5839. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the National Shoe Wholesalers' Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5840. By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of Racine, Wis., requesting an amendment to the Volstead Act, permitting the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines; also protesting against the McKellar bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5841. By Mr. RIDDICK: Petition of citizens of Gallatin, Mont., and Park County, Mont., protesting against an increased duty on wrapper tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5842. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Glenfield, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5843. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Bangor, Franklin County, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5844. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Willsboro, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5845. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Clinton, Clinton County, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5846. By Mr. VAILE: Petition of the Altar Society of Denver (Colo.) Cathedral, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5847. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the Farm Bureau members of Grand Forks, N. Dak., protesting against proposal to place duty on lumber imported from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5848. Also, petition of the Knights of Columbus of Minot, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 17, 1921.*

(Legislative day of Monday, February 14, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

COLD-STORAGE FOODS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] if he will not kindly consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business and let us dispose of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9521) to prevent hoarding and deterioration of and deception with respect to cold-storage foods, to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes. I do not believe it will take very much time. I know of no opposition to it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no objection to taking up several such matters which ought to pass and which have not been acted on up to date. I can not consent to anything that will lead to prolonged discussion. I desire to get the Post Office appropriation bill through just as rapidly as possible. I recognize the importance of the conference reports and that they have the right of way. Unless there is some objection, I shall ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the conference report referred to by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I thank the Senator. I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the so-called cold-storage bill be taken up for consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9521) to prevent hoarding and deterioration of and deception with respect to cold-storage foods, to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, 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 House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'United States cold storage act.'

"SEC. 2. Whenever used in this act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, corporation, or association;

"(b) The term 'commerce' means commerce among the several States or between any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and any foreign nation, or between any Territory or the District of Columbia and any State, or between any Territory and any other, or between any Territory and the District of Columbia, or within any Territory or the District of Columbia, or between points in the same State, but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign nation;

"(c) The term 'cold storage' means the storage or keeping of any article of food at or below the temperature of 45 degrees above zero (Fahrenheit) in a cold-storage warehouse; but does not include the first 10 days of the time during which the article of food is so stored or kept;

"(d) The term 'article of food' means—

"(1) Meat, meat products (including all edible portions of food animals), poultry and game, whether drawn or undrawn, poultry products, game products, fish, fish products, shellfish, oysters, and clams—if fresh, cooked, prepared, cured, or frozen;

"(2) Eggs or portions thereof—if in shell, dried, or frozen.

"(3) Butter, oleomargarine, lard, lard substitutes, butter substitutes, and cheese;

"(4) Oils for food purposes; and

"(5) Milk, evaporated or powdered—

but does not include any such article not intended or designed for food purposes which is plainly and conspicuously marked in such manner as correctly to show the fact in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe;

"(e) The term 'cold-storage warehouse' means any place, including a car, vessel, or other vehicle, in which the temperature is artificially cooled to or artificially maintained at or below 45 degrees above zero (Fahrenheit); but does not include a place used exclusively for storage of any article of food for the sole use of the occupant, owner, or maintainer thereof (1) for consumption by himself or his family or guests, or (2) in his business of serving meals, or (3) in connection with his retail business only, except that such place shall, in respect to any article of food held therein for more than 30 days in connection with such retail business, be deemed a cold-storage warehouse for the whole of the period of storage therein of such article;

"(f) The term 'warehouseman' includes any person maintaining or operating a cold-storage warehouse; and any person who rents and controls a room or space therein; and

"(g) The term 'mark' includes stamp, brand, tag, and label, and the term 'marked' includes stamped, branded, tagged, and labeled.

"SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to ship, deliver for shipment, sell, or offer for sale, in commerce, any article of food that is or has been in cold storage, or to hold in cold storage in commerce any article of food, or, having received in commerce, to sell or offer for sale in the original, unbroken package any article of food that is or has been in cold storage, unless such article of food is plainly and conspicuously marked, in accordance with this act and the regulations thereunder, in such manner as correctly to show (1) the words 'Cold storage,' except that these words may be removed immediately preceding a sale for consumption before the expiration of 30 days following the date when such article of food was first placed in cold storage, (2) all the dates when put in and when taken out of cold storage, except that if the Secretary of Agriculture finds it to be commercially impracticable to mark any article of food with the exact date, the day, but not the month or year, may be omitted, in which case the date when the article of food is placed in cold storage shall for the purposes of this act be deemed the first day of the month, and (3) the names and locations of all the cold-storage warehouses in which stored, or suitable distinguishing designations thereof approved by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose.

"(b) If any article of food which is required by subdivision (a) of this section to be marked is subdivided, or is in or is placed in a container, or is transferred to a different container, the person who is liable under this act for any failure to have such article of food marked shall mark the subdivision or the container thereof in the same manner as provided by subdivision (a).

"(c) If (1) an article of food that has not been held in cold storage is mixed or mingled with an article of food, whether or not of the same kind, that is or has been held in cold storage, or (2) the containers of such articles of food are mixed or mingled, or (3) an article of food that is or has been held in cold storage is mixed or mingled with an article of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

food, whether or not of the same kind, that is or has been held in cold storage during a different period of time, or (4) the containers of such articles of food are mixed or mingled, then for the purposes of subdivisions (a) and (b) of this section and for the purposes of section 6 the dates required to be placed upon the article of food, if any, resulting from such mixing or mingling, or upon the containers so mixed or mingled, and from which the 12 months' period referred to in section 6 is to be computed, shall be those of that one of such articles of food which was first placed in cold storage, and the names and locations of cold-storage warehouses shall be those of all such warehouses in which each of such articles of food is or has been held in cold storage.

"SEC. 4. If the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the proper and customary manner of handling any article of food is such that it is commercially impracticable to mark the same or the container thereof in accordance with this act, the person otherwise required under this act to have the same so marked shall furnish or display, as the Secretary of Agriculture may require, to the receiver of such article of food a written statement, or an invoice or bill of lading or other shipping document, which shall describe such article of food, shall correctly state the facts otherwise required by this act to be marked, in the manner prescribed in the regulations under this act, and shall be preserved and be subject to examination by an officer, employee, or agent duly authorized under this act, for such reasonable length of time as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary for the purposes of this act; except that, in the case under this section, of a sale at retail to the consumer, the facts required by clauses (2) and (3) of subdivision (a) of section 3 may be omitted unless otherwise requested by such consumer.

"SEC. 5. Except as otherwise permitted by this act, it shall be unlawful for any person (a) to alter, mutilate, destroy, obscure, obliterate, or remove any mark required by this act to be placed on any article of food or the container thereof, while it is in commerce or, having been transported in commerce, remains unloaded, unsold, or in the original, unbroken package; or (b) to alter, mutilate, destroy, obscure, or obliterate any statement, invoice, or document or portion thereof required to be furnished or displayed during the time the same is required to be preserved under section 4.

"SEC. 6. It shall be unlawful for any person to ship, deliver for shipment, sell, or offer for sale in commerce, or to hold in cold storage in commerce, any article of food, or having received in commerce, to sell or offer for sale in the original, unbroken package any article of food after the expiration of 12 months following the date when such article of food was first placed in cold storage; except (1) that the Secretary of Agriculture may in such instances in respect to frozen eggs and portions thereof as he deems advisable extend such period of time to not more than 18 months following the date when such eggs or portions thereof were first placed in cold storage, and (2) that the above provisions of this section shall not apply to cheese held for the purpose of ripening and improving the quality thereof.

"SEC. 7. The provisions of sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 shall not apply to any article of food shipped or sold or delivered for shipment to any foreign country, if in respect to the requirements of such section the article of food complies with the specifications and directions of the purchaser or consignee in such foreign country and is not in contravention of the laws of such country; but if the article of food be not actually exported, this section shall not exempt such article of food from the operation of sections 3, 4, 5, and 6.

"SEC. 8. (a) No person shall receive in commerce any article of food for cold storage after the cold-storage warehouse in which it is to be stored is found by the Secretary of Agriculture, after due notice and hearing, to be insanitary or otherwise unfit for the storage of any such article of food. Such finding shall remain in force until the Secretary shall, after further hearing, determine that such condition has been remedied.

"(b) No person shall receive in commerce any article of food for cold storage in a cold-storage warehouse if such person has refused inspection, when requested under this act, of such warehouse; nor shall any person ship in commerce any article of food if he has refused inspection of such article of food when requested under this act.

"SEC. 9. In order to carry out the provisions of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture or any officer, employee, or agent specifically authorized by him in writing for the purpose may, on any business day during the usual hours of business, enter any cold-storage warehouse which receives, or from which is shipped or delivered, any article of food, in commerce, and may inspect such warehouse and the contents thereof, and any statements, books, papers, letters, or documents relating thereto.

"SEC. 10. (a) In order to carry out the provisions of this act and to provide information for the Congress, every warehouseman shall keep such records and accounts and make such reports, in such manner or form, verified under oath or otherwise, monthly and at such other times as the Secretary of Agriculture may require, as to the amounts, kinds, and ownership of any foodstuffs received, held, transported, or delivered by such warehouseman, loans made by such warehouseman upon the security of such foodstuffs, charges made by such warehouseman for storage and other services rendered by him, and the size or capacity of his warehouse. Any information obtained by the Secretary of Agriculture under this act shall be available for the use of either House of Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause such information as may be of public interest to be published from time to time.

