hospitals available for expenses incident to proceedings for commitment of insane patients; appropriates \$16,250, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$32,500, as proposed by the House, for special studies of pellagra, and limits the availability of the amount to December 31, 1920. Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$35,000, as proposed by the House, for the regulation of biologic products.

On No. 17: Appropriates \$50,000, instead of \$60,900, as proposed by the Senate, for the expenses of the Civil Service Commission in carrying out the provisions of the act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, modified so as to provide that no person shall be employed out of the appro-

priation at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,740 per annum except one person at \$2,000 and four at \$1,800 each.

On No. 18: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, re-appropriating an unexpended balance for use of the Council of National Defense in liquidating the affairs of the Committee on Public Information.

On No. 19: Inserts the language, proposed by the Senate, to provide for the Federal Board for Vocational Education additional employees at rates of compensation exceeding \$2,500 per annum, as follows: One, \$6,500; 1, \$5,000; 2, \$4,000 each; 10, \$3,500 each; 10, \$3,250 each; 10, \$3,000 each.

On Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, relating to the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, making applicable to similar appropriations contained in this act the duties and powers conferred upon the board by Chapter XV of the Army act approved July 9, 1918. Appropriates \$450,000, as proposed by the Senate, for allotments to the various States for the prevention, treatment, and control of venereal diseases. Appropriates \$85,000 for payment to universities, colleges, etc., for scientific research in the prevention and treatment of venereal diseases. Appropriates \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for payment to universities, colleges, etc., for development of more effective educational measures in the prevention of venereal diseases. Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, requiring any university, college, etc., receiving funds from the Federal Government to set aside an amount at least equal to the amount to be received from the United States.

On No. 26: Inserts, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation of \$450,000 for salaries and expenses of the Railroad Labor Board, modified so as to limit expenses of per diem in lieu of subsistence to \$4 as required by existing law, instead of \$7 as proposed by the Senate amendment.

On No. 27: Strikes out the language, inserted by the Senate, which provided that nothing contained in the paragraph relating to the emergency shipping fund shall affect, modify, or repeal any provisions of the merchant marine act of 1920.

On No. 28: Appropriates \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of the administration of the National Gallery of Art by the Smithsonian Institution.

On No. 29: Appropriates \$80,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the purchase of additional land adjoining the Zoological Park.

On No. 30: Appropriates \$400,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the participation by the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.

On No. 31: Appropriates \$183,000 instead of \$283,000, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services in the office of the Director of Finance in the War Department.

On No. 32: Appropriates \$150,000 instead of \$125,000, as proposed by the House, and \$160,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the construction of an airship hangar at the Aberdeen Proving Ground.

On No. 33: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the expenditure without reference to section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the appropriations for ordnance storage facilities near Ogden, Utah.

On No. 34: Authorizes not to exceed \$250,000 instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House, and \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for personal services in the Cemetery Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, War Department.

On No. 35: Appropriates \$2,500, as proposed by the Senate, for the construction of a rostrum at the Battle Ground National Cemetery, District of Columbia.

On No. 36: Strikes out the appropriation, inserted by the Senate, for the construction of roads in the vicinity of the Lincoln Memorial.

On No. 37: Strikes out the appropriation of \$20,000, inserted by the Senate, for improving and straightening the military road between the Georgetown Bridge and Fort Myer, Va.

On No. 38: Appropriates \$109,260 for the prevention of deposits in New York Harbor in the manner proposed by the House instead of \$122,985 in the manner proposed by the Senate.

On No. 39: Provides for the furnishing by the Surgeon General of the Army of surgical appliances to persons disabled in the military or naval service prior to April 6, 1917, as proposed by the Senate, instead of prior to October 6, 1917, as proposed by the House.

On No. 40: Appropriates \$50,000, instead of \$75,000 as proposed by the Senate, toward the preparation of a medical and surgical history of the war with Germany and modifies the language of the Senate amendment so as to eliminate authority for the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia, and limits the total cost of the history at not to exceed \$150,000.

On Nos. 41, 42, and 43, relating to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers: Inserts the matter, proposed by the Senate, reappropriating the unexpended balance of the appropriation for repairs for the Eastern Branch, and provides that allotments for the care of war-risk patients shall be made by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as proposed by the House, instead of the Secretary of the Treasury, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 44: Appropriates \$4,000,000, instead of \$4,436,297.00 as proposed by the Senate, for transportation facilities on inland and coastwise waterways.

On No. 45: Provides for the repair and improvement of the Senate and House stables, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 46: Inserts the amendment, proposed by the Senate, consolidating the offices of register and receiver of the land office at Broken Bow, Nebr.

On Nos. 47 and 48, relating to contingent expenses of land offices: Strikes out the authority for the payment of expenses of clerks detailed or transferred from one office to another; increases the appropriation from \$350,000 to \$375,000, as proposed by the Senate, and authorizes the maximum compensation for clerks in Alaska at not to exceed \$2,220 per annum.

On Nos. 49 and 50, relating to the prevention of depredations on the public lands, etc.: Authorizes the use of \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House, for the purchase and maintenance of automobiles for the field service and fixes the rate of per diem in lieu of subsistence at \$3.50, as proposed by the House, instead of \$4, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 51: Increases the appropriation for reproducing plans of surveys from \$5,000 to \$6,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 52, relating to the survey of public lands: Fixes the per diem rate of allowance in lieu of subsistence at \$3.50, as proposed by the House instead of \$4 as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 53: Appropriates \$50,000, instead of \$67,360 as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of the Bureau of Pensions for the administration of the act providing for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, modified so as to provide that no person shall be employed out of this sum at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,740 per annum, except one at \$2,000 and four at \$1,800 each.

On Nos. 54, 55, and 56, relating to the Geological Survey: Strikes out the increase of \$40,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for topographic surveys and makes the appropriation for the examination and classification of lands "immediately available."

On Nos. 57, 58, and 59, relating to the Bureau of Mines: Appropriates \$200,000, instead of \$175,000 as proposed by the House and \$250,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of mining experiment stations; and inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the sale at public auction of the land at Billings, Mont., formerly used as a mine rescue station.

On Nos. 60 to 70, inclusive, relating to the Reclamation Service: Restores the matter, stricken out by the Senate, requiring the sums expended for drainage on the Boise project to be expended in irrigation districts formed under State laws and to be expended contingent upon the execution of agreements for the repayment of the cost, modified so as to provide that the matter restored shall not be construed as an expression of opinion by Congress upon pending litigation. Appropriates \$664,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$974,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the Newlands project. Reappropriates unexpended balances, as proposed by the Senate, for the Minidoka, Rio Grande, Klamath, Belle Fourche, and Shoshone projects. Appropriates \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House, for the Riverton project. Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, appropriating \$20,000 for irrigation investigations in the Imperial Valley, Calif.

On No. 71: Restores the language, stricken out by the Senate, providing for a coal-cleaning plant for Alaska.

On Nos. 72 and 73, relating to the insane of Alaska: Increases, as proposed by the Senate, the per capita cost from \$520 to \$540 and the appropriation from \$115,000 to \$120,630.

On No. 74. Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, hereafter authorizing the exportation of birch timber from Alaska.

On Nos. 75 to 86, inclusive, relating to the national parks: Appropriates \$27,420, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$28,260, as proposed by the House, for personal services in the office of the Director of the National Park Service; strikes out the appropriation of \$50,000, proposed by the Senate, for fighting forest fires in national parks and national monuments; provides, as proposed by the House, that moneys received from the registration of physicians at the Hot Springs Reservation,

Ark., shall be used in the protection and improvement of the reservation instead of being covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as proposed by the Senate; provides, as proposed by the Senate, that \$1,500 of the appropriation for Mount Rainier National Park shall be immediately available for telephone lines; appropriates \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House, for the Rocky Mountain National Park, and makes \$1,500 of the appropriation available for a motor vehicle for use of park employees; appropriates \$278,000, instead of \$260,000, as proposed by the House, and \$380,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Yellowstone National Park; appropriates \$300,000, instead of \$275,000, as proposed by the House, and \$318,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Yosemite National Park; appropriates \$7,300, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,500, as proposed by the House, for the Zion National Park, Utah.

On Nos. 87 and 88: Inserts the appropriation of \$85,000 proposed by the Senate for a home economics building at Howard University.

On No. 89: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the Attorney General to appoint special agents for the execution of the duties to be performed under the appropriation "detection and prosecution of crime" and vests such agents with authority for the execution of such duties.

On No. 90: Strikes out the appropriation of \$300,000 to be expended by the Department of Justice for the enforcement of the national prohibition act.

On No. 91: Appropriates \$2,061,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,286,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of United States marshals, their deputies, and office expenses.

On No. 92: Appropriates \$990,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,040,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries of clerks of United States district courts.

On Nos. 93 and 94: Restores the paragraph, stricken out by the Senate, placing the office of the clerk of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia on the same basis as the offices of clerks of United States district courts, except that the clerk shall be appointed by the chief justice of the court.

On Nos. 95, 96, 97, and 98, relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey: Appropriates \$510,797, instead of \$525,326 as proposed by the Senate, for pay and allowance prescribed by law for commissioned officers, instead of \$256,900 as proposed by the House for salaries of commissioned officers; and reduces the appropriation for field expenses from \$579,800 to \$524,280. Appropriates \$3,000 for the disbursing agent, instead of \$2,500 as proposed by the House and \$3,300 as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the appropriation of \$2,000 for a chief clerk.

On No. 99: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing and directing the Bureau of Standards to make an investigation of gas furnished in the District of Columbia, modified so as to require the investigation to be made of the standard, quality, and cost of production and distribution instead of the comparative cost and quality as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 100: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, reappropriating the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the construction of an immigration station at Philadelphia and makes it available for remodeling the detention house and administration building.

On No. 101: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the reimbursement to the immigration fund any amounts which may be paid by any person or corporation as part or all of the salary of immigration employees in foreign contiguous territory.

On No. 102: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, removing the limitation upon the compensation of the commissioner of immigration at New Orleans.

On Nos. 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107: Appropriates \$1,065,000 for the United States Housing Corporation in the amounts and for the items proposed by the House instead of \$1,152,525 in the items and amounts proposed by the Senate.

On No. 108: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$75,000 for investigations concerning women in industry.

On No. 109: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$225,000 for the employment service.

On No. 110: Reappropriates \$25,000, instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the Senate, of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the War Trade Board.

On No. 111: Appropriates \$4,000, instead of \$8,000 as proposed by the Senate, for purchasing and supplying uniforms for the Capitol police.

On Nos. 112 to 116, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for expenses of the Senate and the Senate Office Building in the manner and in the amounts as proposed in the Senate amendments.

On No. 117: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, requiring illustrations to accompany bound copies of memorial addresses delivered in Congress to be made at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, or, in the discretion of the Joint Committee on Printing, to be obtained elsewhere by the Public Printer.

On Nos. 118, 119, and 120: Appropriates \$7,531,851 as proposed by the House, instead of \$9,094,141 as proposed by the Senate, for maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal. Appropriates \$850,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, for sanitation of the Canal Zone, and makes the total appropriation for the Panama Canal in this act available until expended as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 121: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the information as to the cost of operation of Government-owned buildings required to be furnished by section 3 shall be limited to buildings in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 122: Inserts the section, proposed by the Senate, authorizing the continuance until June 30, 1921, of any journal, magazine, periodical, or similar publication now being issued by a department or establishment of the Government, and modifies the amendment by eliminating from the section that portion which prohibits the issuance in any form of any journal, magazine, periodical, or similar publication which is not now being issued.

On No. 123: Inserts the section, proposed by the Senate, amending paragraphs a, b, and c, of section 210 of the transportation act, 1920, modified so as to add at the end of the Senate amendment a separate paragraph which provides that loans for equipment authorized by section 210 may be made to or through such car trusts or other agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission may deem most appropriate in the public interests for the construction and sale or lease of equipment to carriers upon such general terms as to security and payment or lease as are provided in section 210 or in subsections 11 and 13 of section 422 of the transportation act.

On No. 124: Strikes out the section, proposed by the Senate, providing for transportation from the District of Columbia of Government employees whose services terminate between the date of the passage of this act and July 1, 1920.

On No. 125: Inserts the section, proposed by the Senate, prohibiting the exchange as part payment for a new typewriter of any typewriting machine owned by the Government unless such machine has been used three years.

On No. 126: Strikes out as proposed by the Senate the section relating to the national budget system.

JAMES W. GOOD,
WM. S. VARE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Managers on the part of the House.

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

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I notice in the substitute for amendment No. 19, on page 2, there is a provision, among numerous other large salaries, for a salary not to exceed \$6,500. I want to ask the gentleman whether that is for a messenger or a janitor, or if he can tell us what kind of a position it is?

Mr. GOOD. Is the gentleman reading from the conference report?

Mr. BLANTON. I am referring to the substitute for amendment 19. A number of positions and salaries are fixed, one at \$6,500.

Mr. GOOD. That was a Senate amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Most of the salaries have been fixed at \$10,000 or \$12,000 lately, and I thought it was rather strange that the Senate would fix one for as small an amount as \$6,500.

Mr. GOOD. That is a matter that was presented to the House when the bill was pending here. My recollection is that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] offered an amendment which was defeated on the floor of the House. We did not have time to go into the question with regard to the increase in the limitation.

Mr. BLANTON. But, notwithstanding that the House turned the matter down, you granted every increase asked for by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] which had been turned down by the House, did you not? Is not that the fact, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. GOOD. I do not remember just exactly what the figure asked for by the gentleman from Ohio was. But here is the situation: Congress is attempting to adjourn. The President vetoed a bill last spring because there was a limitation of this kind placed upon it. Here is this Federal Board of Vocational

Education, composed, as I recall, of three members of the Cabinet, the Commissioner of Education, and three other members, to administer this office. Does the gentleman think we ought to tie the hands of this board to such an extent that the President might again veto the bill and make it necessary for Congress to be called in session and the Members brought here from a great many miles to reenact the sundry civil appropriation bill?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not. I am in favor of adjourning. I voted to adjourn, and I want to adjourn, and I think it would be foolish not to adjourn; but I do not think we ought to go crazy just because we are going to adjourn.

Mr. GOOD. Neither do I.

Mr. BLANTON. I think we ought to maintain our mental equilibrium here in the House concerning foolish appropriations.