"(b) No person shall willfully (a) fail or refuse to make full and true entries or make any false entry in the accounts or records of his business required to be kept pursuant to this section, or (b) alter, mutilate, conceal, or destroy any such account or record, or (c) make any report required under this section which is false or fraudulent in any material particular, or (d) fail or refuse to make any report required under this section.

"SEC. 11. No person shall willfully hinder, obstruct, or resist the Secretary of Agriculture or any duly authorized officer, employee, or agent, in the performance of his duties under this act.

"SEC. 12. Any person who violates any provision of sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, or 16 shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment not more than one year, or both. After judgment of any court with respect to any violation of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture may give notice thereof by publication in such manner as he by regulation may prescribe. A person shall not be prosecuted for any violation of sections 3, 4, or 6, resulting from the act, omission, or failure of any other person not acting for or employed by him, prior to the time when the article of food involved came into his possession or control, if he shows that such violation was not knowingly committed by him and also (except in such cases as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary and advisable and shall by regulation prescribe), establishes a written guaranty signed by such other person who shall be a resident of the United States, from whom he obtained the possession or control of such article of food, to the effect that such article of food has not been in cold storage or that, if it has been in cold storage and is apparently marked or represented in accordance with subdivision (d) of section 2 or sections 3 or 4, the marks or representations are true. The guaranty shall contain the address of the person required to sign it and such person shall be amenable to the prosecution, fine, penalty, or imprisonment which would otherwise attach to the person to whom he delivered the possession or control of the article of food.

"SEC. 13. (a) When construing and enforcing the provisions of this act, the act, omission, or failure of any person acting for or employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, within the scope of his employment or office, shall in every case also be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such individual, partnership, corporation, or association as well as of such person.

"(b) If any person acting for or employed by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association negligently or willfully omits personally to perform any necessary act or properly to supervise or apportion duties among his subordinates, in the execution of the authority or functions vested in him, and by reason of such omission a violation of this act directly results, he shall be liable to all the penal and other provisions of this act with respect to such violation; but nothing in this subdivision shall be held to relieve the individual, partnership, corporation, or association from such provisions.

"(c) The provisions of this section shall be held to extend and not to limit the application of sections 37 or 332 of the act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States,' approved March 4, 1909, as amended.

"SEC. 14. (a) Whenever in the case of any article of food being offered for importation, the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any provision of this act is being violated with respect to such article of food, he shall give due notice and opportunity for hearing thereon to the owner or consignee and certify such fact to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall thereupon (1) refuse admission and delivery to the consignee of such article of food, or (2) deliver such article of food to the consignee pending examination, hearing, and decision in the matter on the execution of a penal bond to the amount of the full invoice value of such article of food, together with the duty thereon, if any, and to the effect that on refusal to return such article of food for any cause to the Secretary of the Treasury

when demanded, for the purpose of excluding it from the country or for any other purpose, the consignee shall forfeit the full amount of the bond. (b) If, after proceeding in accordance with subdivision (a) of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture is satisfied that any provision of this act is being violated with respect to such article of food, he shall certify the fact to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall thereupon notify the owner or consignee and cause the sale or other disposition of such article of food refused admission and delivery or entered under bond, unless it is exported by the owner or consignee within three months from the date of such notice, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. All charges for storage, cartage, or labor on any such article of food which is refused admission or delivery or is entered upon bond shall be paid by the owner or consignee.

"SEC. 15. Whenever it appears that any article of food in cold storage in commerce is in such condition that it is likely immediately to become or is unsound, unwholesome, or unfit for food, the Secretary of Agriculture may cause the immediate seizure of such article of food and thereupon shall at once cause notice of the facts to be given to the United States district attorney for the district in which the article of food is seized. Such district attorney shall proceed without delay against such article of food in any court of the United States in such district for confiscation by process of libel for condemnation. If in the opinion of the court the article of food is in such condition that it is likely immediately to become or is unsound, unwholesome, or unfit for food, it shall be immediately disposed of by destruction or sale as the court shall direct, but such disposition shall not be contrary to any law of the United States, or of the State, Territory, or District where such destruction or sale takes place. The proceeds of any sale under this section, less legal costs and charges, shall be paid to the person entitled thereto. The proceedings in such libel for condemnation shall conform as nearly as may be to proceedings in admiralty and shall be at the suit and in the name of the United States. For the purposes of this section the Secretary of Agriculture may cause investigations, inspections, analyses, and tests to be made and samples to be collected of any article of food in commerce. The Department of Agriculture shall pay to the person entitled, upon his request, the reasonable market value of any such samples.

"SEC. 16. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to designate in writing specifically officers, employees, and agents of the Department of Agriculture to administer oaths for the purpose of this act. All such officers, employees, and agents are authorized and empowered to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit for the purpose of this act, or for use in prosecutions or proceedings thereunder. Any such oath, affirmation, or affidavit, authenticated by the official seal of the Department of Agriculture, shall, when offered for use in any proceeding under this act or in any court of the United States, have like force and effect as if administered or taken by or before the clerk of such court, without further proof of the identity or authority of such officer, employee, or agent. No such officer, employee, or agent shall demand or accept any fee or compensation whatsoever for administering or taking any oath, affirmation, or affidavit under the authority conferred by this act.

"SEC. 17. For the enforcement of this act the sum of $200,000 is hereby appropriated, to be available until expended, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the Secretary of Agriculture (a) is authorized to prescribe and promulgate such regulations as may be necessary; (b) may cooperate with any department or agency of the Government, any State, Territory, District, or possession, or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or any person; and (c) shall have the power to appoint, remove, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, not in conflict with existing law, and make such expenditures for rent outside the District of Columbia, printing, telegrams, telephones, law books, books of reference, periodicals, furniture, stationery, office equipment, travel, and other supplies and expenses as shall be necessary to the administration of this act in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

"SEC. 18. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage; but no penalty, fine, forfeiture, or imprisonment shall be enforced for any violation occurring within 90 days after its passage.

"SEC. 19. No provision of this act shall be deemed to repeal or limit the operation of any provision of any other act of Congress, unless directly in conflict therewith.

"SEC. 20. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to certain circumstances is held unconstitutional, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to circumstances other than those as to which it is held unconstitutional shall not be affected thereby."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"An act to prevent hoarding and deterioration of, and deception with respect to, cold-storage foods; to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate and foreign commerce; and for other purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

A. J. GRONNA,
E. D. SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
G. N. HAUGEN,
J. C. MCLAUGHLIN,
JAMES YOUNG,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

GREAT FALLS POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the other day I had referred to the Committee on Printing a resolution providing for the printing as a Senate document of the report of Maj. Tyler on the proposition of the development of power at Great Falls. Yesterday the Federal Water Power Commission sent a communication to the Senate which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, in which they approve the report of Maj. Tyler. This morning I desire to have referred to the Committee on Printing a resolution which I will ask the Secretary to read having in view the printing of the report of the Federal Water Power Commission in connection with the report of Maj. Tyler. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The resolution (S. Res. 452) was read and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the Federal Water Power Commission on the development of hydroelectric power on the Potomac River for the supply of electricity and water for governmental and other purposes in the District of Columbia be printed as a public document, in connection with the report of Maj. M. C. Tyler on the same subject.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Congress convened on the first Monday in December. The first important measure——

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HARRIS. I wanted to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the first important measure passed by the House of Representatives was what is called the Johnson immigration bill. It was passed within a week after Congress convened by a vote of 295 to 41. Members of Congress were fresh from the campaign, fresh from the homes of the people, and knew what they wanted. The first important measure which went through was the Johnson immigration bill. It reached the Senate on December 13. It was sent to the Committee on Immigration, and instead of giving it immediate consideration the committee held hearings and only within the past few days has the bill been brought before the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What does the Senator desire?

Mr. HARRIS. What I want is an agreement to vote on the immigration bill, if I can get it. I have not taken up much time of the Senate, less than any other Member of the Senate, but here is a bill that is of the greatest importance to the country. There are thousands, yes, millions, of immigrants trying to get into this country, and they are bringing the dread disease typhus and other diseases.

The people of the country want the bill passed, and yet in the congestion of legislation there is danger of its being lost. I think the Senate, if necessary, ought to meet at 10 o'clock in the morning and stay in session until 10 o'clock at night to avoid this jam.

If there is going to be any blame for the failure of appropriation bills to pass, do not blame those of us who are interested in the immigration bill. We are just as much interested as anyone in getting the appropriation bills through Congress.

I was pleased to see that President-elect Harding urged the Congress to get the appropriation bills through. But here is the difference: The appropriation bills do not take effect until June 30, and we can, if necessary, let some of them go over until the special session, but the immigration bill, if it goes over, will be delayed 90 days at least, and we will have coming into this country tens of thousands more of these immigrants who

are undesirable. What I would like to get is unanimous consent for a vote on the immigration bill, if necessary by holding night sessions, not later than Saturday.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall have to object to the consideration of any other matter now while we have the Post Office appropriation bill before the Senate, although I am quite as much in favor of prompt action as is the Senator from Georgia. But the way to get prompt action is to proceed to the business before the Senate. These matters can not be disposed of, apparently, unless we waste a lot of time in talking about other matters which are not pertinent to the bill before the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator knows that the Senator from Georgia has not in the past taken up the time of the Senate by making long speeches, and he does not propose to do so in future. I do not believe in long speeches. They do not change any votes. We have had speeches lasting for hours and delaying pressing business of the Senate, when the Senators making the speeches knew that not a vote would be changed. Every Member of the Senate knows how he will vote on the immigration bill. The people of the country wish the bill passed, and their wishes ought to be considered by the Senate of the United States. I am going to do everything in my power to get the bill through, and if any of the appropriation bills are defeated it will be because the Members of the Senate are not willing to let us consider this bill that is so important.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Michigan, before he takes his seat, why we can not get a unanimous-consent agreement that we will vote on the immigration bill at a certain time, and thus we can dispose of it. It should be voted on, because if we do not vote on it at an early date it will not become a law. It is one of the bills that dies on the 4th of March, of course, although it has passed the House. We ought to vote on it. May I ask Senators on the other side of the aisle if they will not agree to a unanimous consent that at some day, three or four or five days from now, we may vote on the immigration bill and the amendments thereto?

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to suggest that as far as the immigration bill is concerned the request ought to be delayed until the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], the chairman of the committee, or the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], who, I think, is on the subcommittee, is in the Senate. They will be here in a little while, and the matter can be taken up again at that time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to put the Senate on notice that if we do not get a vote on the immigration bill, there are some other bills that are going to be considered thoroughly in the Senate. We are passing appropriation bills here in a day that we ought to consider for weeks, and the hearings ought to be gone into by the Senate. I am willing to let those bills and others go through without proper consideration, but I do not believe in letting just as important bills be turned aside because there happens to be a few Senators who are opposed to them.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, since the Senator from Georgia is not only a Senator but a censor of the Senate, I venture to suggest that there are measures other than the one which interests him which other Senators would like to have considered. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who is not on the floor at this time, doubtless would like to have unanimous consent for a vote upon the minimum wage bill immediately to precede or immediately to follow the vote upon the immigration bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Why does not the Senator from Illinois suggest that we agree on a day for voting on that measure?

Mr. McCORMICK. Certainly the Senator from Mississippi would not have me act in the absence of the Senator from California? If the Senator from California will prefer the request, I shall heartily second it.

I venture that it is not Senators on this side of the Chamber alone who have occupied the time of the Senate, either by the offer of amendments or by the discussion of bills. Let me add that the Senator from Georgia forgets that no less authority than the author of Congressional Government remarked that discussion in Congress was addressed not only to the Members of Congress but to the country.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I did not intend to start any partisan debate, but the Senator is unnecessarily sensitive. I did not say a word about Members on that side of the aisle. The chairman of the committee is on that side, and there are members of the committee on that side of the Chamber who are just as anxious to get the measure voted on as I am. The Senator from Illinois is going a little too far when he suggests that I am a censor of the Senate. I do not believe there is another Member of the Senate who believes anything of the kind. If I can do so, I am going to have a vote on the immigration bill. I believe the country is entitled to it and I think the Senate ought to legislate on that question.

Mr. President, there is already a large number of unemployed people in this country due to business depression which has followed the World War. The problems confronting this country in our economic reconstruction are so great and serious that it is inadvisable to permit further the wholesale immigration of aliens.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not present when the request was made in reference to a vote on the immigration bill, and I only desire to say that I think it is of the utmost importance that we should come to some agreement to vote upon that bill. I hope that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], who is now here, and the other Senators who are on the Immigration Committee will take steps to bring about such an agreement as soon as possible.

NONMILITARY MATERIALS OF WAR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 404).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report, in response to Senate resolution 426, of January 21, 1921, as to quartermaster stores, property, and materials of nonmilitary character under the control of the War Department, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 405).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Postmaster General submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of $200,000, required by the Post Office Department for printing and binding for the fiscal year 1921, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT PRINTING AND BINDING, 1921 (S. DOC. NO. 406).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of $76,000, required by the Interior Department for printing and binding for the fiscal year 1921, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ACCOUNTS OF ARTHUR P. CARSON (S. DOC. NO. 407).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of $514.26, to enable the proper accounting officers of the Treasury to credit that sum in the accounts of Arthur P. Carson, cashier of the insurance division of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Massachusetts, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1921.

Ordered, That the General Court of Massachusetts is in favor of the creation or designation of some agency of the Federal Government with full power to ascertain facts and disseminate information and to regulate and control the production, sorting, grading, transportation, and distribution of coal to the several States to secure so far as possible a sufficient supply of coal of good quality at reasonable prices to the consumers in the several States; and be it further

Ordered, That copies of this order be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted February 2, 1921.
In the senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 4, 1921.
A true copy.
Attest: F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. WILLIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Miller City; sundry citizens of Millersburg; Anna Frint, president, Society Nanebevzete Bl. B. Marie, of Cleveland; Mrs. Mary Hessoun and Mrs. Bessie Esner, of Cleveland; Catholic Ladies' Club, of Cleveland; Society of Strose, of Cleveland; Society of St. Ludmil, of Cleveland; St. Procops Young Men's Club, of Cleveland; St. Joseph's Society, of Cleveland; Society of St. Barbara, of Cleveland; Society of St. Anna, of Cleveland; St. Catherine Society, of Cleveland; Josephine Reinick, president, Branch 408, L. C. B. A., of Fremont; Cincinnati Chapter, Knights of Columbus, of Cincinnati; Painesville Council, No. 947, Knights of Columbus, of Painesville; William J. Anthony, president, Owensville Society of Men, of Batavia; Holy Name Society of Painesville; the president and staff of St. Ignatius College, of Cleveland; Branch No. 750 of Catholic Knights of America, of Fort Recovery; Catholic Women's League, of Colum-

bus; and the presiding officers of the German-American Catholic District League, of Cleveland; all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented memorials of the National Council of Catholic Women of the National Catholic Welfare Council, of Seattle, Wash., and the faculty and students of Mount St. Michaels, of Hillyard, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MYERS presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Montana, ss:

I, C. T. Stewart, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of an act entitled "Senate joint memorial No. 1," enacted by the seventeenth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by Joseph M. Dixon, governor of said State, on the 12th day of February, 1921.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 12th day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.] C. T. STEWART,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 1.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

Whereas the Yellowstone River, which flows for about 460 miles through the State of Montana, drains Yellowstone Lake, in the Yellowstone National Park, in the State of Wyoming, and gets its main water supply therefrom; and

Whereas Yellowstone Lake is at altitude of 7,741 feet above sea level, and is a catchment basin for a drainage area of more than 1,600 square miles, which drainage area is subject to a heavy winter snowfall; and

Whereas in the spring and early summer months this deep covering of snow on the drainage area is rapidly melted by the warm winds and spring rains, and in a few days runs into the said lake, causing its level to be raised rapidly to 6 feet above the low-water mark; and

Whereas the rise in the level of the lake causes a heavy increase in the flowage of the Yellowstone River draining therefrom, such increase in flowage amounting to more than thirty times the low-water flowage of said river; and

Whereas this great increase in the volume of river flow constitutes a flood, which flood, on certain years does a property damage along the 460 miles of river in Montana, and which flood runs out each season prior to the time the water of the river can be used for irrigation purposes; and

Whereas an estimate of this property damage shows it to have been upward of a million dollars in a single season; and

Whereas there is now irrigated from the Yellowstone River, by canals taken therefrom, upward of 250,000 acres, inclusive of the area under the Huntley and Lower Yellowstone Federal reclamation projects; and

Whereas after the surplus waters have run out of the lake and gone to waste as a flood, the volume of flow in the river becomes so depleted that there occurs a period of water shortage, such period of water shortage in the season of 1919 having caused a crop loss of approximately $4,000,000 to the farmers along said valley, a part of which loss was suffered by the farmers under the said Federal reclamation projects; and

Whereas in addition to the lands already irrigated by canals from the Yellowstone River, there are vast areas of fertile but arid land that can still be reclaimed by canals taken from said river, provided a sufficient water supply to serve such canals can be furnished during the irrigation season; and

Whereas the construction of a small masonry dam across the Yellowstone River at or near its point of outlet from Lake Yellowstone, in the Yellowstone National Park, will serve the threefold purpose of—

First. Preventing a major portion of the damage due to floods that originate in this lake.

Second. Hold back and conserve in storage a sufficient volume of water to furnish an adequate supply to the canals already taking water from said river, including the Federal reclamation projects at Huntley and Lower Yellowstone.