Mr. GOOD. I am entirely in accord with the gentleman, and I hope there is enough sanity in this board to which this amendment refers to protect the Treasury of the United States. Congress can only appropriate. Congress does not spend the money. If this board foolishly spend the money that is appropriated, we are helpless. We are giving \$90,000,000 into the control of this board, and we have got to trust the board. That is all there is to it. That is one of the executive departments, and for us to attempt to say how much pay Sam Smith shall have and how much John Jones shall have, and all the other employees, is altogether impracticable. The board said they had to have this amount, and the Senate put this increase in this salaried position. The Senate conferees refused to yield in a single particular in that respect. They said the board had made it very plain to them that they had to have this, and if there was any falling down in their usefulness, it would be because they did not have enough men of this character to perform the work.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman has finished his statement, I would like to ask him two or three questions.

Mr. GOOD. I should like to make a brief statement first with regard to what the conference report contains. Then I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will permit me, right on this point, here is the information I want. The gentleman can cover it in his statement. It is not controversial at all. Will the gentleman state how much this bill now carries, and how much it carried when it passed the House; and then will he state also what legislation, if any, is now in the bill with reference to the railroads?

Mr. GOOD. The bill as it passed the House carried \$427,967,569.92. It passed the Senate carrying \$442,404,383.52. The amount added by the Senate was \$14,436,813.60. The Senate receded to the extent of \$5,242,876.60. The House receded to the extent of \$9,194,737. The total amount now carried by the bill is \$437,162,306.92.

The amounts added by the Senate, which have been agreed to, where the amounts are of considerable increase, were as follows: Customs Service, the Senate added \$2,000,000, and the conferees have agreed to an increase of \$1,000,000. It was pointed out that the customs receipts are increasing every day; that because of the fact that many of the officers and employees at the various ports are leaving, the merchants all over the country are complaining because they can not get merchandise, and, of course, the Government is not getting revenue when they can not clear the merchandise.

The House is compelled to yield something in this regard, and we agreed upon \$11,300,000 instead of \$10,300,000, as passed by the House, and instead of \$12,300,000 as passed by the Senate.

There was an increase of \$1,000,000 for guarding the liquor in bonded warehouses under the prohibition act. The gentleman will remember that we were compelled to carry a deficiency for the balance of this year. The Senate added \$1,500,000 and the conferees have agreed on \$1,000,000 for that purpose.

The civil service retirement act was passed, as I recall, after we passed the sundry civil bill; it was approved on May 22; and it made it necessary to appropriate money for that service, and the bill carries \$50,000 that was not carried in the bill as it passed the House.

Some of the items for the social hygiene board went out on a point of order in the House. They were restored in the Senate and amounted to \$785,000, the same amount that was carried by the bill as reported to the House, and the conferees of the House agreed to that amount.

The railroad labor board item was not considered at all by the House. The estimates were made after the House had considered the bill and amounted to \$450,000. The committee

of conference went over the hearings. This is a new board. The hearings were quite complete in the Senate and the Senate conferees insisted that that amount should be carried, but because it was impossible to tell at this time what the activities of the board would be or what the expenses would be, the House conferees did not care to insist that that amount be decreased because we had not had time or opportunity to personally investigate the matter and therefore accepted the judgment of the Senate.

An estimate of \$80,000 was made to purchase the land at the entrance of the Zoo Park on Connecticut Avenue. It has been contended for some time that this land would be sold and that houses, stores, and shops would be built along the entrance to the park.

The superintendent of the park appeared before the House committee. We thought it was not the time to purchase, but the owner of the land is dead and the land is thrown on the market. While the owner of the land was living he refused to sell to anyone who would put up stores or shops at the entrance to the park. He thought it would spoil the entrance. The land is thrown on the market, and the Senate conferees absolutely insisted that this amount of \$80,000 should be carried. The conferees have agreed to that.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. How much land is there for this \$80,000? The Senate put this on in addition to what the House gave?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; the House put in nothing for this land. This amount is at the assessed value of the land.

Mr. McKEOWN. Is this to carry out the scheme of having the parks connected?

Mr. GOOD. This has nothing to do with that. This is the land on Connecticut Avenue right at the entrance to the Zoo. It is on the east side of the little street or entrance that leads down to the Zoo.

Mr. McKEOWN. What is the acreage?

Mr. GOOD. Two hundred and ten thousand square feet of land, which is assessed on the average at 36 cents per square foot. The amount carried in the bill is the assessed value.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Does the gentleman remember the number of square feet in an acre?

Mr. GOOD. About 43,000 square feet.

The Director General of Finance requested an appropriation for clerk hire of \$283,000. This was a matter of a great deal of contention with the conferees. The conferees on the part of the House did not like to agree to this amount. The whole matter was thrashed out in the legislative bill, and that is one of the troubles that we have in appropriations first on one bill and then on another bill.

After we have fought it all out we have to go over and fight it out again. We passed the bill with \$283,000. I am satisfied that the Director of Finance can not conduct his office on the allotment made to him by the Secretary of War out of the \$3,000,000 in the legislative bill. The committee therefore agreed upon an increase of \$183,000 instead of \$283,000.

Then, there is the cemeterial division in the Quartermaster's Department. The House will recall that when this matter was up there was a spirited discussion as to the amount which should be allotted for clerks in Washington out of the \$21,000,000 appropriated for bringing back the bodies of our deceased soldiers. The House permitted to be set aside \$100,000 for clerk hire in the District of Columbia. The Senate amended that by adding \$400,000, making it \$500,000. The Secretary of War and the Quartermaster General contend that that will not pay the expense. The House practically instructed the conferees upon the matter, but the conferees desired to bring the completed report. We want the bodies of our deceased soldiers brought back if the families desire them to be brought. It was not the intention of the conferees that that work should be halted in any particular. It is believed that the \$250,000 which they will be permitted to expend here will be a great deal more than they can possibly expend in the District of Columbia in the matter of clerk hire. Therefore we added \$150,000, making it \$250,000 instead of the \$100,000 carried by the House bill and the \$500,000 carried by the Senate bill.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CRAGO. Does the gentleman know that those of us who voted with the committee to keep down that amount of money to be taken to be expended in the District of Columbia for clerk hire and the building up of a great organization in the District are being denounced by some propaganda starting here in Washington as being opposed to the return of our dead soldiers from France?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and I have a suspicion that the whole thing started right down in the Quartermaster's Division in the War Department, and it ought to be denounced.

Mr. CRAGO. I have written back for one of those letters, stating to those people that I wanted the letter to find out exactly where this false statement originated. There is no request here from the department for any additional money for the actual work of bringing back the dead.

Mr. GOOD. Not a cent. This does not carry a dollar of appropriation, but provides, in case it is necessary to use the funds for that purpose, to use them to the extent of \$250,000.

Mr. CRAGO. For clerk hire?

Mr. GOOD. For clerk hire.

Mr. CRAGO. And this is not an increase of the amount for the actual work of bringing back the dead.

Mr. GOOD. No. The matter of \$100,000 was put on after the hearings had been had. It was put on after the legislative bill had passed, because when the legislative bill was passed and the amount of \$3,000,000 was fixed for clerk hire in the War Department, the War Department had not yet agreed with France that these bodies could be brought back. Therefore, it was a new thing altogether.

Mr. CRAGO. In any event the matter that we voted on in the House was a matter of taking a part of the money already appropriated for the actual work of bringing back the dead and allowing them to use that sum to build up a great organization in the city of Washington. We are all of us ready to vote any amount needed to carry on this work, but we should limit the amount they can divert to clerk hire.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and that is all we have done here.

Mr. DUNBAR. How many dead will be returned?

Mr. GOOD. My recollection is that under the appropriation of \$21,500,000, and the \$8,500,000 appropriated previously, they expect to bring back about 50,000 bodies, and will reinter in some central cemetery in France about 25,000 additional bodies.

Mr. DUNBAR. Then, this \$250,000 will provide an expense of \$5 for clerk hire for every body brought back?

Mr. GOOD. The same expense would be used for reintering those bodies in France.

Mr. BEE. This same item was up in the House before?

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. BEE. Is there any change in the amount?

Mr. GOOD. I have been explaining the whole thing for the last 10 minutes. The Senate added \$400,000, and the conferees have agreed on \$250,000.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. As I understand it, the \$250,000 here recommended is only in the nature of a compromise between the conferees.

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And you are still not yet convinced that \$250,000 would be needed for clerk hire?

Mr. GOOD. I do not believe it will be used, and we are not appropriating a single penny. It is simply a permission to use what is necessary up to that amount.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. If it is not too late, I desire to get some information about amendment No. 29, appropriating \$80,000. I want to ask the gentleman in all fairness if he thinks that the Nation is buying land at current, proper prices when we pay \$80,000 for a piece of land of 200,000 square feet surrounding the entrance to a park which lies out in the country where we ought to buy land by the acre instead of by the foot?

Mr. GOOD. Well, if the gentleman will try to buy land that near by the acre in the city of Washington he will have some difficulty.

Mr. JUUL. We are helping to put an extraordinary value on the land, and I am just trying to find out if the committee that had this matter in charge are not staking their reputation in paying this price for the land?

Mr. GOOD. This is a Senate amendment; the Senate insisted on it.

Mr. JUUL. Suppose it does insist. Does that follow that we have got to swallow it?

Mr. BLANTON. Of course.

Mr. GOOD. The superintendent of the park has said it is a low price and that we could never duplicate it.

Mr. JUUL. Could we not leave it alone and not buy it if they were robbing us?

Mr. GOOD. I do not think they are robbing us. I think if we can buy it at 36 cents a square foot we are paying a low price. That is the assessed value.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, on the contrary, this land now belongs to a certain estate, and it is stated by the superintendent and others that unless the Government buys at this particular time they will not be able to get it for anything like this price later on. In other words, the parties who own it now are willing to sell to the Government.

Mr. JUUL. I should think they would be willing. Here is an appropriation of \$80,000, and we ought to get 80 acres of land for that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman know where this land is situated?

Mr. JUUL. I know where it is situated exactly. It is wild land.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon. It is land subject to being built up, and it has been the fear that houses and apartment houses will go upon it if it is not bought, and in addition it has been stated that this is the assessed value of the land. Now, certainly if it has been assessed at that price it must be worth that.

Mr. JUUL. I want to tell the gentleman, if I may, that the assessed value of land does not mean anything in Washington at all. [Applause.] If owners paid all their own taxes the assessment would drop to one-half.

Mr. GOOD. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The assessed value of the land is always a little less than the land is worth.

Mr. JUUL. I want to tell the chairman there ought to be some way of getting this item out of the bill. It ought not to remain there.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will this particular tract of land, which seems to be a small one, be of very great aid in making this park better? Is it necessary?

Mr. GOOD. I think the gentleman has gone to the Zoological Park by the Connecticut Avenue Road?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Now the Government does own the entrance to the park, and that is quite a wide entrance, but there is a strip of land on the north and on the south that faces right on that entrance. The land has been owned a great many years by a gentleman who believed that the Government should own it, and he has refused to sell for the purpose of building houses, small shops, and things of that sort. It is true that he has leased a part of it for peanut stands or something of that kind. Now, that gentleman has died, and the land is thrown upon the market to settle his estate, and if the Government is ever going to buy it I assume it ought to buy it before shops and buildings are constructed, and the amount carried here is the assessed value of about 36 cents a foot.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not question the value, but it is a question of whether or not to the park it is worth that much?

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that Dr. Walcott, of the Smithsonian Institution, and the superintendent of the park have come before the committee and have been pleading with us to put this on, but because of the condition of the Treasury we did not do it. The Senate put it on and insisted that it remain on and it is not an item of sufficient importance in a bill carrying over \$400,000,000 to have a strenuous contest with the Senate about.

Mr. JUUL. If the chairman pleases, it is not the amount involved. If it was only \$80, if it is wrong it ought to go out.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit an observation, I think I have as much familiarity with that section of the city as any gentleman, and I think it is not only necessary we should have that land, but I think the price we are giving is a reasonable price.

Mr. GOOD. I have no doubt the price is reasonable.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say to my good friend here only three days ago I priced a piece of land 3 miles farther out about 800 feet off Connecticut Avenue and they wanted 20 cents a foot for it.

Mr. GOOD. No question about the price.

Now, the Senate bill carried an appropriation of \$100,000 for building a road around the Lincoln Memorial. That road is to be built where they are filling at the present time. It occurred to the House committee that now was not the proper time to put a hard surface on the filling that is just being put around the memorial. Therefore that item went out. The inland waterways—

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman look at item No. 37, and tell why, so to speak, he killed the only ewe lamb I had in this flock?

Mr. GOOD. There was an officer who came before the House committee when we had the hearings and said that he had reported adversely on this particular improvement. After hearing him we cut it out.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will assure the gentleman if he will go down and look over that road and ride over it he should have an accident policy.

Mr. GOOD. As to inland waterways the Senate bill carried \$4,436,000 for building transfer terminals and for operation and for building storage facilities and for loss in operation for the next year. That matter was not considered by the House committee at all. The transportation act, 1920, transferred to the War Department the operation of the boats and barges on the New York State barge canal, the Black Warrior River, and the Mississippi River. We acquired a great deal under Federal control of the railroads in the way of boats and barges, and we are now operating them.

We are operating them under the provision of the transportation act that turned over to the War Department the operation of these projects. It is estimated that the next year the loss in operation will amount to about \$730,000. It is also estimated that it will require \$2,100,000 to build transfer terminals. There is no estimate for building terminals to serve a locality on either of these rivers. The localities must provide their own terminals. But where it is necessary to provide large terminal facilities so that the freight from the boats can be transferred from the boats to the railroads or from the railroads to the boats, especially on the Mississippi River, where the difference in the rise of water during high water is about 40 feet, great expense will be involved in building those terminals.

Now, obviously that expense could not be paid, or would not be paid, and should not be paid, by a local organization that received no benefit at all, because the freight is being transferred from water to rail transportation, or vice versa. Now, about \$2,100,000 was estimated for that purpose. Then it was necessary to provide for oil tanks and cold storage in these large terminals. I do not know whether this is going to be a success or not. Congress by the transportation act provided that the operation of these waterways should be made an experiment by the War Department, and, so far as I am concerned, that experiment, it seems to me, ought to be complete and the department ought to have the money to carry it out. If the experiment fails, then there will be an end to these appropriations for rivers and harbors of questionable character.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GOOD. For a question.