Third. Furnish a sufficient additional supply of water to make possible the irrigation of at least 250,000 acres of the arid land not now under irrigation; and

Whereas the 250,000 or more acres of arid land that can be reclaimed, provided a supply of stored water is afforded, are almost entirely in the hands of settlers, which settlers are abandoning said lands, permitting them to revert to grazing lands with the loss of improvements already thereon because such settlers are unable to successfully farm said lands without a supply of irrigation water; and

Whereas a masonry dam sufficient to accomplish the purposes herein recited need be only high enough to maintain the level of Lake Yellowstone at its mean high-water mark, 6 feet above its mean low-water mark; and

Whereas such a dam can be so constructed as to serve as a bridge for foot and vehicular traffic, which bridge is badly needed to replace the present dilapidated pile structure known as the Fish Bridge; and

Whereas the construction of such a dam will in no wise injure or mar the scenic beauty or attractiveness of Yellowstone National Park but will be an added attraction therein, and will, in addition, so equalize and regulate the flow of the Yellowstone River that the beauty of the falls of the Yellowstone and Grand Canyon will be greatly enhanced; and

Whereas the construction of such a dam is not in the interest of any power development, nor is any structure other than the dam itself required in Yellowstone Park to accomplish the desired purpose; and

Whereas the State of Montana, or an association of irrigation districts organized or to be organized under the jurisdiction of the said State will construct and maintain such dam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Seventeenth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, That we do hereby petition and earnestly pray the honorable Congress of the United States for the passage of Senate bill 4529, being a bill for the erection and maintenance of a dam across the Yellowstone River, in the State of Wyoming; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to each Member of the honorable Congress of the United States in session assembled.

NELSON STORY, Jr.,
President of the Senate.
PERCY F. DODDS,
Speaker of the House pro tem.

Approved February 12, 1921.

JOS. M. DIXON, *Governor.*

Filed February 12, 1921, at 4.30 o'clock p. m.
C. T. STEWART, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have a letter from the faculty and students of Mount St. Michaels, of Hillyard, Wash., in opposition to the Smith-Towner bill. I request that it be read to the Senate. It is very brief, and I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary may read it.

There being no objection, the letter was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

MOUNT ST. MICHAELS,
Hillyard, Wash., February 9, 1921.

The Hon. MILES POINDEXTER,
1750 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are the accredited representative in the United States Senate of the voters of the State of Washington, and it is because we rely upon your absolute faithfulness to the trust confided to you that, as Americans, we appeal to you to serve the best interests of State and Nation by defeating the Smith-Towner educational bill, which we protest against as irrevocably opposed to the principles of American democracy.

Reasons for rejecting the bill are numerous. Chief among them is the fact that the proposed bill will tend to make the individual States more and more reliant upon the Federal Government and to destroy that nice balance of interests and powers which is the unique glory of our governmental system. Centralization of power is un-American, and as Americans we protest against it.

A second grave defect in the proposed bill is the fact that, even in its amended form, it leaves in the hands of a political appointee, secretary of education, the decision whether or not State school programs are meeting the requirements of the Federal board. On this decision depends the disbursement of the Federal millions, so that practically in one man will be vested the power of an educational czar. The man that holds the money strings is the man that wields the power.

For these and for numerous other reasons, honorable Senator, we expect your uncompromising opposition to this Smith-Towner bill in its present dangerous and un-American form. With interest shall we follow the progress of the bill in Senate and House, and with special interest and confidence look for your rejection of it.

Will you kindly have this protest read before the assembled Senators?

Sincerely, yours,

PAUL P. LAUER
(And many others).

Mr. ASHURST. I present a joint memorial unanimously adopted by both houses of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, and I ask that it may be read by the Secretary.

The Assistant Secretary read the memorial, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 3.

STATE OF ARIZONA,
FIFTH STATE LEGISLATURE.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Fifth Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully represent:

Whereas from the most remote period our country has been famed in every land and on the seven seas as the home of the free and the haven of the politically persecuted of the world; and

Whereas from Russia, Austria, and Japan; from the Occident and the Orient—Christian, Jew, and pagan, has sought asylum from oppression and reached a harbor of safety when once under our flag; and

Whereas aside from the merits or demerits of the greater question involved the Hon. Donal O'Callaghan, lord mayor of Cork, Ireland, is now within the confines of the United States, having embraced the only possible opportunity offering, to appear as a witness before the committee of one hundred now investigating affairs in Ireland; and

Whereas the Federal Government, through its accredited officials, propose to deport to Great Britain the said Donal O'Callaghan, lord mayor of Cork: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Fifth Legislature of the State of Arizona, That it is its sentiment that such deportation is contrary to the traditions of our country, and said legislature most earnestly hopes and desires that some solution may be found that will not require the said Donal O'Callaghan to leave the United States except on his own volition; that said legislature does not wish to be understood as protesting against the enforcement of law, but feels that some solution other than deportation can be found; that if the law technically demands deportation, Congress and the President should see that future laws do not require the deportation of such an one as the said Donal O'Callaghan.

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial and these resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States; the President of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to Secretary W. B. Wilson, of the Department of Labor; to Secretary Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State of the United States; to Hon. MARCUS A. SMITH and HENRY F. ASHURST, Senators from Arizona; and to Hon. CARL HAYDEN, Representative from Arizona.

Passed the senate February 2, 1921, by the following vote: Ayes 19, nays none, absent none, excused none.

H. B. WILKINSON,
President of the Senate.
ROY N. DAVIDSON,
Secretary of Senate.

Adopted by the house February 3, 1921, by unanimous vote.

P. C. KEEFE,
Speaker of the House.
OSCAR ZAPF,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Approved February 3, 1921.

THOMAS E. CAMPBELL,
Governor of Arizona.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of Arizona this 5th day of February, A. D. 1921, at 9 a. m.

ERNEST R. HALL,
Secretary of State.
By JOHN McK. REDMOND,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. ASHURST presented a memorial of the Legislature of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures, as follows:

FIFTH LEGISLATURE, REGULAR SESSION,
STATE OF ARIZONA.

Senate memorial 1, introduced by Senator MacMillin.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialist, the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Arizona, in regular session convened, respectfully represents:

That there are 10 cities and towns in the State of Arizona in which gas devoted to commercial, industrial, and domestic purposes is manufactured exclusively from petroleum or its products;

That to a considerable extent the electricity manufactured and sold in the State of Arizona is produced from apparatus using petroleum or petroleum products as fuel;

That the price of petroleum and its products necessary to the manufacture of gas and to the production of electricity over a period of many months has been subject to frequent increases, and there is reason to believe that further increases are contemplated;

That efforts have been made on a considerable scale by individuals to reclaim arid land by the employment of pumping equipment designed to use certain products of petroleum, the present price of which is in effect prohibitive and the supply inadequate and uncertain;

That artificial gas and electric energy for industrial, commercial, and domestic purposes are necessities;

That the prices charged by producers or distributors of artificial gas and electricity are subject to the control and jurisdiction of a State regulatory body and are maintained thereby at reasonable levels;

That the cost to such producers and distributors for fuel oil and its products is rapidly approaching a point at which gas rates will be prohibitive and gas service discontinued entirely, with resulting loss to investors in Arizona public utilities and with great inconvenience and distress to the people of Arizona;

That the price of petroleum and its products to producers and distributors of electric energy is reaching an amount where resulting electric rates are likely to be such as to seriously curtail commercial activities and the mining of gold and other metals in the State of Arizona and such reclamation of arid lands as depend upon electric power for operating pumps;

That the reclamation of arid lands is advantageous not only to the individual engaged in such reclamation but also, through increased farm products, to the Nation;

That the price which may be exacted for petroleum and its products used in the manufacture of gas and the production of electric energy is beyond the control of the individual States and the State of Arizona; and

That the necessities of the State of Arizona and of the other States similarly situated require that Congress take such action as may be necessary to regulate and maintain at reasonable and proper levels the price of petroleum and its products used in the manufacture of gas, in the production of electric energy, and for agricultural and other essential industrial purposes.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully and urgently prays that such action be had by Congress as may be necessary to effect the proper, just, and expeditious relief to the people of Arizona and her sister States, that their development may not be retarded.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

And it is hereby ordered by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Arizona that engrossed copies of this memorial be sent to the honorables the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, Secretary of the Interior, Federal Trade Commission, Senator-elect Ralph H. CAMERON, Senator ASHURST, Senator SMITH, and Representative HAYDEN.

Passed the senate January 31, 1921.

H. B. WILKINSON,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

ROY N. DAVIDSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN. I report back with amendments from the Committee on Appropriations the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 803) thereon. I shall endeavor to call up the bill either to-day or to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13225) providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 805) thereon.

COAL INDUSTRY.

Mr. GAY presented his views, being a minority report to the report of the Committee on Reconstruction and Production with respect to its recommendations regarding the coal industry, which was ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 666.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 5014) granting an increase of pension to Helen F. Lasher; and

A bill (S. 5015) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Elizabeth Holton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 5016) for the relief of Anna Volker; to the Committee on Claims.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS IN CHINA.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, there are some 40,000,000 people starving in China. The farmers of the country have donated a number of millions of bushels of corn and other material, the railroads have donated the transportation, the railroad men have offered their services free for the transportation of corn and other cereals, and the local and terminal elevators have agreed to assist. The China Relief Association and the Farm Federation of Bureaus are all working on the proposition. The foods can be gotten to the Pacific coast free, and the proposition is to get them from there on.

I desire to introduce a joint resolution and have it go to the Committee on Appropriations. I think possibly it can be made a matter of instruction to the Shipping Board to convey to China these food products.

By Mr. KENYON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 260) appropriating $500,000 to convey cereals for the relief of China; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. KEYES submitted an amendment proposing to create a bureau of aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $25,000 for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in cooperation with the University of California, intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $10,000 for the conduct of investigations in the development and standardization of methods of preservation of Pacific coast fishes, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had been heretofore signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 12157. An act to amend an act of Congress approved June 30, 1913;

H. R. 13606. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 14311. An act to authorize the improvement of Red Lake and Red Lake River, in the State of Minnesota, for navigation, drainage, and flood-control purposes;

H. R. 15011. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to offer for sale remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 15131. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Troy, in the county of Rensselaer, and the city of Cohoes, in the county of Albany, State of New York;

H. R. 15271. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Majestic Collieries Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River, at or near Cedar, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky.; and

H. R. 15750. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River, in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Burnham, in said county.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhue, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4582) to declare Bayou Cocodrie non-navigable from its source to its junction with Bayou Chicot.

The message also returned in compliance with the request of the Senate with the accompanying papers the bill (S. 4205) to amend section 4, chapter 1, of Title I of an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, as heretofore amended by section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 86 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, to provide for additional judges, and for other judicial purposes," approved March 3, 1909, and for other purposes.

DISTRICT COURT FOR ALASKA.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4205) to amend section 4, chapter 1, of Title I of an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, as heretofore amended by section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 86 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, to provide for additional judges, and for other judicial purposes," approved March 3, 1909, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KELLOGG. I now move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to know what are the amendments.

Mr. KELLOGG. I will state what the point is. The Senate, at the request of the Department of Justice, passed a bill changing the boundaries of two judicial districts in Alaska, taking the valley along the Kuskokwim River and putting it into the northern district. After the bill was passed in the Senate, the Attorney General, in consultation with the judges of Alaska, came to the conclusion that that should be changed, and the Judiciary Committee of the House, after hearing the matter, recommended the amendments which were adopted. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate did not know the object of the amendments and simply asked that conferees be appointed. Conferees were appointed, and after considering it with the Attorney General and his two assistants and looking over the correspondence, it was concluded that the House amendments are correct. It is those amendments which we ask the Senate to accept.

The amendments of the House of Representatives were, on page 3, line 5, to strike out all after the word "point" down to and including "Territory" in line 18, and insert: "Midway between the Yukon River and the Kuskokwim River; thence southwesterly to the point of intersection of the sixty-first parallel of north latitude with the shore of Bering Sea; the said division to include all the islands lying north of the fifty-eighth parallel of north latitude and west of the one hundred and forty-eighth meridian of west longitude, excepting Nelson Island, all islands in Kuskokwim Bay, all islands in Bristol Bay, and all islands in the Gulf of Alaska north of the fifty-eighth parallel of north latitude."

On page 4, line 17, after "longitude" insert: "also Nelson Island and all islands in Kuskokwim Bay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the amendments are agreed to, and the bill as amended is passed.

THE COTTON AND WHEAT SITUATION.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to have Senate resolution 443 disposed of. It was reported favorably from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It authorizes the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, during the Sixty-sixth Congress, to make an investigation to ascertain the amount and grades of cotton and wheat now held in this country.

May I ask the Senator in charge of the present unfinished business to let us dispose of the resolution? I do not think consideration of the resolution will take any time. It is a matter of vital importance to certain interests in the country.

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

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no objection if it can be voted on at once without debate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I understood when the request for the consideration of the resolution was presented the other day the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] objected.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. He did, but I saw him afterwards, and he stated to me that while he is not in favor of the measure he will offer no objection to its consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to make an investigation, to ascertain the amount and grades of cotton and wheat now held in this country, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding $1.25 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection therewith, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I move to amend, on page 1, in line 3, by striking out the words "during the Sixty-sixth Congress." The reason why I move the amendment is because the time is very short before the end of the present Congress, and if the committee begins the investigation I should like to have it given time sufficient to complete the work, as it is of such great importance.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to state in connection with the resolution which has just been passed that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] has called my attention to the fact that in the speech which I made on presenting the resolution I said that I had been informed, or was under the impression, that Secretary Hester, of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, was also in the employ of the Lancashire Mills, or was officially connected with them. The Senator from Louisiana now informs me that Secretary Hester says he has no connection with any European concern, or business of any kind, or cotton mill on either side of the Atlantic. I desire at this time to state that I accept the statement of the Senator from Louisiana as correct and desire that it may go into the RECORD.

Mr. RANSDELL. In this connection will the Senator from South Carolina also state that when he said he had information to that effect it was not positive information, but was an inference derived from some publication which he had seen?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes, Mr. President; I had read that the reports of Secretary Hester as to cotton statistics were also published by the Lancashire and Manchester mill people. It may have been that that is where I got the impression that he also reported cotton statistics for them. It is a fact that the world does accept Mr. Hester's statements as being official, as he is looked upon as the statistician for the cotton interests of the world, in view of the fact that America produces probably 67 per cent of all the world's cotton.

Mr. RANSDELL. Let me say just one other word. Mr. Hester assures me that in all his career as a statistician, which embraces nearly half a century, he has never had any connection with the Lancashire mills, or business of any kind with any cotton mill or other concern, having devoted himself entirely to the New Orleans Cotton Exchange as its secretary and superintendent since 1871; that incidentally, many years ago, he acted as special expert for the Bureau of Internal Commerce of the Treasury Department; that in 1905 he assisted the Census Bureau, Department of Commerce and Labor, in preparing its first report on American cotton supply and distribution; that he does not yield even to Senator SMITH of South Carolina in his devotion to the cotton-producing interests of the South; and that his entire life has been spent in a constant effort to make the South its own authority on data of production and consumption of its cotton, that it may be represented in fairness and truth without prejudice and without fear or favor. I merely wish to add that these statements are entitled to absolute credence.

COOK-CUMMER STEAMSHIP CO.

Mr. SPENCER. From the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 564) to appropriate $95,000 for the relief of Henry W. Cook, Arthur G. Cummer, and Waldo E. Cummer, trading as Cook-Cummer Steamship Co., copartnership, for the loss of schooner barges *South West* and *North West*, I report a resolution (S. Res. 454) referring the case to the Court of Claims.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the resolution just reported from the Committee on Claims by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], has reference to a bill which I introduced. The Committee on Claims, instead of reporting the bill, has reported a resolution referring the matter to the Court of Claims. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 564) to appropriate $95,000 for the relief of Henry W. Cook, Arthur G. Cummer, and Waldo E. Cummer, trading as Cook-Cummer Steamship Co., copartnership, for the loss of schooner barges *South West* and *North West*, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

CONTROL OF CUBAN SUGAR CROP.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I submit a Senate resolution making inquiry of the State Department as to the recent organization of a commission in Cuba to control the Cuban sugar crop. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. It simply asks the State Department for information as to whether or not such a commission has been formed to control the sugar crop and to furnish all information in regard to the organization of the commission.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 453) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to send to the Senate any information in the possession of the Department of State showing or tending to show that an agreement has been reached for pooling the 1921 Cuban sugar crop between (1) the Governments of the United States and Cuba, or any governmental agencies thereof, (2) the Government of Cuba and any person, partnership, corporation, or association, or (3) any individuals, partnerships, corporations, or associations.

TREATY WITH COLOMBIA.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations if there is any chance of having an executive session for the purpose of considering the Colombian treaty? It seems to me that treaty ought to be disposed of before the present Congress shall finally adjourn.

Mr. LODGE. I quite agree that the treaty ought to be disposed of, but I think it is a question that will take considerable time before it can be disposed of, according to the information I have received. I may add that the treaty will not die with the end of the present Congress.

Mr. KING. I appreciate the fact that the treaty will not die, but it has been here for a long time.

Mr. LODGE. There is no desire, I will say to the Senator, to prevent the consideration of the treaty; I desire to have it acted upon; a majority of the committee have authorized the report of the treaty, but it has been in the charge of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], who is not present at this moment. He has gone into the question very elaborately and has had charge of it in the committee. I repeat that I am afraid it will involve considerable discussion.

Mr. KING. I wish the Senator would ask for an executive session for the consideration of the treaty to ascertain if we can not dispose of it at the present session.

SALARIES IN PATENT OFFICE.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday at 4 o'clock the Senate shall vote on the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11984) to increase the force and salaries in the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Patents; it has passed both Houses, and the conference report is now ready for action. I make the request, I will say to the Senate, because there are Senators——

Mr. HARRISON. Under the Senator's request there will have to be a call for a quorum.