Mr. MacGREGOR. You are aware perhaps that the State of New York wants the War Department to get off the Erie Canal?

Mr. GOOD. I heard something about that the other day.

Mr. MacGREGOR. They are quite unanimous in regard to that, and the War Department need not spend any money on terminals on that canal.

Mr. GOOD. They are not going to spend any money on that canal.

Mr. SABATH. There was evidence to the effect that all the barges acquired by the Government are being utilized to good advantage on the Mississippi and other waterways.

Mr. GOOD. Are they being utilized?

Mr. SABATH. There was evidence to the effect that they were being utilized to good advantage.

Mr. GOOD. I think the evidence before the committee is to the effect that the shortage next year, at least so Gen. Hines stated—and it is the estimate of the War Department—will be caused by the fact that they will not have enough barges and boats to do the business, but after these barges and boats that have already been contracted for by the Railroad Administration and paid for by the Railroad Administration, to be turned over to the War Department, are placed in operation they think there will be a net revenue. There ought to be a net revenue, because there will be then a great many millions of dollars invested, and we ought not only to have a net revenue, but it ought to be a substantial amount.

Mr. SABATH. Even now, with the small barges we have, they are of great aid and assistance in transporting our vast cargoes in various sections of the country.

Mr. GOOD. I understand that is so; yes.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. I want to suggest to the gentleman that the purpose of appropriating the money on the terminal facilities there is to establish a transfer connection between the rail and water carriers, and is a part and parcel of the greater transportation system, and there hangs in the balance now the determination of the success or failure of inland water transportation in this country, and if it now fails it will be positively determined adversely to the undertaking for 30 or 40 years to come. If it is a successful and profitable undertak-

ing on the part of great transportation, then it ought to be adopted by the Government to relieve the congestion that exists in the Nation to-day.

Mr. GOOD. That is true. Now, there have been some changes and additions in regard to the national-park service.

There is also one increase of \$253,897, made necessary by the increased pay bill for the Coast Survey. That was an increase in salaries, made necessary by the increased pay bill, which passed after the House bill was enacted.

Mr. CRAGO. What was that?

Mr. GOOD. That was \$253,897.

Mr. CRAGO. Did they put in increased pay for the Army and Navy in that?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. CRAGO. I do not think it is necessary for the Army and Navy.

Mr. GOOD. There is nothing for the Army and Navy.

Then, the item for investigations concerning women in industry was agreed to in conference.

The House bill originally carried \$75,000 for that. It went out on a point of order in the House, and was restored by the Senate, and we agreed to that. We carried \$225,000 for the Employment Service. That went out in the House, and that was restored by the Senate. That was agreed to in conference. The Senate added \$1,562,000 for the Panama Canal for maintenance. It added also \$150,000 for sanitation of the Panama Canal. The Senate receded from those increases.

Now, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo] has asked for information with regard to the legislation that is carried in the bill.

The Senate placed an amendment on the bill making certain changes in the transportation act. Section 210 of the transportation act makes provision for new loans to railroads for equipment and the method of paying for it. Gentlemen will recall that a period of five years was given for the repayment of those loans. After the passage of that act it was claimed that the time for repayment was too short. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and the Commerce Committee in the Senate practically decided that the time was too short. When this amendment came up, I consulted with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch], who is an authority on this subject and is familiar with its details. He asked that the Senate amendment in that respect be agreed to. The bill also provides with regard to the \$300,000,000 for these loans that it may be used for the payment of outstanding deficits. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] informed me that that was the intention.

Some attorney in the Treasury Department rendered a ruling that it could not be used for that purpose. That ruling then was sent to the Attorney General, who held that it could be used for that purpose. But inasmuch as there was a conflict between these two legal authorities, the Treasury Department wanted that matter cleared up.

Then the House bill centered in the Treasury Department certain authority with regard to loans and certain authority in the Interstate Commerce Commission. It was thought best that this authority should be concentrated with regard to loans in the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that its power with regard to these loans that were made out of this \$300,000,000 fund should be made absolute, and the Senate amendment provided for those changes. After the Senate made those changes the conferees on the part of the House took the matter up with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch], who not only agreed that it was desirable but thought it was very necessary, and therefore the conferees have agreed to that amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand, of the three changes that the gentleman has detailed, the first is extending the time of payment on the debt due from the railroads to the Government from 5 to 15 years?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman recall what the amount of that is?

Mr. GOOD. Of the equipment trust?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. It is out of the \$300,000,000 appropriated in the transportation act. I do not understand that the amount of the equipment trust that the director general of finances was attempting to float is involved in this at all. It is the \$300,000,000 fund carried in section 210 of the transportation act.

Mr. WINGO. I thought the \$300,000,000 fund was a revolving fund.

Mr. GOOD. It is.

Mr. WINGO. I want to find out if I am wrong or not; I am not engaging in a controversy with the gentleman, but I want to obtain information. I had the idea that the Esch-Cummins Act provided for a five-year time on certain indebtedness due the United States by the railroads.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. This amendment, that you say the conferees have agreed to, extends that time 10 years more, making it 15 years?

Mr. GOOD. That is correct. That draws interest at 6 per cent.

Mr. WINGO. I have not the Esch-Cummins Act before me, and I do not recall what particular fund that is, the amount in millions.

Mr. GOOD. That is the new loans that can be made to the railroads on equipment, secured out of the \$300,000,000 fund that is loaned to them. They take an equipment trust security, and under the act those loans can only be made for five years. The railroads say they will be in as bad condition in five years as they are now in paying them, and they said they ought to have the same power that they have always had in making their loans on equipment, and that is to make them for 15 years.

Mr. WINGO. The last change you made is that where the Esch-Cummins Act allowed the Secretary of the Treasury the exercise of certain discretion. You have transferred that discretion to the Interstate Commerce Commission along with the other discretion that the original act gave to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. So the Interstate Commerce Commission will have absolute control—

Mr. GOOD. With regard to these loans.

Mr. WINGO. And the discretion of making these loans in behalf of the Government will be left entirely to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely.

Mr. WINGO. And not to the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely. And I will say to the gentleman that Senator UNDERWOOD came before the conferees and asked for the additional authority. He was very insistent to the committee. The conferees, after consulting, saw no objection to it, and that is contained in the paragraph at the bottom of page 6 of the report, which provides that the loans for equipment authorized by section 201 of the transportation act shall be made to or through such organization, car trust, or other agency, as may be determined.

Now, the Senator's idea was that a great many of these loans would have to be made through some other organization than the carriers. The act itself limited it to the carriers; but to make it a mobile and workable proposition, the loans would have to be made to car trusts, security, or other organizations. We saw no objection to it, and after conferring with those who were interested, and who were experts on the subject, they saw no objection to it.

Mr. WINGO. If I get the idea, it is that if they want to they can organize a separate corporation to handle this equipment, and so forth?

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

Mr. WINGO. And then instead of making loans direct, the Interstate Commerce Commission would have authority to make loans to this corporation created to handle them.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is right about that.

Mr. JONES of Texas. As I understand, most of this loan of \$300,000,000 is to be made for cars and rolling stock. In the extended period of 15 years most of the equipment would be worn out before the time comes for payment.

Mr. GOOD. No. That is just what Mr. Sherley did in reference to the 100,000 cars purchased during the war. It was what Mr. Hines recommended, and they say that is in accordance with the existing practice, and it is the plan that has been followed for years in regard to equipment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Interstate Commerce Commission has discretion in the matter as to whether it shall make the term 15 years or a less number of years.

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I see from some of the reports that they are going to put most of the \$300,000,000 into cars and rolling stock. It occurs to me that most of the cars would be worn out in less than 15 years.

Mr. GOOD. Let me say to the gentleman that it is the estimate of the Railroad Administration that because of the war, because of the fact that the great railroad shops and locomotive works of America were used for war purposes, we are short in railroad equipment to the value of \$1,600,000,000 behind what we would have had if these facilities could have

been used during the war for that purpose, and that is the reason why there is such a congestion all over the United States to-day.

Now, I think the other items of legislation in the conference report are of minor importance, and are matters upon which there is no dispute. Therefore I move the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves the previous question on agreeing to the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. WINGO) there were—ayes 104, noes 18.

Accordingly the conference report was agreed to.

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

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10378) to provide for the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine, to repeal certain emergency legislation, and provide for the disposition, regulation, and use of property acquired thereunder, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY 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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 14335, the third deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

SETTLEMENT OF CONTRACTS.

The following unexpended amounts of appropriations for the fiscal year 1918 shall remain upon the books of the Treasury to the credit of the respective appropriations until June 30, 1921, to permit payments for the adjustment and settlement of claims resulting from the suspension or termination of contracts or other procurement obligations of the War Department, consequent upon the suspension of hostilities, and for the adjustment of claims under the act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1919.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Under the head of "Transportation of the Army," page 25, I notice an estimate for the transportation of the wives of soldiers from Europe. I called the gentleman's attention when the sundry civil bill was up to the fact that the effects of officers and enlisted men who lost their lives and articles sent to many of our soldiers were stored in Paris with the American Express Co., and that the charges now held against them are so exorbitant that on many of the articles which were not delivered the charges are more than the intrinsic value of the property. At that time the gentleman thought that there was a provision to return that property to the United States, but I have taken the matter up with the War Department and they say that there is no authority to pay for the return of these articles.

Mr. GOOD. No estimate was made for anything of the kind and I assume that there is plenty of money available out of the pay for the Army or the transportation of the Army for that purpose. This is a matter that they would not be authorized to pay. This is an appropriation of \$13,000 that would be subject to a point of order. It is to bring back the war brides of men in the service who married over there. They were ordered back to this country. They had no money with which to bring their wives back and the War Department felt that it would not be right to leave them stranded over there, and so they attempted to pay their transportation back. They owe these claims to the steamship companies for bringing back the war brides of our soldiers.

Mr. McKEOWN. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman again to the fact that although we have called the attention of the War Department to the fact that the effects of these deceased soldiers and many others are in the warehouses of the American Express Co., which was one of the corporations taken care of when the Railroad Administration bill turned the roads back, yet they are charging such high rates that these effects will have to be sold at auction in Paris because the Government can not bring them back.

Mr. GOOD. The War Department has made no estimate for it.

Mr. McKEOWN. I want to voice my protest against these charges, so large that they will prevent the relatives of these deceased soldiers getting this property.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's pro forma amendment. I am in favor of this appropriation of \$13,000 because these war brides ought to be brought back. I think, however, the sum should have been made in some other amount—\$14,000 or \$12,500—because we want these war brides to start out under the most auspicious circumstances possible in this country. We don't want any 13 hanging over them.

The main reason I desire to call attention to this item, however, is this: The other day we passed a resolution in this House to carry 300 civilians to Antwerp on Army transports to engage in the Olympic games, and it was then stated by my friends on the other side of the House that it would not cost a penny to carry them over on the Government transports. But this very item in this bill demonstrates the fallacy of that statement. It demonstrates that it cost \$13,000 to bring the war brides back, and it is going to cost several times \$13,000 to deliver 300 civilians in Antwerp to engage in the Olympic games. And you are doing it when your country is in debt, but you did it over my protest.

The Clerk read as follows:

Supplies, services, and transportation, 1918, \$9,625,816.55.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman to an error in line 2, page 27, where there are two "and"s.

Mr. GOOD. I move that the first "and" be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$51,505,158.88: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be used to pay any claim arising out of any contract or other obligation unless such contract or obligation was entered into subsequently to April 6, 1917, and prior to November 12, 1918.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 10, after the figures, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this sum shall be paid for any claim for profits on any such contract or obligation."

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether any part of this appropriation was intended to cover profits or not, but out of abundance of caution I think it would be well to have the provision in there. I know that in a number of other contracts that have been settled and provision made for them such a stipulation has been embodied in the legislation that provided for the payment. It seems to me that these various claims that are authorized when contracts and obligations were settled should carry with them no profit on any work done before the contract was canceled. There simply ought to be a payment of the obligation due or the expenses incurred prior to the cancellation of the obligation. I have offered the amendment for the purpose of limiting it to that.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, there are large unexpended balances under these appropriations that will lapse on June 30. All general appropriations are available for obligations during the fiscal year for which they are made. They continue available for two additional years for payment of obligations incurred during the year for which the appropriation was made. These appropriations were all made during the war, and the money has not been available for obligations since the years specified here. None of it will be available for payment of the obligations, no matter how meritorious they are, after June 30, unless we extend the time. We are not appropriating any additional money. The Secretary of War estimates that it will be necessary to use approximately \$51,505,000 to settle these claims. The gentleman is injecting into the question something altogether new.

These contracts were made during the war. Some of them have been canceled, some of them have not been paid because of contests; some of them may go to the courts. All we are attempting to do is to extend the time within which payment may be made. What might happen is this: If the gentleman's amendment should be adopted the War Department might rush ahead and settle these claims before June 30, and we might actually lose more money than we would save. There is no legislation that I know of on contracts of this kind where Congress has provided that they should be made without profit. I think the profits are too large in a great many of them. They were contracts made during the war and approved by the Secretary of War. I doubt very much the wisdom of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman understands from the first part of this that it applies only to contracts not finished at the time the war closed?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. This proviso is to prevent any construction being placed upon this extension of time whereby the Secretary of War might enter into new contracts or pay for contracts not made strictly in accord with—

Mr. JONES of Texas. But the gentleman does not think that in contracts never finished a profit should be allowed manufacturers of arms and equipment of the kind mentioned and enumerated on page 26, when in the other contracts we have appropriated for we have specifically provided that no profits should be allowed?

Mr. GOOD. We never have provided for anything of that kind.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes. In all of the legislation this kind of an amendment has gone on, that in these informal obligations and contracts the Government has assumed, no allowance should be made for profit.

Mr. GOOD. So far as it relates to informal contracts, the law already provides for that. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, \$242,500.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee if the \$242,500 carried in this item is sufficient. I noticed by the report that it has not been reduced. Is it absolutely sufficient?

Mr. GOOD. The board of managers sent their estimates to the committee with quite a full explanation. The amount made necessary for subsistence by this deficiency is caused largely by the increase in the cost of the kind of subsistence they have had to purchase.