Mr. NORRIS. No; there will not have to be a call for a quorum under the rule; the rule does not so specify in the case of such a request as I have made. I should like to have the report voted on to-day; but some Senators who are opposed to it are not present, and, of course, I do not want to have it taken up in their absence. I should like, however, to fix a time when the vote shall be taken, and I do not care whether it is the day I have suggested or any other day, provided the bill may be disposed of before the session expires. The bill has been pending for over a year; it has finally reached the last stage; and it either ought to be approved or not, because, as every Senator knows, unless acted on it will die with this session and all the work will have been done in vain.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, do I understand that the conference report to which the Senator refers is the one that was not signed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]?

Mr. NORRIS. The conference report has not been signed by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MOSES. I think that no action such as the Senator suggests should be taken in the absence of the Senator from Connecticut, and I hope he will withhold the request until that Senator is on the floor; otherwise I shall be compelled to object.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator feels that way, of course I withdraw my request. I will add that I made the request out of consideration for Senators who are not here and sought to fix the time several days in advance in order to give plenty of time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in reference to the Senator's suggestion that it would not be necessary to have a quorum of the Senate under his request for unanimous consent, I think the Senator is mistaken in his position, for, in my opinion, there is no doubt about the rule, which provides:

3. No request by a Senator for unanimous consent for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution shall be submitted to the Senate for agreement thereto until, upon a roll call ordered for the purpose by the presiding officer—

What the Senator has asked for is a final vote.

Mr. NORRIS. It is not a final vote on the passage of a bill or joint resolution. However, in view of the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], I will withdraw my request.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of taking up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no unfinished business before the Senate; it was displaced on motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] to proceed to the consideration of the measure named by him.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not so understand, and I do not believe any other Senator on the floor understood the situation in that way. I asked that the unfinished business be laid aside for the consideration of the matter in charge of the Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota moved to take up the conference report; the Chair put the question, and the motion was carried. There will be no trouble about the Senator from Michigan getting up his bill in a few moments, but the Chair has stated the record as it is.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Chair may not remember it, but I made the request I have indicated, and I did not understand that any motion had been made. I made a request for unanimous consent to lay the unfinished business aside for the consideration of the very matter which the Senator from North Dakota moved to take up.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider 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. 15130) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The conference report was read, 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. 15130) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, 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 1, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 26, 27, 28, 31, 34, 63, 65, 73, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 123, 124, 125, 126, 130, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 152, 153, 157, 163, 166, 172, 178, 179, 180, 181, 187, 192, 196, 197, 199, 207, 217, 222, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, and 256.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 18, 19, 24, 25, 29, 30, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 68, 69, 71, 74, 77, 84, 129, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 141, 142, 155, 156, 158, 161, 164, 167, 170, 171, 174, 175, 176, 177, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 188, 190, 191, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 218, 219, 220, and 221; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "clerk $1,200"; 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 lieu of the sum proposed insert "$31,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$32,240"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"For incidental and all other general necessary expenses authorized by law, including the employment of expert services where necessary, $7,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$39,740"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the number stricken out by the Senate and, on page 13 of the bill, in line 26, strike out "$8,400" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000," and, on page 14 of the bill, in line 1, strike out "$38,400" and insert in lieu thereof "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$8,000"; 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: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Northwest: For grading Thirteenth Street, Buchanan Street to Shepherd Street, $14,155."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Northwest: For paving Allison Street, Fifteenth Street to Sixteenth Street, 30 feet wide, $7,125."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Northwest: For paving Taylor Street, east of Fourteenth Street, 30 feet wide, $7,885."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Northwest: For paving the roadway of New Hampshire Avenue between Upshur Street and Grant Circle, 50 feet wide with 10-foot center parking, and the roadway around Grant Circle, 40 feet wide, with standard asphalt pavement, including resetting existing curb where required, $35,910."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$144,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$72,220"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For wiring and improving the Johnson School Building, $2,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 139: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 150: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$20,320"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 160: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 160, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 165: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 165, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$31,089"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 173: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 173, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$198,355"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 194: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 194, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 195: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$21,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments of the Senate numbered 32, 37, 39, 66, 70, 72, 91 to 122, inclusive, 127, 132, 140, 148, 149, 151, 154, 162, 168, 169, 193, 198, 205, 206, and 223.

CHARLES CURTIS,
LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
JOHN WALTER SMITH,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

C. R. DAVIS,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
J. P. BUCHANAN.
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if in the conference the Senate retained anything, for it seems to me that they have conceded everything which the other House asked?

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will read the report he will find that the House receded in just about as many items as did the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives in connection with the conference report. The Secretary will read the message.

The reading clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
February 15, 1921.

Resolved, That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32, 37, 39, 66, 70, 72, 91 to 122, inclusive, 140, 148, 149, 154, 162, 168, 169, 205, and 206 to the bill (H. R. 15130) entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes," and agrees to the same.

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$235,370."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert:

"Community center department: For salaries of directors, supervisors, teachers, clerks, and other employees for civic, educational, recreational, and social activities under the direction of the board of education; for payment of janitor service; for equipment and supplies; for lighting fixtures; for maintenance of automobile. Employees of the day schools may also be employees of the community center department; in all, $35,000, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not more than 60 per cent of this sum shall be expended for salaries of directors, supervisors, teachers, and clerks."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$31,220."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,000."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$220,800."

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 223, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert:

"SEC. 8. That the commissioners are authorized, in their discretion and under such regulations as they may prescribe, to grant not exceeding 15 days' leave of absence with pay each year to per diem employees of the District of Columbia who have been employed for 10 consecutive months or more."

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments to the Senate amendments numbered 127, 132, 151, 193, 198, and 223.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas state briefly what the amendments are?

Mr. CURTIS. Four of the amendments are with reference to certain totals, which are reduced. One is a reduction of $4,550, another makes a reduction of $29,100, and another a reduction of $120. Another amendment is in relation to the community-center provision. The Senate provision was changed by a vote of the House, so that all of the money used for community centers shall be payable out of the funds of the District of Columbia, instead of 60 per cent out of the District funds and 40 per cent out of the United States Treasury. I will state that I would prefer to have the language of the Senate amendment, but the time is so short that I think we can afford to agree, in view of the fact that I have an assurance from those in charge that not a dollar of this appropriation will be used for any purpose except educational and athletic and that none will be used to provide for dances and other activities that were strongly condemned some days ago.

The last amendment is in regard to leave of absence, not to exceed 15 days, to per diem employees of the District, the Senate provision granting it to those who were regularly employed, and the House by a vote changed the words "regularly employed" to "10 months in a year." I think that amendment should be agreed to, because the commissioners advised your committee that they considered the words "regularly employed" to mean those who were employed 10 months in the year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If these amendments are agreed to, it passes the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. It passes the bill.

Mr. KING. I understand, then, that there will be nothing that will demand further consideration by the committee of conference?

Mr. CURTIS. Nothing at all.

Mr. KING. In view of that fact I shall not resist the motion of the Senator from Kansas, although I am very much displeased with the report. I think the Senate ought not to have receded from its position with respect to the community centers.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senate did not recede, but the matter was taken to the House, and the House has amended our amendment. The bill can go back into conference, if the Senator desires, on that one question alone; but in view of the promise of those in charge that they will not use the money for any purpose other that that contained in the Senate amendment I think the Senate would be justified in taking their word for it. Those in charge of the work would hardly violate their word, because they would know that if they did their appropriation would very likely be cut off the next year.

Mr. KING. To what extent will the board of education exercise a supervisory care over these expenditures?

Mr. CURTIS. It is all turned over to them. It must be done upon the recommendation of the board.

Mr. KING. I hope the board will appreciate the criticism which was delivered against the community centers by the distinguished Members of the House who denounced the activities of that organization and condemned much of its work in the past, and I think there is much basis for the criticism in which they indulged. I want to state to the Senator now that in the next appropriation bill, if there is any proof of the pernicious activities of this organization such as has been accumulated with respect to its past activities, I shall oppose the appropriation of a single dollar for community-center work.

Mr. CURTIS. I will join the Senator if the evidence shows that this money is used for any activities of the kind complained of.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? The sites that were provided for in the bill are stricken from the bill, are they?

Mr. CURTIS. They are stricken from the bill on the ground that they were not estimated for by the department; and the House conferees refused to agree to them, after considering them for nearly a day, because they had not been submitted to them by the department.

Mr. HARRISON. Then this conference report carries no new buildings, nor does it carry any of the sites that the Senate committee and the Senate provided?

Mr. CURTIS. It carries none that were in section 9. The House did agree to two or three amendments in regard to buildings and playgrounds put in by the Senate. I want to state to the Senator from Mississippi, because he has taken a deep interest in the matter, that the Senate committee gave to the District every dollar they asked for in their estimates that came to the Congress for school purposes, including the purchase of playgrounds, and those are all retained.

Mr. HARRISON. Now, I want to ask the Senator another question. A committee representing the board of education visited Cleveland, and perhaps some other cities, viewing the school buildings and investigating the cost of erection of school buildings in those cities. Have that committee made any report to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. CURTIS. I am sorry to say they have not.

Mr. HARRISON. They have not communicated with the Senate and given the advice or the information that they gathered on that subject?

Mr. CURTIS. I am sorry to say that they have not; and I have been so busy with conference reports—as perhaps the Senator knows, I have been attending meetings every morning and afternoon on bills in conference and on appropriation bills. I have not had the time to call them up to get a report. I intend to request a report of them, because they have not made one; but I have not had time to do it.

Mr. HARRISON. It has come to me in some way, through some grapevine route or other, that the last bid on some buildings here was quite low—I think 20 cents a cubic foot.

Mr. CURTIS. I was advised over the telephone yesterday or the day before that on one of the buildings the bid was about 30 per cent lower than the amount estimated by the department and appropriated by Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. I simply desire to say that that committee representing the board of education, after making a tour—I do not know at whose expense; perhaps their individual expense—certainly ought to give to the committee in charge of this legislation the information that they gathered on the trip, so that the committee can frame some kind of legislation for the Congress to enact touching the school buildings here.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that, as chairman of the subcommittee until the end of this Congress, I shall ask that they make a report, and I shall also make an investigation with reference to the telephone communication which came to me in reference to the bid being 30 per cent less than the appropriation or the estimate.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, it is impossible for anything to be done at this time. In view of the Senator's statement, this report ought to be adopted; but the extra session of Congress will come on, and no doubt there will be a deficiency bill in that Congress. That is the Senator's opinion, I should imagine?

Mr. CURTIS. I should think so; certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. And if the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and, I take it, of the House, too, should gather sufficient information touching the erection of buildings, and that the price here has gone down sufficiently, they would make ample provision to erect some new school buildings?

Mr. CURTIS. I can not, of course, speak for other members of the committee; but I will state to the Senator so far as I am personally concerned that I think the District is greatly in need of new school buildings, and I shall use every effort I can to secure necessary legislation if the department will estimate for it; but, of course, the Senator knows it must be estimated for before the committee can do anything.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. I have not had time to read the full report. Was the business manager that was provided for, the third assistant superintendent of schools, stricken out?

Mr. CURTIS. That was stricken out.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope next time it will be admitted; and was the increase for the janitors stricken out?

Mr. CURTIS. The increase, I think, for most of the janitors was stricken out.

Mr. HARRISON. So our efforts were unavailing?

Mr. CURTIS. Unavailing.

Mr. HARRISON. I am sorry.

Mr. CURTIS. I am sorry, too.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 15441, the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15441) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with amendments.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with, and that the bill may now be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. KING. Just so we have a full reading of the bill before its final passage, I have no objection.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no objection to reading the whole bill now, if when we come to the committee amendments we can dispose of them. I want the formal reading dispensed with.

Mr. LODGE. The whole bill will be read for amendment, of course.

Mr. KING. I understand that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The bill will be read, and I desire to have the committee amendments considered first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read the bill.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 2, line 7, after the word "inspectors," to strike out "as authorized in the act approved June 5, 1920," so as to make the paragraph read:

For salaries of post-office inspectors: For salaries of 15 inspectors in charge of divisions, at $4,200 each; and 420 inspectors, $1,327,000; in all, $1,390,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 10, after the words "One hundred and fifteen," to strike out "as authorized in the act approved June 5, 1920," so as to read:

For compensation of clerks at division headquarters: One hundred and fifteen, $238,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 12, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That hereafter, whenever the office of a postmaster becomes vacant through death, resignation, or removal, the Postmaster General shall designate some person to act as postmaster until a regular appointment can be made by the President in case the office is in the first, second, or third class, and by the Postmaster General when the office is in the fourth class; and the Postmaster General shall notify the Auditor for the Post Office Department of the change. The postmaster so appointed shall be responsible under his bond for the safekeeping of the public property pertaining to the post office and the performance of the duties of his office until a regular postmaster has been duly appointed and qualified and has taken possession of the office. Whenever a vacancy occurs from any cause the appointment of the regular postmaster shall be made without unnecessary delay.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 7, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That hereafter in post offices where the receipts are $9,000,000 and less than $20,000,000 there shall be a superintendent of delivery at the same salary as provided for superintendents of mails in offices of this grade. An assistant superintendent of mails at the maximum salary provided for offices of this grade shall be assigned as assistant to the superintendent of delivery.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 24, before the word "auxiliary," to strike out "temporary and"; and on page 5, line 2, before the word "auxiliary," to strike out the words "temporary and," so as to read:

For auxiliary clerk hire and for substitute clerk hire for clerks and employees absent with pay at first and second class post offices and auxiliary clerk hire at summer and winter resort post offices, $12,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 15, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That hereafter the marine letter carriers assigned to the Detroit River postal service shall be paid $300 per annum in excess of the highest grade for carriers in the City Delivery Service, and that those in the service on July 1, 1920, who have continued in the service be paid such salary from July 1, 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 22, after the word "auxiliary," to strike out "and temporary," so as to read:

For pay of substitutes for letter carriers absent with pay, and of auxiliary letter carriers at offices where city delivery is already established, $10,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to insert:

For village delivery service in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class, and in communities adjacent to cities having city delivery, $1,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 15, to increase the appropriation for street-car collection service from $4,100 to $7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 19, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the Postmaster General may, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, authorize the delivery of special-delivery matter without obtaining a receipt therefor: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as excusing the delivery of special-delivery matter in the first instance.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan why that authority was given to permit the delivery of special-delivery matter without obtaining a receipt therefor? It seems to me very important that a receipt should be given.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It has been found, through the workings of the present law, that it frequently happened that they could not get a special-delivery letter delivered; nobody would happen to be in the place of business, and the letter could not be left without the personal receipt of the party to whom the letter was directed. The department felt a year ago that the satisfaction of the public would be met by a change of the rule. We did change the rule a year ago. The House omitted it this year, and we put it back, with the additional provision that there must at least be an attempt to deliver the letter. A great many people felt that under the present ruling special-delivery letters were held until the regular mail delivery, and thus, instead of having an advantage, special-delivery letters were treated as regularly addressed mail.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As the chairman of the committee knows, in the committee I raised the point that has been suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts. I thought it virtually did away with the necessity of making a special delivery of these letters, and I think the original provision that was offered was susceptible of that construction. As the chairman of the committee recalls, the second proviso is one I had put in for the purpose of trying to see to it that they made an attempt to deliver such mail. I think it will have that effect, at all events. But I am not so sure about the provision myself.

Mr. LODGE. The receipt is a great protection. It makes the special-delivery letter almost as safe as registered mail. It enables the tracing of letters. It seems to me it is very risky to abandon the requirement of a receipt. I do not think it is quite a satisfactory reply to say that in that case they do not

carry out the law and do not deliver, but send it by regular mail. That is bad administration, of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. The matter which brought it sharply to my attention was the fact that mail from Memphis gets into Washington ordinarily on the 12.30 midnight train. I found frequently that special-delivery letters came through the mail in the second mail, at 10.30 in the morning, whereas ordinary letters reached me in the early morning mail, at 8 o'clock, and it occurred to me that the post office was rather remiss in not delivering those letters earlier. I called those facts to the attention of the committee, but they thought that was a particular case and that it did not apply generally.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I want to say to the Senator from Massachusetts, further, that the department denies that it does not attempt to deliver a special-delivery letter as soon as it reaches the post office, and the case of the Senator from Tennessee is the only one of the kind I have learned about. I afterwards took occasion to check up, in reference to my mail, what the Senator from Tennessee said to me, and I found that there was an attempt made to deliver a letter, upon its receipt at the post office, by special delivery. But we put in the provision, at the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee, in order that the Postmaster General might be instructed to deliver it, although I think it was his duty to do it without that instruction.

Mr. LODGE. Of course.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But consider the situation of an addressee who has an office. It frequently happens that no one can be found at his office or at his residence and, if the department is obliged to take his receipt, that letter is delayed; it is held up for another attempt. The department say and believe—and so do your committee—that there is no particular danger in allowing a letter to be delivered if there is a safe receptacle for it at the regular place of business or the residence of the addressee. That is the reason why we put it in.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, if they require a receipt of the person to whom the letter is addressed, I can see that that would cause delay. They could enlarge the number of persons or the methods of receipting, it seems to me. We pay the extra sum for special delivery in order to get the greater speed and also greater security. This, it seems to me, would do away with the security very largely. It would mean that no receipt need be given.

Mr. MOSES. Let me say to the Senator that the practice of enlarging the number of people who can give a receipt is already in vogue. Let me call the Senator's attention further to the fact that this is not a permanent provision. It is merely continuing for another year the experimentation that has been going on in the department of this method of delivering special-delivery letters to meet the situation to which the Senator from Michigan refers, where a large number of special-delivery letters going out on the first delivery may be left at an office.

Mr. LODGE. It caught my eye, and it seemed to me that it impaired the security which we hope to get by special-delivery letters.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, would it not be a satisfactory solution to say in case such a letter is delivered to any person a receipt should be taken from that person, even if it is not the addressee?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that would cover it. This allows them to toss the letter in the box and takes away the element of security which a special-delivery letter ought to have.