Mr. PELL. I sincerely trust that there has been no effort made whatever to economize on this particular thing.

Mr. GOOD. It is just exactly what the board asked.

Mr. PELL. Everything possible is being done for these men?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. PELL. It seems to me that the prime duty of this Government to these soldiers is to take care of the injured.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that it was with this thought that we should not question this item, because we propose to use for the next year about nine or ten thousand beds in the soldiers' homes for the soldiers of this war. This is all to go to purchase provisions, and if it is not all used this year there will be a demand for it immediately at the opening of the next fiscal year.

Mr. PELL. I am sure we are all willing to do everything necessary for that purpose. Those men who have suffered in the service of their country should receive all that we can give them. They should be cared for and cherished; their pains have ransomed us all and they are a charge on us all, not of charity but of justice and duty. They do not complain; they maintain no lobby—their wounds speak for them. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

DAMAGE CLAIMS.

Damage claims: To pay the claims adjusted and determined by the Navy Department under the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1911, on account of damages occasioned to private property by collisions with vessels of the United States Navy and for which naval vessels were responsible, certified to Congress in House Documents Nos. 741 and 757 of the present session, \$5,302.44: *Provided*, That the amount stated in item 18 in Document 741 shall be \$228.79 instead of \$288.79.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee in reference to this item for damage claims, Navy Department, and that is if there has ever come to his knowledge any requests for appropriations to pay claims which were occasioned by the laying of the helium-gas line from Petrolia to Fort Worth?

Mr. GOOD. No; this would not come within that class of claims.

Mr. PARRISH. I did not think it would come within that class of claims.

Mr. GOOD. No; this class of claims has relation only to collisions between vessels, where the vessel belonging to the Navy is at fault, and where the amount involved is less than \$500.

Mr. PARRISH. I see that it would not come under that class of claims, but it suggested to my mind that these people had never been compensated for the damage occasioned by the laying of that line. I know of my own knowledge there are probably

as many as 50 claims which have passed through my hands occasioned by the laying of that line, and I was wondering if any arrangement could be made to compensate those citizens whose property had been damaged by reason of the laying of that line by the Government.

Mr. GOOD. I know nothing about the controversy.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Outfits on first enlistment: Outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment, at not to exceed \$100 each; for the clothing gratuity of officers and other members of the Naval Reserve Force, not to exceed \$150 each for officers for civilian clothing not to exceed \$15 per man to men given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, or inaptitude; in all, fiscal year 1919, \$856,848.03.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If I may have the attention of the Chairman, I notice in line 9 the bill carries an item for civilian clothes for dishonorably discharged men at \$15 per man. That evidently is the price that was established a number of years ago and clothing has gone up to such an extent that they would probably have to give the man something made out of paper at \$15 or else let him go away naked.

Mr. GOOD. This is an actual deficiency for the year 1919.

Mr. CALDWELL. Where the Government has actually paid the money?

Mr. GOOD. Where the clothing has already been furnished and this is to compensate in that amount.

Mr. CALDWELL. All right.

The Clerk read as follows:

For vehicle allowance, the hiring of drivers, the rental of vehicles, and the purchase and exchange and maintenance, including stable and garage facilities, of wagons or automobiles for, and the operation of screen-wagon and city delivery and collection services, \$1,200,000.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I would like to ask the chairman if this \$1,200,000 takes into consideration the increased compensation to be paid to the employees of the Postal Service in case the bill is reported in to-morrow?

Mr. GOOD. No; this has nothing to do with that.

Mr. JUUL. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. GOOD. This is simply to take care of the vehicle service.

Mr. JUUL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee to explain the difference between this item for copies of the Official Postal Guide for 1920, \$6,500, and for 1921, \$50,000.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. What does that difference represent?

Mr. GOOD. The difference represents the additional cost for securing the Postal Guide. The contract is on a four-year basis. The Post Office Department took proposals for printing the Postal Guide, and the increased cost is \$50,000 in excess of the \$43,000 carried in the legislative bill for 1921. It is over 100 per cent increase of the price at which the contract was let four years ago.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is it not, in fact, about 400 per cent increase?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know exactly what the contract was let at four years ago, but my recollection is it was for \$33,000, and for the next year the legislative bill carries \$43,000. Since that time, in advertising for bids, they received one proposal, and could not get other proposals, and they increased it \$50,000. We have to have these Postal Guides.

The Clerk read as follows:

For reimbursement of the Government Printing Office for the cost of furnishing steam for heating and electric current for lighting and power to the Post Office Department building at Massachusetts Avenue and North Capitol Street, District of Columbia, \$1,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling the attention of the chairman of the committee to the spelling of the word "reimbursement" on page 34, line 10.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make the correction.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will make the correction.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For payment of limited indemnity for the injury or loss of pieces of domestic registered matter, insured, and collect-on-delivery mail, for the fiscal years that follow:

For 1918, \$50,000;

For 1919, \$125,000.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the spelling of the word "years" in line 4, page 36.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inland transportation by star routes (excepting service in Alaska), including temporary service to newly established offices, \$1,600,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, the debate on this bill has covered an exceptionally wide range of subjects. Therefore it seems to me I may with propriety beg the indulgence of the House while I make something of a personal statement. No man can prize more highly the great privilege I have had of being a Member of the Sixty-fourth, the Sixty-fifth, and this the Sixty-sixth Congress. The European war broke out a few months before I was first elected, so that the days I have spent here have been critical ones for the Nation and full of long hours of work for Members of Congress. In fact, the Congress has been in session almost continuously since early in December, 1915. During that time came our participation in the world-wide conflict. Critics there have been, critics there are, and critics there will be, but the cold truth remains that the United States raised and equipped a larger Army, put to sea a greater Navy, and raised more dollars for her own finances and for the Allies than was believed possible. The American people rose to the occasion, and that their great effort made possible the defeat of Germany there can be no doubt. Designing men, for political purposes, have attempted to besmirch that record of imperishable glory, but as the years of the century roll by it will in pride be told with patriotic fervor as a priceless heritage. Certainly there were mistakes; it could not have been otherwise. Mere human men do not make perfect records either individually or when collectively bound together in a republic. Perfection is a quality of the Divine alone. That our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps were the best physical specimens, the cleanest morally, the best fed, the best clothed, the best equipped, and the best paid will always be a source of pride to every American. On every occasion presented I voted to sustain and support the defenders of our Nation. Through the days of the gathering storm and the weeks of the conflict my vote was cast to uphold the dignity, the honor, and the integrity of America.

The Sixty-third Congress, the first during the administration of President Wilson, placed some notable measures on the statute books. Let me mention the income-tax law, the Federal reserve act, the agricultural extension act, the Clayton anti-trust law, the creation of the Federal Trade Commission, the seaman's law, and the marine insurance act. How thankful we all are that the Federal Reserve System was established before the war. It removed from Wall Street the control of the money of the land and made financial panics a thing of the past.

Not less brilliant were the legislative achievements of the Sixty-fourth Congress, in which I first served, which provided for section grazing homesteads, Federal aid in the construction and maintenance of roads, the safety of railroad employees, uniform grain grades, rural credits, and liability for injury of Government employees. The rural-credit system has, of course, made but a small percentage of the real estate loans, but its effect has been to reduce interest rates quite generally over the country.

The time of the Sixty-fifth Congress was very largely devoted to legislation under which the war was fought and financed. The soldiers' insurance law provided insurance at low rates for soldiers, sailors, and marines, made provision for compensating those wounded and disabled in the service, and extended financial assistance to dependents of service men. The income and excess-profits taxes recognized the justness of graduated taxes by levying heavier rates on big incomes than were ever before laid in this country. The deportation was authorized of foreigners who claimed their alien citizenship to evade the obligation of military service here. Within less than three months after the armistice, the resumption of voluntary enlistments for the Army was ordered, and thus it became apparent that this Nation, which willingly adopted the

draft law for raising an army in time of war, did not intend to continue in time of peace a policy of compulsory military service. Under the food-control act the President had guaranteed the price of the 1919 wheat crop and appropriate legislation was enacted to carry that into effect.

Coming events cast their shadows before them, and so the 1920 presidential election had its effect on the Sixty-sixth Congress. That unanimity of purpose which prevailed during the two previous Congresses was succeeded by criticism and discord. Even so, considerable legislation has been enacted, of which I mention the submission of the woman-suffrage amendment, the oil-and-coal-land leasing act, the law for the enforcement of national prohibition, the civil-service retirement act, provision for the vocational rehabilitation of those disabled in industry, the creation of a Woman's Bureau in the Department of Labor, and the liberalization of the compensation payments under the war-risk insurance law.

I did not vote for the railroad control act, for I did then and do now doubt the wisdom of embarking on a policy of guaranteeing the dividends of the railroads by directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to lay such freight rates as will produce the required net income. That looked too much like the cost-plus system to suit me. The provision which requires consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission before any railroad can be built, extended, or bought is covertly drawn to head off any competitive railroad building and to preserve the railroad status quo. We are now advised that the estimated returns from the freight rate increases already applied for under that act are as much for each year as the much-talked-of deficit was for the two years and two months of governmental control.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that there came the differences between the President and the Senate regarding the treaty of peace, which includes the covenant of the League of Nations. More than 25 of the nations of the world have ratified that covenant, while the United States holds aloof. The fathers and mothers of this land have a right to demand for the coming citizens that there come as the result of the great conflict something more than a big debt. If there does not come an international agreement or understanding or league of nations or something to bind the nations of the earth together on common ground, then the future presents only a race for armament in a breathing spell before another war.

FEDERAL AID FOR GOOD ROADS.

In my first congressional campaign in 1912 I talked to western South Dakota folks about Federal aid in the construction and maintenance of roads, and there were those who smiled at what then appeared to be an idle dream. In 1916 it was my privilege to help pass the first Federal appropriation bill for good roads, and thereunder South Dakota received \$1,256,250 for the five-year period, besides aid in road work in the forest reserves. The appropriation has been increased, and the South Dakota allotment up to 1921 now stands at \$4,452,883.04.

THE MAIL SERVICE.

South Dakota west of the Missouri River is larger than the State of Ohio. It has approximately 1,100 miles of railroads, 2,000 miles of rural mail delivery routes, and 4,000 miles of star routes. That mileage statement in itself shows clearly the mail-service problem. I have worked with home folks in a studied effort to improve the service, and to-day approximately 3,000 homes are receiving mail delivery on rural or star routes or city delivery established since I came to Congress.

The unusual condition brought about by the war, with counting costs and increasing salaries, has been a serious trial to the Postal Service. Most any sort of labor has been able to command more money than the average postmaster, post-office clerk, or rural carrier. That has also been true of all other lines of the Government service. A temporary bonus was provided, but even that has failed to put the Government employees on a parity with other workers. The Postal Salaries Reclassification Commission has filed its report, and action thereon by Congress will very shortly be taken. I have no doubt that the report will be adopted and postal workers all along the line will be benefited thereby.

Fourth-class postmasters never have received the recognition to which they are entitled. The little offices are just as essential in the general postal scheme as the big offices, yet a fourth-class postmaster is expected for a pitifully small allowance based on the business of the office to furnish a building, heat and light it, and do the work. In all lines of public service the American people have been doing away with the old fee system, and I hope the day will soon come when fourth-class postmasters will not longer be on a fee basis.

Another great inequality in postal affairs is the condition that prevails in the star-route service. These routes are on a contract basis, and, hence, within the technical meaning of the term, the contractors or carriers are not employees of the United States. For that reason no provision for their relief is made in the report of the Reclassification Commission. Because of unusual conditions, we provided relief for the man who had a contract to furnish Army or Navy supplies. We have made provision for the man who has a contract to build a post-office building, but I have yet to see any relief or hear any voice raised in this House in behalf of the man who has a star-route contract, and there are thousands of them scattered over the country. I heretofore called attention to the exceptional star-route mileage in the district I have the honor to represent. Practically every contractor, where the contract was made a year or two or three years ago, is to-day faced with bankruptcy. Many of them have already been wiped out.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GANDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KREIDER. I wish to say to the gentleman that the Post Office Department has authority to change their contracts and agree on a new price.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is mistaken. They absolutely refused to do it down in my section.

Mr. KREIDER. I know they have done it.

Mr. BLANTON. I have had 20 different cases up with them, and they refuse to change the contract.

Mr. GANDY. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] is in error on that, because I have had much experience in the last few months with that proposition.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GANDY. I yield.

Mr. SINNOTT. I will state that I agree with the gentleman. I have had the matter up with the Postmaster General, and he refuses to approve a bill that tries to remedy the condition. I have one contractor that offered \$4,000 to be relieved from his contract.

Mr. KREIDER. I have had a route in my district where the carrier had agreed to carry the mail for, I think, \$500. He took it up with the department and the department adjusted it on the basis of \$800.

Mr. SINNOTT. The department not only refused to adjust the matter in my district, but refused to approve of a bill to give them authority to adjust it.

Mr. CRAGO. One of the troubles I have had is this: I have had cases, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] had, where they have voluntarily increased the pay in existing contracts. But what I do object to is that they do not seem to have a uniform rule. A man comes up and makes a good case, and they refuse to increase him. There ought to be some uniform system.

Mr. GANDY. It is my understanding there is no provision of law to adjust the compensation except where the Government wants to increase the service on the route or because of something of that kind it is deemed wise to let a new contract.

Mr. CRAGO. And where there has been an increase of the amount of mail matter carried.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it not true that the contract is practically prescribed by the law that Congress has passed, and the Postmaster General has no discretion whatever about them?

Mr. GANDY. The Postmaster General has no discretion.

Mr. BRIGGS. Congress has taken no steps to change the situation.

Mr. GANDY. That is exactly it.

Mr. JUUL. I wondered if the gentleman was going to offer an amendment to cure the case he complains of.

Mr. GANDY. I have no opportunity to do that on this bill, but I do hope to offer to this House in the very near future an amendment to a bill, where I think it will be in order, to take care of that situation. There should be an adjustment of pay based on present-day costs, for certainly this great Government of ours ought not to receive service at less than the cost thereof.

CUSTER STATE PARK GAME SANCTUARY.

The 1919 session of the Legislature of South Dakota memorialized Congress for an addition to Custer State Park, which is located in the Black Hills in Custer County. Pursuant thereto I introduced and secured the passage of an act authorizing the establishment of the Custer State Park game sanctuary, not exceeding 30,000 acres in the higher ranges adjoining and west of the State park and including Harney Peak. The land will remain a part of the national forest, but the State will be permitted to fence it, and on a basis of even exchange to acquire not to exceed 1,600 acres within the area for camp sites, administrative and other locations. With this addition, South

Dakota's State park will contain nearly 100,000 acres and will be the largest in the Nation. Without doubt in the years to come it will be a heritage of which the State will indeed be proud. It is now well stocked with game, and its rugged mountain grandeur, set out by lofty peaks, deep gorges, and clear, sparkling streams, makes it an ideal recreation place.

THE CHAMBERLAIN BRIDGE.

The pile and pontoon bridge of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, across the Missouri River at Chamberlain, early in its existence acquired a habit of journeying down the river with the flow of ice in the early spring or late fall and of drifting on the crests of such freshets as chose to pass that way during the late spring and summer. Before I came to Congress the State board of railroad commissioners had taken action in court, the State legislature had passed appropriate resolutions, commercial clubs and private citizens had protested, cussed, and discussed this situation, which was then, and is now, a menace to the safety of the property and persons dependent upon that bridge for crossing the river. The very uncertainty of travel that way has retarded the settlement, growth, and development of the country along the Milwaukee Railroad between the Missouri River and Rapid City.

Seeking to remedy this almost intolerable situation, I introduced in the Sixty-fourth Congress and secured the passage of the act of April 28, 1916, to compel the building of a new bridge. That act gave the railroad company two years within which to commence construction, but within that time came the war with Germany and incidental war conditions, including control of the steel industry by the War Trade Board, which made impossible the erection of the bridge. Then, also, came the Federal control of railroads, during which an authorization for the erection of the bridge could not be secured. In 1918, after the bridge franchise lapsed, the railroad company, although not able to procure a new bridge, moved to Chamberlain two secondhand steel spans of 300 feet each. The work of erecting those spans and the building and launching of a new 200-foot pontoon was completed in the spring of 1919. I refused to introduce a bill for another franchise unless it carried adequate safeguards of the public interest, for it must be remembered that under the general laws governing bridges across navigable streams no authority is retained over the structures except that pertaining to navigation. During the summer and early fall of 1918, in conferences with Government officials here and with railroad officials in Chicago, I insisted that the bridge, as contemplated, would not meet the requirements of continuous railroad traffic, and later events have justified that opinion. H. R. 13004, Sixty-fifth Congress, introduced by me on September 25, 1918, which became a law on February 25, 1919, granting extensions of time within which to commence and complete the bridge, provides:

That if the bridge * * * shall be found, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, to be so constructed that it does not reasonably meet the requirements for continuous and uninterrupted railroad traffic, then, and in such event, he may order such changes as in his judgment may be necessary to make said bridge meet such requirements. All the privileges herein conferred and the right to maintain the bridge to be built hereunder shall cease and determine unless such changes as the Secretary of War shall direct shall be commenced within six months and completed within two years next following the date of service of such order.

Thus, twice has a precedent been set in bridge legislation—once when the building of a new bridge was sought to be compelled by the repeal of the bridge franchise then in force with a requirement that plans be submitted for a new bridge; and, second, when the Secretary of War was given jurisdiction to see that the bridge meets the requirements of continuous railroad traffic. I filed formal complaint against the bridge, and an investigation by Army engineers sustained the complaint. A hearing has been ordered at Chamberlain, S. Dak., before the Army district engineer, Maj. R. T. Ward, of Kansas City, Mo., upon the question of alterations or additions necessary to meet the requirements of continuous railroad traffic, and, the Secretary of War having already found the bridge to be deficient, there is no question but what changes will be ordered. In fact, the Chief of Engineers of the Army has announced that in his opinion the following changes are necessary:

Replace the pontoon draw by a lift span or other satisfactory form of opening providing a vertical clearance of not less than 38 feet above the extreme high water of the navigation season.

Replace the western pile approach by two steel spans, with adequate protection for the western abutment.

Maintain the channel within the draw or lift span.

Replace the present pile piers by concrete or masonry piers extending below the scour line.

I thus have reason to believe that there will shortly be erected at Chamberlain such a structure as will make certain the crossing of the Missouri River at any and all times of the year.

PENSIONS, COMPENSATION, AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

The pension law lately enacted for Civil War veterans is the most generous ever placed on our statute books. The "boys of long ago" who by their service in the Union Army made possible this great country of to-day will be materially assisted by the increases provided. The recent enactment by Congress of a bill to pension the disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War, whether that disability arose in or subsequent to war service, is evidence that Congress believes those who offered their services to the Nation in its hour of danger ought to be assisted in case of disability. Pensions for the widows of Spanish War veterans were provided during the last Congress, and rightly so. Assistance has also been given during my service here to the veterans of Indian wars. Several private pension bills introduced by me for veterans who were equitably entitled to assistance but were unable for some technical reason or other to secure a pension under the general law have been enacted. Allowances under the war-risk law provide for disabled service men of the recent war. They are the most liberal ever paid by any country, and experience under that law is demonstrating just how helpful it is, both to the veterans and the country. Vocational training and rehabilitation are provided for those veterans whose disability indicates they can not return to their previous occupation.

Looking back over my service in Congress, it will always be to me a pleasant recollection to know that I have advocated liberality in providing for the defenders of the Nation, and have heartily supported pension, war-risk insurance, and vocational-training measures.

BELLE FOURCHE IRRIGATION PROJECT.

The Belle Fourche project is one of the most successful of the Government projects. Nearly 100,000 acres will be irrigable when it is completed and water is now available for over 82,000 acres. Complete success will not be assured until a sufficient water supply is provided for the Johnson lateral and the Willow Creek lateral is constructed. Water for the Johnson lateral is taken directly from the inlet canal between the Belle Fourche River and the reservoir; hence it is dependent on the unregulated flow of the river, which has been insufficient during 4 of the 10 years of the operation of this unit that serves approximately 3,750 acres. A plan for constructing a storage reservoir in Chicken Creek, southwest of Belle Fourche, has been approved by the Reclamation Service, which, if constructed, would not only serve this lateral but furnish additional water to the Red Water project, a private project of many years' successful operation. The estimated cost of the reservoir and incidental works is \$300,000. The Willow Creek unit is a proposed extension of the north canal a distance of approximately 20 miles, and between seven and eight thousand acres will be served. The cost of the unit is estimated at \$180,000.

On May 8, 1920, during the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill in the House, I fully discussed the urgent need for storage for the Johnson lateral and for the construction of the Willow Creek lateral, and was assured by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that additional appropriations for the Belle Fourche project will be made just as soon as money is available in the reclamation fund, which is thought will be within the next few months.

LIVE-STOCK DEMONSTRATION WORK.

In 1916 I secured an amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill making provision for investigations and experiments in problems connected with dairying and meat production in the semiarid and irrigated localities. Under that amendment at the Government farm at Ardmore, S. Dak., barns have been erected and other improvements made, and dairying, hog raising, and the production of beef cattle are receiving careful attention. That is known as a dry-land station, while the one at Newell is an irrigated station, and there hog feeding and pasturing, sheep pasturing, and the testing of mixed-grass pasturing are being carried on and studied. Mr. Chairman, the records of this work, experimentation, and study will be disseminated among the stock raisers of the West and great benefit will be derived therefrom.

The two stations mentioned are not only furnishing excellent examples in live-stock demonstration work but in crop production as well. Every farmer in western South Dakota who possibly can ought to visit one of them, for I dare say no one can thus spend a few hours without acquiring new ideas and useful information.

DEADWOOD ASSAY OFFICE.

Early this year the House Appropriations Committee again made an effort to close the Deadwood assay office by eliminating the item from the legislative, executive, and judicial appro-

priation bill, but it was restored in the House by the adoption of an amendment which I offered. That office is needed by the prospectors and the gold producers. Thought should be given to making it more useful instead of trying to close it.

THE SIOUX CLAIMS.

Long before I became a resident of South Dakota the Sioux Indians were complaining that they were practically forced to cede the Black Hills country in 1876 and received no real remuneration therefor. The Constitution of the United States provides that private individuals can not sue the Government; hence without special authority from Congress there was no way they could secure an adjudication of their claims. Early in the Sixty-fourth Congress I introduced a bill to authorize the Court of Claims to hear and determine not only the Black Hills claim of the Sioux but all claims of the tribe or any band or bands thereof, to the end that there might be a complete accounting between the Government and its wards. I re-introduced that bill in the Sixty-fifth and again in the Sixty-sixth Congress, and recently it became a law. The Indians of western South Dakota are thus to be given an opportunity to balance accounts with the Government, for which they have striven for nearly 40 years.

IMPROVEMENTS AT INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOLS.

At Rosebud Boarding School, at Mission, S. Dak., and at Pine Ridge Boarding School, at Pine Ridge Agency, improvements and additions are under way which will cost approximately \$100,000 at each place. These improvements will increase the capacity of both schools, will make them more convenient and enjoyable for pupils and employees, and will provide better educational training.

Appropriations totaling \$67,000 have been made for a new school building and assembly hall, remodeling of buildings, construction and maintenance of the road through the school farm, and for irrigation and drainage at the Rapid City Indian School since I came to Washington. These improvements when completed will increase the capacity and efficiency of this school, which is held in high esteem by the Sioux Indians and neighboring tribes. At the next session of Congress I will offer further plans for strengthening it.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS IN SOUTH DAKOTA NATIONAL FORESTS.

The Public Lands Committee of the House has favorably reported H. R. 11118, which I introduced to authorize an exchange of lands in the national forests in South Dakota between the Government and private owners. There are many instances in the forests where a property owner would like to trade some land chiefly valuable for forest purposes for adjoining agricultural Government land, or where one may have timber property in two or more locations and it would be to his interest and the forest's interest to have his holding consolidated. Both of these classes of cases would be taken care of by the passage of this bill, which now has an advantageous position upon the calendar of the House.

DESIGNATION OF LANDS.

Subsequent to the amendment which on March 4, 1915, made the half-section homestead law applicable to South Dakota and the passage of the section stock-raising homestead law on December 29, 1916, thousands of original and additional homestead applications were filed for lands in western South Dakota. In the public-land States of the West 60,000,000 acres were filed on under the section law alone within 60 days after the approval thereof. It was not humanly possible for the Interior Department officials to pass on this great number of applications without some delay, and in many cases long delay. Practically the first designations under the section law were made in South Dakota, and while delays have tried the patience of many homesteaders, the work has progressed steadily. I am happy to have been advised that within the next few weeks, when designations shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior in the cases now prepared for action, there will be less than 100 pending applications in South Dakota, except the new cases filed. No other public-land State of the West is so fortunate, for nowhere else are the designations so near to completion. Practically all the public lands in South Dakota have been filed on, and it is apparent we are now approaching the time when we shall no longer be called a public-land State. Within a few years at most final proofs will have been made, patents will have been issued, and the land offices will be institutions of the past. One of the most pleasant of the remembrances of my service here will be that thousands of western South Dakota citizens have secured original or additional homesteads under laws or amendments which I either introduced or assisted in the consideration of in the Public Lands Committee of the House.

FORT MEADE.

The Mexican border service and the war brought about such concentration of troops that Fort Meade, near Sturgis, has not been utilized for some years. It is a very excellent post, of brick and stone construction, with electric lights, and a gravity water system. Twelve sections of land provide ample room for maneuvers. Many similar posts are also practically unoccupied.

During the consideration of the general hospital bill for the Public Health Service, which is charged also with the hospitalization of the patients of the War Risk Bureau, I on January 27, 1919, called the attention of the House to the large number of military posts unoccupied and offered an amendment which, in my judgment, would have, if adopted, made possible the use of quite a number of them. A provision in that bill made available to the Public Health Service all space and equipment in Battle Mountain Sanitarium at Hot Springs, S. Dak., not needed for the purposes for which that institution was established. That has somewhat helped the situation, although the majority of the patients at the sanitarium are veterans of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars. Recently during consideration by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of an additional estimate for appropriation for hospital needs of the Public Health Service, I again specifically called attention to the desirability of Fort Meade. I pointed out that in the tenth district of the Public Health Service, which is composed of the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana, the Surgeon General estimated that additional hospital capacity will be needed for 1,300 patients of varying degrees of incapacity. By the expenditure of a relatively small sum, Fort Meade could quickly be made ready to accommodate that number. The Secretary of War was called before the committee, and although not declining to transfer the post for the time being, he stated:

This post is only vacant at this time by reason of the necessity of retaining certain cavalry organizations on the Mexican border. A change in conditions which would permit the material reduction of the large body of cavalry now required on the border would require the use of Fort Meade.

The post has recently twice been inspected by officials of the Public Health Service. Whether the Surgeon General will ask for the transfer of Fort Meade I now have no means of knowing, but I do know this magnificent piece of Government property ought not to stand idle if use can be found for it. I have persistently urged that it be occupied, either with troops or by some other Government agency, and shall continue to do so.

IN CONCLUSION.

The review of this legislative record is a pleasant task for me. The accomplishments therein have concerned in one way or another practically every resident of the district I have the honor to represent. I have tried to be faithful to the task at hand and to merit the confidence reposed in me. In attending to business before governmental departments or to other requests of western South Dakota citizens I have endeavored to serve one and all regardless of political affiliation or other distinction. The financial needs of the many governmental activities in my district have been given very careful attention through the maze of details in the various appropriation bills and adequate provision made therefor. My record of votes in the House will show a conscientious endeavor to honestly represent my constituency.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GANDY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KREIDER. I wish to say to the gentleman that the Post Office Department has authority to change their contracts and agree on a new price.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is mistaken. They absolutely refused to do it down in my section.

Mr. KREIDER. I know they have done it.

Mr. BLANTON. I have had 20 different cases up with them, and they refuse to change the contract.

Mr. GANDY. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] is in error on that, because I have had much experience in the last few months with that proposition.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GANDY. I yield.

Mr. SINNOTT. I will state that I agree with the gentleman. I have had the matter up with the Postmaster General, and he refuses to approve a bill that tries to remedy the condition. I have one contractor that offered \$4,000 to be relieved from his contract.

Mr. KREIDER. I have had a route in my district where the carrier had agreed to carry the mail for, I think, \$500. He took it up with the department and the department adjusted it on the basis of \$800.

Mr. SINNOTT. The department not only refused to adjust the matter in my district, but refused to approve of a bill to give them authority to adjust it.

Mr. CRAGO. One of the troubles I have had is this: I have had cases, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] had, where they have voluntarily increased the pay in existing contracts. But what I do object to is that they do not seem to have a uniform rule. A man comes up and makes a good case, and they refuse to increase him. There ought to be some uniform system.

Mr. GANDY. It is my understanding there is no provision of law to adjust the compensation except where the Government wants to increase the service on the route or something of that kind it is deemed wise to let a new contract.

Mr. CRAGO. And where there has been an increase of the amount of mail matter carried.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it not true that the contract is practically prescribed by the law that Congress has passed, and the Postmaster General has no discretion whatever about them?

Mr. GANDY. The Postmaster General has no discretion.

Mr. BRIGGS. Congress has taken no steps to change the situation.

Mr. GANDY. That is exactly it.

Mr. JUUL. I wondered if the gentleman was going to offer an amendment to cure the case he complains of.

Mr. GANDY. I have no opportunity to do that on this bill, but I do hope to offer to this House in the very near future an amendment to a bill, where I think it will be in order, to take care of that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 7 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this and other subjects connected with my service here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on this subject and other subjects in connection with his service here. Is there objection?

Mr. RAMSEY. What are they about? If the remarks are on the bonus bill, I object.

Mr. GANDY. It is not on the bonus.

There was no objection.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, the star-route contract, so-called, is a contract for carrying the mail for so much per year, generally for four years. Now, there were some contracts before the war, and the general level of prices were so increased that it was thought best for Congress to pass an act authorizing the department to readjust them. We did so in 1918 and gave the department authority to readjust the contracts, and a great many of them were readjusted.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] and several other gentlemen introduced bills of a similar character.

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

Mr. STEENERSON. I can not yield.

Mr. JUUL. I wanted to know from the gentleman if at the time you did that an appropriation was made to enable the department to comply with it?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes. There was money in the appropriation bill for that purpose.

Mr. JUUL. Excuse me. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEENERSON. A bill was introduced by the gentleman from Oregon, and other gentlemen introduced similar bills, authorizing the department to readjust star-route contracts made since July 1, 1918. The committee had a hearing on it and called upon the department officials to give their reasons for or against this relief bill. We heard the First Assistant Postmaster General and other officials, and it was explained to us that the contracts about which complaint was made were all let after careful information, and it was printed in the contracts that the contractor must be bound by the terms of the contract.

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

Mr. STEENERSON. No; wait a minute.

Now, then, the theory of these contractors seemed to be that the United States is a guarantor of a profit on every contract that is made with it; that if the contractors make a profit it is all right, but if they have a loss they can come back on the Government.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. STEENERSON. Not now; the gentleman will excuse me.

The department by these bills was authorized to readjust the compensation in their discretion. We asked the officials if they would readjust these contracts if that bill became a law, and they said there was not a single contract in the records of the Post Office Department that they would readjust if they had the authority to do so, and consequently the committee did not see fit to recommend the passage of a bill that would be absolutely fruitless.

It would be no good to anybody, because they pointed out that these contracts were all fairly let with men who were already of age, who knew what they were doing. It was after the war had begun. Anyway, it was after the previous act had been passed, and adjustments had been made under it, and there was no occasion to readjust any of those contracts.

That is the reason why the Post Office Committee did not recommend the passage of any other bill, because if they had passed it and it had become a law the department would not have given the contractors one cent.

Mr. GANDY. There is not any difference in the contract, so far as the obligation of the contract is concerned, with a star-route contractor, or a man who had a public building contract, for whose relief a bill has been passed, or an Army or Navy contractor, is there?

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, I am not familiar with those contracts where readjustment was made, but I know that the contractors for envelopes, for all sorts of supplies, came in with new bills, just as these star-route contractors did, and we did not recommend them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, before you do that, I would like to have unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this bill; not only these remarks that I have just made, but the remarks I made before on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. The Sinnott bill is as follows:

That the Postmaster General is authorized to investigate conditions arising from contracts in the star route, screen wagon, and other vehicle service entered into prior to June 30, 1918, with a view to determining whether any adjustment should be made in the compensation and to adjust the same for service hereafter to be furnished or rendered in cases where the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment; or, in his discretion, with the consent of the contractor and his bondsmen, the Postmaster General may cancel such contracts.

It will be noted that it simply confers authority to adjust, and if the department states there is no case that would be readjusted after authority is given it would be useless to pass the act. Here is the testimony on the subject:

Mr. KOONS. I will give you my views on it. Personally I am not in favor of going back with any further readjustment of these contracts. Now, the contractor when he makes a bid naturally takes a risk. It is a gamble with him as to what service he will be required to perform under the contract. That is the natural risk of any contractor, and when they bid prior to June 30, of course, they did not know that we would enter into the war. I think that it was all right to make the adjustment if the increased costs were not covered. I think that was considered by Congress at the time this original legislation was passed. But by July 1, 1918, they had been in war conditions, and I don't think that readjustments should be made after that period.

If you will let me refer to a memorandum—I think the reason June 30, 1917, was the date specified was this: Because the contracts entered into beginning July 1, 1918, were entered into after we had entered the war, and the contractor knew at the time he submitted the bids that the country was engaged in war, and should have taken that into consideration in submitting his contracts, and that was the reason that the contracts entered into prior to June 30, 1917, were entered into before there was any declaration of war.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that that is what they brought up before the conference committee, that these bids were invited before the contract was dated.

Mr. MADDEN. That is right; it is pretty hard to remember the details of all those things.

Mr. KOONS. That is the reason June 30, 1917, was fixed, and the cost did not mount immediately, and for that reason the service that was to be rendered after the approval of that bill was the date fixed.

STATEMENT OF MR. GEORGE L. WOOD, DIVISION OF RURAL MAILS.

Mr. WOOD. A star-route contract is a funny thing, and a star-route contractor is a still funnier thing. I have gotten things from star-route contractors that you could see tears all over the page. The children were barefooted in the wintertime, and the contractor was wearing a straw hat in the wintertime, "and for God's sake do something for us." They asked more money, however, than I thought they ought to get,

so I advertised the route, and those same contractors would come back and bid less under the new advertisement than they were getting before-hand, and they would get the contract awarded at less money, too.

I am opposed to any modification of the law that would raise the date a year to contracts made prior to July 1, 1918. There is altogether too prevalent an idea, and it is very common, that nobody should lose money on Government contracts. That is inherent—that nobody should lose money on a contract for the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the star routes?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; and I am reactionary on this.

Mr. MADDEN. It has become more common since the war began than ever before.

Mr. WOOD. It is very common—the belief that nobody should lose money on a Government contract—but I don't believe that we should look at it that way.

Now, while we are all sitting here together, I want to show you a typical case. This is Mr. SINNOTT's great case, on which he has written letter after letter, and letter after letter. I am just going to read an extract on how this man came to make his contract: "I had never made any inquiries of any former stage drivers as to the general outlay and expenses, nor had I ever even driven a car to have any personal knowledge of the cost of upkeep of touring cars."

That is the way he came to make the contract. That is the gist of his complaint. "When I put in a bid, I only bid \$1,100 for the first-class mail, but I was perfectly green as to the expenses of operating such a line, as I had never talked to any carriers to get their opinions or figures, nor had I ever driven a car to know what ordinary car expenses were. Consequently I find myself going behind every month, and I can't possibly stand it."

Now, this contract was made in 1918, by the way, early in 1918, right after the war began. He simply bit off more than he could chew.

Mr. MADDEN. What do you do in a case like that?

Mr. WOOD. I hold him to his contract, of course.

Mr. MADDEN. He knew the conditions?

Mr. WOOD. He knew the conditions; he knew every one of them.

Mr. MADDEN. He knew all the conditions, except how fast an automobile would run and how many tires it would use up and how much gasoline it would take and how much oil it would take and how much mail he had to carry, or anything about it. He just made a bid.

Mr. WOOD. Now, every star-route bid contains this—and it is not hidden away in small type:

"This proposal is made in my own interest and not by me as the representative of another person or company, and with full knowledge of the distance over the route, the weight of the mail to be carried, and all other particulars in reference to the route to be served."

That is in the bid that the man signs when he makes it; and it is in the advertisement.

Mr. MADDEN. Suppose he can't read; then what about it?

Mr. WOOD. He is in a pretty bad way, anyway, if he can't read.

The CHAIRMAN. That is about all we want to know. As I understand it, the department is not in favor of any bill to readjust the compensation of star-route contractors?

Mr. WOOD. Beyond what is already law.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, in a new law?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. KOONS. And the same about screen wagon.

The CHAIRMAN. And the same thing you have stated about screen-wagon service. So that eliminates those two. Now, what else is there in here? We have covered star routes and vehicle service.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, that is the most absurd, unreasonable, argumentative excuse that I have ever heard on the floor of this House for not doing a man's duty.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] admits that the star-route contractors are now facing bankruptcy, and such is the fact. He admits that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] introduced a proper bill to adjust the matter, and thus save these star-route contractors from ruin, and the bill was before his committee, and that he had the Postmaster General before him, and yet he says that because, forsooth, the Postmaster General, in his opinion, would not obey Congress, he virtually threw the gentleman's bill in the wastebasket and did not do anything more about it. And thus he denies all relief to these deserving star-route mail contractors.

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

Mr. BLANTON. No; I can not yield. I say, it is absurd, ridiculous, unreasonable.

I do not yield. The gentleman has argued himself out of court here for the last five minutes. I say what the gentleman should have done was to report out that Sinnott bill and have Congress pass it, and then if the Postmaster General did not carry out the mandate of this Congress we would know how to attend to him, would we not?

Mr. JUUL. What would the gentleman do to him? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I will tell you what I would do to him. He is from my State, and he is my friend, and he is the most efficient officer in this Government. [Laughter and applause.] But if he were to disobey the mandate of Congress I would vote to kick him out so quick that it would make his head swim. [Applause.] Cabinet officers do not often disobey the mandates of Congress. You should pass that bill and authorize the Postmaster General to adjust these contracts with the star-route carriers, every one of whom is facing bankruptcy now, and I will guarantee that the contracts will be adjusted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment to Francisco Montefredini for legal services and expenses in the matter of the claim of the United States Government for coal on German steamship *Waltrante*, at Brindisi, Italy, \$800, and the value of 3,860.41 lire at the time actual payment is made, in all not to exceed \$1,500.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. To whom did this attorney render these services, and why should the Government pay him?

Mr. GOOD. He rendered these services to the United States, and collected, as I recall, about \$25,000.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The appropriation, of course, does not set out any of the facts.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The accounting officers are authorized and directed to allow the claim of Edward Fraser, Leavenworth, Kans., for \$21 for expense of repair of damage to his automobile by automobile belonging to the penitentiary.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee has this claim been passed on by the Claims Committee of the House?

Mr. GOOD. It has been examined by the Department of Justice and recommended.

Mr. CALDWELL. I know, but has it been investigated by the Claims Committee of this House? These things as a usual rule are referred to the Claims Committee.

Mr. GOOD. The Claims Committee of the House does not have jurisdiction of an item of this kind. This is a deficiency.

Mr. CALDWELL. This is a collision claim.

Mr. GOOD. This is just a credit. It is a paper balance, practically to correct a bookkeeping item.

Mr. CALDWELL. But this is to pay a claim of \$21 for the expense of repairing a private automobile.

Mr. GOOD. The claim has already been paid.

Mr. CALDWELL. I know; but they had no right to pay it.

Mr. GOOD. It was a claim that originated with regard to an automobile accident.

Mr. CALDWELL. I understand that; and that is the reason why it should go to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GOOD. And the claim was paid, but the auditing department have refused to allow the account. Now, this is simply the method that is usually taken in matters of this kind.

Mr. CALDWELL. All right.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

The cash allowance of \$5 and the clothing allowance of \$12, now authorized by law for prisoners on discharge from the United States penitentiaries, are increased during the fiscal year 1921 to \$10 and \$20, respectively.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this item. What is the idea of legislating an increase in the cash and clothing allowance to prisoners on discharge from the United States penitentiaries?

Mr. GOOD. The present allowance, as the gentleman is aware, is \$5 in cash and \$12 worth of clothing for prisoners who have served a term in a United States penitentiary upon their discharge. The Department of Justice feels that the present allowance is so small that it does not furnish a discharged prisoner with clothing suitable for him to go upon the streets and travel any distance, and that under the present rates for subsistence the allowance of \$5 would perhaps lead a man to go out and steal if necessary before he would get to his home. The matter was seriously urged by the Attorney General, and it seemed to us that in the interest of good morals, if not good administration, it ought to be allowed. It is true that it is legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. The \$12 that used to buy a good suit of clothes would not buy a good teddy bear now.

Mr. GOOD. It might buy a necktie.

Mr. WALSH. I make a point of order against this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY.

General expenses, Bureau of Biological Survey, including the same objects specified under this head in the Agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$36,271.50.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this paragraph. I should like to have the chairman explain it.

Mr. GOOD. This expense was incurred in feeding the elk that during the latter months of the winter and the early spring are

under the jurisdiction of this department. There was a great shortage in forage, and it was necessary to buy hay in large quantities, 576 tons, to keep the elk from starving. The hay was purchased and the herd was preserved, with a loss, I think, of about 8 or 10 per cent in number. The money was actually paid out and it is an actual deficit to that amount.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is an increase of \$36,271 in general expenses of the Biological Survey. It relates to a matter included in the annual appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. At the time the officials of the bureau appeared before the committee they made no claim for additional money, as I remember it, and the committee recommended and the House approved of the same amount of money for this item of general expense for the bureau that was appropriated the year before, following the general policy of the committee to recommend no increases unless absolutely necessary, the idea being that each line of work as far as possible should be kept on a level with the present conditions.

Following the recommendation of the department, when the bill was under consideration and after the hearing of the testimony, the committee recommended, and the bill carried, and the House approved of the amount of last year, which was \$34,600.

Evidently the officials of the bureau thought some additional money was necessary, because later they went before the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate and secured an increase of \$5,135, bringing the total up to \$39,735, and that was all they wanted at that time for expenses under this item.

The committee heard nothing about this additional amount. No testimony was given before the committee relating to it. I wish to know if it is properly a deficiency; therefore, I reserve the point of order so the gentleman from Iowa may explain it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I wish to reserve the point of order for a moment.

Mr. BLANTON. I demand the regular order.

Mr. GOOD. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That it is not a deficiency; it is an increased appropriation for the current year.

Mr. GOOD. That is a rather novel and new point of order that the gentleman is suggesting to the Chair. I do not recognize those as legal objections to an appropriation.

Now, what are the facts? The gentleman has been talking about an appropriation for the fiscal year 1921. The facts in this case are these: There was an appropriation for this service of \$718,000 for this bureau this year. Out of that appropriation the Secretary of Agriculture, who had charge of 8,000 elk out in this locality known as Jackson Hole, Wyo., made an allotment of \$45,000, because a severe snowstorm came on and it was necessary to preserve the herd of elk. These elk are under the charge of the Secretary of Agriculture. He is charged with the care and preservation of animals of this kind. He allotted out of that appropriation \$45,000 for keeping these elk and preventing them from starving. There was a natural loss of elk of 500 out of 8,000. He has actually paid out the money or obligated the fund for the purchase of hay to feed the elk during the latter part of the winter and spring, all of which is authorized by law, and there is no question about there being a regular deficiency authorized by the act itself.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The truth of the matter is the gentleman's committee—the Committee on Agriculture—did not have jurisdiction.

Mr. GOOD. Of course not; it is a deficiency for this year, and the Committee on Agriculture did not have jurisdiction of that.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCER. I call for the regular order.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman remembers that the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming—

Mr. TINCER. I call for the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON (continuing). Got an appropriation of \$25,000 to feed the elk, and then he got another appropriation of \$25,000 to feed the Wyoming elk, and now he wants \$45,000 as another Wyoming deficiency.

Mr. GOOD. This is a different herd of elk. That was a herd in the northern part of the State.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if it is not a deficiency, it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The appropriation by the Congress was made a year ago. This property belongs to the Government, and under the law it is placed in charge of the Secretary of

Agriculture. Now, if this is subject to a point of order then the original appropriation would be subject to a point of order on the Agricultural appropriation bill. It is necessary to feed these elk, and the way to get rid of them and the expenditure in regard to them is to let them all die. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman from Michigan will read the provision of the current Agricultural act he will find the same provision with regard to the Biological Survey; where it is provided:

For the maintenance of the Montana bison range and other reservations and for the maintenance of game, etc., on public lands.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is made under a particular item for general expenses.

Mr. GOOD. Of course.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In the appropriation bill you will find, on page 65, an appropriation for general expenses. In my judgment the department has pursued an unusual course, although not unusual in some other departments.

Officials go before a committee and ask for money to enable them to carry on work for the next fiscal year, and the committee determines what amount is necessary and reports it to the House. A certain amount of money is then appropriated, and the department is limited to that amount in carrying on its work. Then some officials disregard that, and instead of planning their work on a scale—

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to his point of order; he is discussing the merits.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am not. I am talking to the point of order. If this is not a deficiency, but is an expenditure made in carrying on work on a larger scale than was justified by the appropriation, it is subject to a point of order. This is a deficiency bill and only real deficiencies can be provided for. If I am wrong, then I do not understand what a deficiency bill is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order against the paragraph under the Bureau of Biological Survey, general expenses, that it is not a deficiency.

The reading of that paragraph is as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Biological Survey, including the same objects specified under this head in the Agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$36,271.50.

On turning to the Agricultural appropriation act for the current year the Chair finds that under the Bureau of Biological Survey there was an appropriation made of \$686,300. The point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan is that this item making an appropriation for the same objects specified under this head is not a deficiency. The Chair is unable to rule that it is not a deficiency. Where there has been an appropriation for a particular item in the current law, and the committee comes in with an additional sum submitted upon an estimate of the department and states that it is a deficiency, how is the Chair to find that it is not? It is impossible in such circumstances for the Chair to determine whether or not it is an actual deficiency. In the view of the Chair it is a deficiency in a parliamentary sense, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. TINCER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I make this motion at this time for the purpose of remarking that there is considerable merit in the contention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] that the departments have a system of presenting their claims to one committee and getting a raise in the appropriations by going to other committees. That is one reason why I insisted upon voting for the budget system, which every Member of this House can clearly see eliminates any possibility of a duplicate appropriation, such as is claimed in this case. It will eliminate that system of the departments asking for all they can get from one committee and then practically appealing to another committee for a deficiency. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

For Signal Service of the Army, \$15.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call the attention of the chairman to the fact that he has an item under the head of "Claims allowed by the Auditor for the War Department" on page 50, and then he has another one in another place, and then he has one on page 56. Why do you just scatter them around that way over the place?

Mr. GOOD. There were two different documents. One was sent to the Senate after the House had acted upon the last deficiency bill, and the department sent that to the Senate. The Senate did not act upon these items, and as this committee considered the audited claims and judgments we took under

consideration all that had been certified either in the Senate document or in the House document.

Mr. CALDWELL. I notice each line has a different item, and they are practically duplicates as to words but differ as to amounts.

Mr. GOOD. But they are not duplicates at all.

Mr. CALDWELL. I say they are duplicates as to words but differ as to amount. I presume the committee has carefully gone over and checked them up so as to see that there is no duplication?

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely. The documents to which they refer give the names of each applicant and the amount of the claim, and there is no duplication. The committee has checked them up and can give the gentleman the absolute information if he requests it.

Mr. CALDWELL. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I would like to ask the gentleman, line 5, page 55, in reference to the item, "Total audited claims, \$125,303"; is that the total of the preceding items or an additional appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. That is the total amount that is carried in the bill that was specified in the Senate document.

The Clerk read as follows:

For books for judicial officers, \$10.56.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in the print I have, in line 20, the word "officers" should be corrected. It is misspelled.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE AUDITOR FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.
For railroad transportation, \$210,263.17.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is a considerable item in a deficiency bill for railroad transportation, \$210,000, under claims allowed by the Auditor for the Post Office Department, several times larger than that carried under a similar item on page 54. Is this made necessary owing to the change from paying for transportation of the mail on a space basis rather than by weight?

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will take House Document No. 766, second session, Sixty-sixth Congress, and look at page 36, he will find several pages enumerating small claims of railroads—I suppose about 200 or so—which were incurred for services rendered in 1917. The appropriation for that year has lapsed, and the total is this amount.

Mr. WALSH. Then it is a matter properly to be charged against the great surplus that we were told they had in 1917 in the Post Office Department?

Mr. GOOD. I think in this case there was enough money appropriated for that year to pay these claims, but whether or not in making that statement the Postmaster General took his actual expenditures and did not take into consideration these claims, I do not know. Of course, if he did not take into consideration these claims, some of them must have been pending. If he did not take them into consideration, the surplus would be reduced to the extent he did not take them into consideration.

Mr. STEENERSON. If the gentleman will permit, the surplus is determined by the difference between the audited expenditures and the audited receipts. This not having been paid at the time, the surplus would be diminished by this amount.

Mr. WALSH. Now, can the chairman of the committee state why these claims were not paid, the money being available for them?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose that in many cases there was some delay in presenting the claim, but the auditor, writing me under date of May 25, 1920, said:

In compliance with your request I have to report that none of the claims certified by this office and reported in Senate Document No. 222 and House Documents Nos. 606 and 766, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, represent deficiencies. In every case sufficient funds were provided by Congress, but the appropriation had lapsed and the balances had been carried to the surplus fund prior to the submission of the claim to this office for settlement.

Mr. WALSH. I am very glad to have the gentleman read that document and in his explanation corroborate the claim of the gentleman from Minnesota, which he has made here several times with reference to this alleged surplus on the part of the Post Office Department.

This should properly be deducted from any claim for surplus for that year. I understand the gentleman agrees with that.

Mr. GOOD. I understand it so.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman agrees with that provided it was taken into consideration?

Mr. GOOD. I understand it was taken into consideration.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. How does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. GOOD. I understand that from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. The item certainly was not audited as an expenditure during that fiscal year, because if it had been it would have been paid out of the appropriation, which they say was ample. Therefore it must have been audited and allowed since the surplus was stated.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Clem's statement is that it has been paid. If the amount had been carried in the surplus fund, of course it was not taken into consideration, and if taken into consideration the surplus fund would have been that much more.

Mr. BLANTON. If it is absolutely necessary to wipe out the surplus of the Post Office Department, which is the only department which has a surplus, before we get to the convention we will agree to wipe it out on paper and go on and pass the bill.

Mr. WALSH. It is only a part of what is claimed.

Mr. BLANTON. The surplus is there.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Texas, and another Member of this honorable body, and a gentleman who presides over a department of the Government, state and claim the surplus is there, and it is just such items as these that come staggering along two or three years later which lead one to believe that these surpluses after all may be a myth.

Mr. BLANTON. If we had time to get the Postmaster General's explanation, he would explain this item.

Mr. WALSH. The Postmaster General can explain most anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 14 for the purpose of offering an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to return to page 14 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 14, after line 9, insert:

"FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION.

"The Federal Power Commission is hereby authorized, within the limits of its appropriations and to the extent that the work under its direction can not be economically or practically performed through the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture, to employ such expert, technical, clerical, or other personnel in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as may be necessary for the proper performance of its duties."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is not germane.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the gentlemen will withhold that for a minute.

Mr. CALDWELL. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. I will say that I have a letter signed by the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Agriculture, the three Secretaries that are intrusted with the administration of this act, calling attention to this fact: The act has recently been passed, but by some oversight no authority was given to use any funds carried in the act, and there is only one officer that can administer this law.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. I have submitted the letter to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT], who had charge of this legislation. They assure me that this or something like this is necessary. It is legislation—

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOOD (continuing). But I think it is absolutely necessary that something be done, and if we do not do it in this bill we will have to bring in some other resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] withdrew their reservations of the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I would like to ask the gentleman how is it that this commission contend that they are without authority to function after this carefully prepared law was considered by the conferees for so long? And my recollection is that there was a provision made in there for this commission's expenses and operation.

Mr. GOOD. There is no authority for the employment of the necessary personnel.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman let me explain that?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. ESCH. The water-power act contained these words:

The work of the commission shall be performed by and through the Departments of War, Interior, and Agriculture, and their engineering, technical, and other personnel, except as may be otherwise provided by law.

The contention made by the three Secretaries is that if the personnel of the three departments is to be utilized for the carrying out of the water-power act it would deprive those departments of that personnel, and therefore the work to which they are allotted would remain undone. We thought when we framed the bill there was sufficient personnel in the three departments to carry out the provisions of the water-power act. They claim now that they should have further clerical and expert help. It is not an increase of the appropriation. They have to act within the limit of \$100,000 that we have already appropriated.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the provision.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] wish to be heard?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to return to page 2 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to return to page 2 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what amendment it is he desires to offer?

Mr. GOOD. I send the amendment to the Clerk's desk in order that it may be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, after line 11, insert:

"ANTHRACITE COAL COMMISSION.

"For salaries and expenses of officers, employees, and witnesses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, purchase of supplies, printing and binding, reporting proceedings, per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4, in accordance with the act approved August 1, 1914, and for all other necessary expenses in connection therewith; in all, \$10,000, to continue available until June 30, 1921."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Iowa through?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. GARRETT. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not exceeding 10 minutes, not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for not exceeding 10 minutes, not in order. Is there objection?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I ask that at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks I may proceed out of order for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee should know upon what subject either of these gentlemen wishes to speak.

Mr. GARRETT. So far as I am concerned, I desire to make a very brief response to a remark made in the course of debate a few days ago by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] in regard to Mr. B. M. Baruch. I have advised the gentleman from Illinois of my purpose so to do. He told me that he could not be present.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Well, reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the committee should know what the gentleman from Kansas is going to speak on.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I wish to speak on the soldiers' adjusted compensation.

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, was objection made to my request? Did the gentleman object to both requests?

Mr. WALSH. I made objection to both requests because the gentleman from Kansas made your request conditioned upon the granting of his.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not propose to object to the gentleman from Kansas speaking, but it is hardly fair, inasmuch as we are not intending to discuss the same thing, to tie our requests together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I object.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Too late!

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I reserved an objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was fairly liberal and repeated the request a number of times.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I reserved an objection, and the gentleman repeated his request, and I renewed it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to get the attention of the Chair for some time. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. I tried for some time to get the attention of the Chair. If the Chair will not recognize us we will adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. CRAMTON. I was on my feet, trying to get the attention of the Chair for the purpose of making objection to that speech at this time in the night.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair repeated a number of times the words, "Is there objection?"

Mr. CRAMTON. If the Chair had looked in this direction he would have seen me on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire, of course, to impose on the courtesy of the House, and I regret that it is necessary to proceed with even apparent objection. But it seems to me that the remark of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] a few days ago, in regard to a private citizen who rendered to his country very great service in its hours of stress and strains, deserves a response. It was my purpose to respond to it at the time, but I had only a very limited time, and I was unable to reach the subject.

The gentleman from Illinois said on the 27th of May—and this appears on page 7753 of the Record:

I want fair play. I am willing to vote to have your Attorney General bring suit against Barney Baruch, the chief man, the closest man to the President of the United States, who stole \$50,000,000 in copper alone.

That statement was made, of course, under the constitutional privilege of a Member of the House. Mr. Baruch has absolutely no recourse by which to defend himself against this direct charge of speculation in this tremendous amount. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read in my time a letter which I have received from Mr. Baruch.

Mr. CRAMTON. I object.

Mr. GARRETT. This letter is addressed to me, and says:

NEW YORK, June 1, 1920.

HON. FINIS J. GARRETT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GARRETT: On page 7753 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27 the following occurs:

"Mr. MASON: * * * I want fair play. I am willing to vote to have your Attorney General bring suit against Barney Baruch, the chief man, the closest man to the President of the United States, who stole \$50,000,000 in copper alone. * * *"

Under our Constitution there is guaranteed to each man life and liberty. Neither is worth having without character and reputation. When a man, especially a Member of the Congress, makes a statement such as Mr. MASON made upon the floor of the House, he should be so certain of his facts that there can not remain a scintilla of a doubt as to their truth; otherwise he unjustly besmirches reputation, a man's chief possession, and that which all men hold dearest. As Mr. MASON said, I, too, want fair play.

I am writing to ask you to demand of Mr. MASON that as he made that statement under the protection the Constitution gives the Congress, he should do either one or two things: He must use his utmost ability both as a Member of the Congress and as a private citizen to see that I am prosecuted to the limit of the law, if he be right; and, if he be wrong, he must make an apology as full as was his charge. I am not making this for myself alone; I am asking it in the interest of justice. No one guilty of theft from the Government should be permitted to escape.

[Mr. GARRETT here read from the letter a sentence, which he subsequently withdrew.]

Very truly, yours,

BERNARD M. BARUCH.

[Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the words in the last sentence of the letter be taken down.

Mr. WINGO. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman has no right to demand that the words be taken down. The gentleman had a right to object to the reading of the letter. The rule applies to the words of Members themselves, and

there is nothing in the rule which says that a quotation from somebody else may be taken down.

Mr. GARRETT. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this statement was not made under privilege, and that the gentleman [Mr. MASON] will have his recourse in the courts, if he desires it, against Mr. Baruch.

I read further a letter written by Mr. Baruch to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan insist on the words being taken down?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the rule:

If a Member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the Member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Chair hold that a Member getting consent to proceed out of order for a certain length of time comes within the provisions of the rule respecting words spoken in debate?

The CHAIRMAN. If they be improper words to utter.

The gentleman asked permission to speak out of order. Nevertheless, the Chair would hold that the gentleman would not have unlimited liberty. Therefore if the words were not proper to be uttered, the gentleman could be called to order. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read the words.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language is not contrary to the rule.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask this question—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will make his inquiry.

Mr. BROWNE. When a Member reads the remarks of another person, does he not really appropriate those remarks to himself? Or, in other words, can a Member of this body get up here and read slanderous words concerning a Member of this House written by some one else and still not come within the rule? If he can, if the gentleman's contention is correct, then it is a very easy thing for a Member to get some irresponsible person to slander a Member of this House and then read the words.

Mr. WINGO. My point was on something else.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is clearly right; that could not be done.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, may I make this observation? It was clearly within the rights of the gentleman from Michigan or any other Member to object to the reading of the letter. The general observation made by the gentleman from Wisconsin that a Member of the House could procure a statement to be made by anyone on the outside and read that and use it against any Member of the House of course could not be done.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from Michigan had the right to assume that the letter which would be read by the gentleman from Tennessee was a defense of Mr. Baruch rather than a personal attack on the integrity and character of a Member of the House. The fact that it was such an attack was not apparent until the words had been read. I had not seen the letter and did not know until the words were uttered, and it became apparent that in the absence of one of the oldest Members of the House, toward midnight, words derogatory to that Representative were uttered and I objected to the words appearing in the Record of the House.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I think I can settle this. I am willing to let those words be taken out of the letter. I assume no responsibility for the words and I do not express them as my sentiments, if that is what is intimated by the gentleman. I did assume the responsibility for reading the letter, but I do not want to violate any rules of the House.

Now, I will read a copy of the letter addressed to Mr. MASON by Mr. Baruch.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I will object to the reading of the letter.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman can not object to my reading of the letter. He can object to the Clerk reading it.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is objection the Chair will have to submit it to the House.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Tennessee is proceeding under permission of the committee, out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the rule:

When the reading of a paper other than one upon which the House is called to give a final vote is demanded, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined without debate by a vote of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the objection was not made when the gentleman proceeded to read, and the objection can not be made after.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the gentleman can proceed, with the approval of the House.

The question is, Shall the gentleman from Tennessee be permitted to read the paper in question?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMTON) there were—ayes 75, noes 14.

Mr. GARRETT. I will read the letter:

JUNE 1, 1920.

Hon. WILLIAM MASON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: My attention has been called to the charge made by you against me on the floor of the House of Representatives, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27, 1920, reading in part as follows: "I want fair play. I am willing to vote to have your Attorney General bring suit against Barney Baruch, the chief man, the closest man to the President of the United States, who stole \$50,000,000 in copper alone."

I demand that you submit at once to the Congress and to the Attorney General the evidence which prompted you to make this statement. A course short of this would make you particeps criminis. In justice, therefore, to yourself, to the Government, and to myself, I demand that you immediately present your evidence, and that I be immediately brought to the bar of justice and condemned to punishment if found guilty, and exonerated, if innocent, from the infamous and malicious charge you make against me.

Very truly, yours,

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. BEE. On what subject?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. On the future compensation of soldiers.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I object.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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 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, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

There was no demand for a separate vote, and the amendments were agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. GOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR RECLAMATION OF LANDS IN OREGON.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 14101) providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14101) providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized within his discretion to continue to not beyond October 21, 1930, the segregation of the lands embraced in approved Oregon segregation list No. 11, under the Carey Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I think we can take this up better to-morrow when we will have time to discuss the matter. It is pretty late and we have been here since 11 o'clock this morning. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman object to taking up two or three little bridge bills to-night?

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, the time is about to expire and I think this bill ought to be passed now.

Mr. GARD. How many of these bills have we?

Mr. SINNOTT. I just have this one.

The SPEAKER. There were two or three bills allowing bridges to be constructed, which should be passed, and the Chair thought they would be brought up to-night.

Mr. GARD. Why not take them up in the morning?

The SPEAKER. We shall be very much pressed for the next few days.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we have been here 12 hours now.

The SPEAKER. So has the Chair.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? Does the gentleman from Ohio withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. GARD. If we are to have only two or three uncontested bills, I do not want to stand in the light of objecting to having the bills passed, although we have been here for 12 hours now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair intended to recognize Members to present bills only which he was perfectly confident there would be no objection to. The Chair does not think contested bills ought to come up for consideration at this hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk again reported the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ALLEGHENY RIVER, CITY OF PITTSBURGH.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13976) to amend an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk has reported. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if the gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to bring up the Mason resolution.

The SPEAKER. He is not.

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

Mr. GALLIVAN. Does the Chair speak for himself or for the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

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

Mr. GALLIVAN. Did the Chair speak for himself or for the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

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

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan withhold that for a moment?

Mr. CRAMTON. If we are going to pass bridge bills, I will withdraw it; but if we are going to discuss international and home politics, I insist upon it.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I think we may as well make the point of order at this time.

Mr. PORTER. I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection.

HOOR 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?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS ALLEGHENY RIVER, CITY OF PITTSBURGH.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan insist upon the point of order that there is no quorum present?

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, I withdrew that, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," be, and the same is hereby, amended so that the time within which the actual construction of said bridge may be commenced is

hereby extended for a period of two years, and the time for the completion of said bridge is hereby extended for a period of four years from the date of the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved February 27, 1919, to be built across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, in the county of Allegheny, and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are hereby extended two and four years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

"Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River, at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ALLEGHENY RIVER NEAR MILLVALE, PA.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, H. R. 13977.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13977) to amend an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Millvale borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of an act approved February 27, 1919, entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Millvale Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," be, and the same is hereby, amended so that the time within which the actual construction of said bridge may be commenced is hereby extended for a period of two years, and the time for the completion of said bridge is hereby extended for a period of four years from the date of the approval of this act.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge, authorized by act of Congress approved February 27, 1919, to be built across the Allegheny River, at or near the borough of Millvale, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, are hereby extended two and four years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

"Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when was authority given to build the bridge?

Mr. PORTER. February 27, 1919.

Mr. GARD. And it was to be completed in what time?

Mr. PORTER. It must begin within a year under the general bridge act of 1906.

Mr. GARD. It has not been begun as yet?

Mr. PORTER. In the case of the Millvale Bridge, plans have been prepared and approved by the War Department, and they are about ready to begin the work.

Mr. GARD. The bill now provides that it shall be begun in two years and completed in four years. Is that right?

Mr. PORTER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was again reported.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read as follows: "A bill to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Millvale Borough, in the county of Allegheny, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. There are five supply bills out that are yet to go to the enrolling clerk. Is that department going to have plenty of time between now and Saturday at 4 o'clock to arrange all of these bills?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think these bills interfere.

Mr. BLANTON. These bills will not interfere?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. GARD. I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House resolution 533.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio should either make his point of order or withdraw it.

Mr. GARD. I made the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. There is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Thursday, June 3, 1920, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting further communication in connection with proposed legislation authorizing the President to present certain ordnance and ammunition to the Portuguese Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of requested legislation for the approval of action taken by the War Department for the relief of flood sufferers at Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting notice for contest of a seat in the House of Representatives for the Sixty-sixth Congress for the fifth district of the State of Wisconsin and transmitting original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto (H. Doc. No. 803); to the Committee on Elections No. 1 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. HAMILTON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14122) to authorize the sale of a portion of the Copper Harbor Range Lighthouse Reservation, Mich., to Houghton and Keweenaw Counties, Mich., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1086), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

My VOLSTEAD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the 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, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1087), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TILSON, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14368) to provide revenue, encourage domestic industries, and make provision for the national defense by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition in the sale of aeroplanes imported into the United States, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1088), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14208) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1089), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HUSTED, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report (No. 1090) on the actions of the Attorney General relating to the price of Louisiana sugar, pursuant to House resolution 469, which said report was referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 132) for the relief of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.; the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co.; and the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1091), 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 (H. R. 13051) to add certain lands to the Lemhi National Forest, Idaho, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1094), which said bill and report were referred to the House 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. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 14366) to reclassify salaries of laborers in class C, Customhouse Division, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 14367) to provide short-term credit for the farmers of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 14368) to provide revenue, encourage domestic industries, and make provision for the national defense by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition in the sale of aeroplanes imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 580) as substitute for the League of Nations covenant; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: Resolution (H. Res. 581) that the Interstate Commerce Commission be directed to furnish the House of Representatives with certain information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 582) to investigate the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRAMTON: Resolution (H. Res. 583) amending the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 584) providing for the consideration of House concurrent resolution 57; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 374) regarding exploration for oil in territory controlled by England; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the compensation of United States postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 14369) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Bogner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 14370) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14371) granting a pension to William Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14372) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Pentz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENHAM: A bill (H. R. 14373) granting an increase of pension to John B. Wayman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 14374) granting a pension to Dustin D. Elsie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 14375) granting a pension to Sarah A. Mentzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 14376) granting a pension to Mae M. Ulrich; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 14377) granting a pension to Jennie A. Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14378) for the relief of John Dzikowicz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 14379) granting a pension to Cathern Whitaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 14380) granting an increase of pension to May A. Chorpennig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 14381) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 14382) for the relief of the Delaware River Lighterage Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14383) granting a pension to Mary L. Cox; 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:

4058. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Sacramento Church Federation, Sacramento, Calif., favoring a mandate over Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4059. Also (by request), petition of the general conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the extension of the prohibition law to the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4060. By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of postal employees of York, Pa., opposing the report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Postal Salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4061. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of numerous residents of Glenville, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 10925; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4062. Also, petition of numerous residents of Schenectady, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 1112; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4063. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of board of directors of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring increased postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4064. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Merchants Association of New York, favoring increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4065. By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: Petition of A. R. Doten and other residents of Massachusetts, desiring the passage of House bill 1112, introduced by Mr. RAKER, providing for the parole of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4066. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, favoring increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4067. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Teachers' Union of New York, favoring increased salaries for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4068. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of sundry citizens of Paris, Biteley, and vicinity, in the State of Michigan, protesting against compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4069. Also, petition of retail trade committee of the Manistee (Mich.) Board of Commerce, protesting against the McNary bill (S. 4285), "requiring the branding of the manufacturer's selling price on shoes transported in interstate commerce, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4070. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Saline County, Nebr., protesting against the policy of the United States land office at Lewistown, Mont., in withholding final certificates and patents from homesteaders; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

4071. By Mr. MAHER: Petition of Americans of Ukrainian descent, asking for investigating committee to relieve suffering in the Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4072. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Commercial Electrolytic Corporation, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring increased postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4073. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of L. A. Hageman, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and the National League of Postmasters of the United States, favoring increases in postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4074. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York and sundry other organizations and citizens, favoring increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4075. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Harry Glover and E. E. Watts, secretary Railway Mail Association, favoring increased postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4076. By Mr. RODENBERG: Petition of East St. Louis Lodge, No. 2, of St. Louis Yardmen's Association, asking that the Labor

Board recognize the yardmen's association; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4077. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 3, 1920.

(Legislative day of June 2, 1920.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AT WASHINGTON TERMINAL.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Out of order, I ask leave to submit a Senate resolution, and I ask that it may be read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 382) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate the conditions of the Washington Terminal, in the District of Columbia, its management, treatment of its employees, working conditions, wages paid, sanitary equipment, and any other matters relating to said Washington Terminal the committee may deem it advisable to look into.

The said committee is authorized to take testimony relating to said matters and may summon before it any and all persons, and have brought to it for its consideration all necessary papers, books, and records deemed necessary; and for this purpose subpoenas may be issued, if necessary, to produce the attendance of witnesses, books, and papers, to be served by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate; that said committee may act through the full committee or any subcommittee appointed thereby, and may sit during the sessions of the Senate or during the recess; and it shall report its findings and recommendations to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the committee has general authority to make the investigation and employ a stenographer, and the resolution will involve no additional expense. I ask that it may go to the Committee on the District of Columbia, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

CALLING THE ROLL.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Harding	McKellar	Robinson
Brandegge	Henderson	McLean	Sheppard
Calder	Jones, Wash.	McNary	Simmons
Capper	Kendrick	New	Smoot
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Norris	Thomas
Comer	Keyes	Nugent	Townsend
Dial	King	Page	Trammell
Fernald	Knox	Philips	Walsh, Mass.
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Pittman	Watson
Gay	McCormick	PoinDEXter	Wolcott
Gerry	McCumber	Pomerene	

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

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. HALE, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. WARREN answered to their names when called.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. STERLING, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. REED, and Mr. PHELAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

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

MAGNESITE ORES.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I call up the motion coming over from a previous day that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5218) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of magnesite ore and manufactures thereof in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the pending question.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to have the Senate dispose of the adjournment resolution. I ask the Chair kindly to lay before the Senate the resolution from the House touching final adjournment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I should like to have the adjournment resolution disposed of, but I yield for a moment.