Mr. NELSON. There ought to be a receipt from the person to whom it is delivered, whether it is the person to whom the letter is sent or not.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the reason, and the sole reason, why this experiment, which has been tried under the sanction of last year's appropriation bill, has been continued was that the committee thought it was best, after it had received the report from the Postmaster General that it had worked satisfactorily, that no complaints had been made, and that it expedited special-delivery mail.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 17, to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Postmaster General may contract with any individual, firm, or corporation for an airplane mail service between such points as he may deem advisable and designate, in case such service is furnished at an actual cost not greater than the cost of the same service by rail, and shall pay therefor out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] has a unanimous-consent agreement which he wishes to submit to the Senate.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the following agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed agreement.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] asks unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Wednesday, February 23, 1921, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill, House bill 14461, a bill to provide for the protection of the citizens of the United States by the temporary suspension of immigration, and for other purposes, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition, and that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m., on said calendar day, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 5 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. POMERENE. What is the day and the hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Wednesday, February 23.

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection among the Senators present to this agreement?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I would like to know what date is fixed for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Next Wednesday.

Mr. CURTIS. At what hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At 4 o'clock. Is there any objection among Senators present? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Harris	McCormick	Simmons
Ball	Harrison	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Heflin	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Henderson	McLean	Smoot
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	McNary	Spencer
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Sterling
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	New	Swanson
Dillingham	Kellogg	Norris	Thomas
Edge	Kendrick	Overman	Townsend
Fletcher	Kenyon	Phipps	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	Keyes	Pittman	Wadsworth
Gay	King	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	Knox	Pomerene	Warren
Gooding	La Follette	Ransdell	Williams
Gronna	Lenroot	Reed	Willis
Hale	Lodge	Sheppard	Wolcott

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I have been requested to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will again read the unanimous-consent agreement.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] asks unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m., on the calendar day of Wednesday, February 23, 1921, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill, House bill 14461, a bill to provide for the protection of the citizens of the United States by the temporary suspension of immigration, and for other purposes, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition, and that after the hour of 2 o'clock p. m. on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than 5 minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether some of us will have an opportunity during the debate on this bill under the unanimous-consent agreement to call up by unanimous consent some of the private bills—smaller bills—in which we are very much interested? There are a number of measures on the calendar that we are very anxious to get through before the end of the session, and I hope we can have some assurance that an opportunity will be given to consider those rather unimportant measures.

Mr. LODGE. I think there will be opportunity to take up bills on the calendar in the interval. If there is no objection, they can be taken up when the immigration bill is pending, but the important thing, to my mind, is to get through with the great bill on immigration, which I think the country demands and which ought to be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the request, may I ask?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To vote upon House bill 14461, the immigration bill, on next Wednesday. Is there any objection?

Mr. FRANCE. I must object to that.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this side of the Chamber has tried to cooperate with the other side in the passage of the legislation referred to. It is urgent, it is necessary, and it is important. Next Wednesday is six days off, and that is ample time for any Senator to discuss the immigration measure. It will not interfere with the passage of general appropriation bills. We serve notice now that unless some unanimous-consent agreement can be entered into to get a vote on the immigration bill, other bills will be delayed more than they would be ordinarily. In the interest of expediting the general appropriation bills, the proposed unanimous-consent agreement should be made.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. May I say to the Senator from Maryland that this is purely an emergency measure. Its operation is covered in the period of a year. It is intended simply to give Congress time to take up the whole question of immigration deliberately and to devise additions to our present law that will result in a better selection and a better distribution of immigrants throughout the United States after the year 1921. The bill is simply to meet the present emergency. It is very important that we should pass it; and we are now so near the close of the session that unless we begin to do as we have done in this case, and set special times for votes on such important measures, it will be impossible to pass them.

Mr. FRANCE. I will say in reply to the Senator that my objection to taking up the bill at this time is based upon the theory that it will be impossible for us to give a fair consideration to the bill without jeopardizing the supply bills.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do not see how it will at all jeopardize the passage of the supply bills. It seems to me, in view of the notice which has been given us, that it will expedite the passage of those bills; and whatever debate is needed upon the immigration bill may be put in between now and next Wednesday at odd times when it can well be done.

Mr. FRANCE. Personally, of course, I feel that the fears that a great flood of immigration will take place from Europe to this country are entirely unfounded. I think there is nothing to substantiate the opinion that there will be a flood of immigration from Europe to this country. When we consider the rates of exchange and what a passage from Europe costs the average immigrant in European money, it seems to me absolutely impossible that there should be a great immigration from Europe.

However, as I said, my objection is based upon the theory that we would be unable to fairly discuss this most important measure in the few remaining days of the present session. I anticipate that very soon after the 4th of March there will be an extra session of Congress at which the matter could be very carefully considered, and a bill brought in which would be a more permanent solution of the problem.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. As I understand the matter after the explanation offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], this is only a temporary measure to give us time to prepare permanent legislation.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Purely that.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The bill now under consideration applies for just one year?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. For one year. The bill as passed by the House prohibits immigration during that time, permitting certain relatives of people already here to come in. The bill proposed by the Senate committee is in the nature of a substitute for that measure, being based on a percentage plan which will undoubtedly decrease the immigration which has given us the problem that we now have to meet. That coming from eastern and southern Europe would be reduced from 735,000, as it was during the last two or three years before the war, to substantially 250,000. In other words, it would reduce that particular immigration to one-third of what it was prior to the war.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from Maryland stated his objection to be that he would not have time to consider the bill. I wonder if he heard the explanation of the Senator from Vermont that this is only temporary legislation looking toward protecting the country against an influx of immigrants until such time as we can digest and prepare permanent legislation at the next session? Individually, I sincerely hope the Senator from Maryland will not interpose an objection, but that we may have this legislation, and then we can address ourselves at the next session of Congress to such legislation as is necessary for the purpose of covering the matter permanently.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. FRANCE. Certainly.

Mr. COLT. May I say to the Senator first that the House in the Johnson bill, by a very large majority—I might say almost unanimously—suspended immigration for the period of one year, the bill not going into effect for two months after its passage. The Senate bill limits immigration to a fixed number for a period of a year and three months from April 1. In the Johnson bill there was an exception admitting dependents. It was believed that under that exception very large numbers of the dependent class would be admitted, and that this provision in the Johnson bill might be open to great abuse. The effect of the Senate bill is merely to substitute for this exception in the Johnson bill a maximum number, a comparatively small number, amounting perhaps, as the committee estimates, to about one-third of the normal immigration for the period of four years prior to the war.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COLT. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator stated a moment ago the number of immigrants who had come in between July 1 and January 1. May I ask whether the hearings did not demonstrate that the number of immigrants who are coming in now is only limited by the shipping capacity?

Mr. COLT. I am not prepared to state that the number of immigrants coming in now is only limited by the shipping capacity. When we get to the question of shipping we reach a proposition which is disputed and upon which there are two sides.

I do know, however, that the number of immigrants coming in up to the 1st of January was 411,000, that they fell off somewhat in January, owing to our economic conditions here. The proposed bill, however, will quiet the apprehension of the American people as to an impending flood of immigration, because it positively fixes the maximum number for the next 15 months. Why should not we be reasonable as to this whole subject? Why should we not admit a reasonable number, a maximum number, during the next 15 months, and in the meantime give the committee time to frame constructive legislation along the lines of selection at the source and distribution? All we are doing is to take the Johnson bill, which provides for suspension and which would admit the dependents, and substitute for that dependent clause a comparatively small maximum number. Of those who will come in there will be a larger number of immigrants from northern and western Europe than from eastern and southern Europe. Of course, the apprehension arises from the fact that over 700,000 immigrants from southern Europe came in, on the average, for the years 1910 to 1914, and if there is any flood it is a flood from those quarters of Europe.

I should like to say to the Senator from Maryland that there is an opinion in the country, which it is very difficult to answer, that there is danger of a flood of immigration from Europe. I personally do not think these apprehensions are well founded. At the same time there is a great deal to support them.

Now, coming to the facts, we find that in the six months from the 1st of July to the 1st of January 411,000 immigrants landed. That is not equaling the prewar period, but it is approaching the prewar period. In view, however, of the conditions in Europe, in view of the fact that the existence of a flood is a disputed question, in view of the apprehension in the country as to this flood and the desire to guard against it, in view of the fact that those who are not convinced of the flood may be mistaken, and especially in view of the fundamental fact that the public opinion of the country demands that during the next year or more immigration should be regulated and controlled—I feel that the Senator ought to permit the bill to come to a vote.

Is it not reasonable, under the present circumstances, that we should pass a temporary measure which will admit a greater percentage of those from northern and western Europe and a less percentage of those from southern and eastern Europe, and at the same time a percentage based upon absolute equality? Is not that a fair measure to be adopted at the present time in substitution for the House bill and in meeting, I say, the settled convictions of the country that immigration, owing to war conditions abroad, should in some way be controlled during the next year?

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question?

Mr. COLT. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does not the Senator have knowledge of the fact that the people of the country are of the opinion that we are threatened by a terrible plague by the coming in of these immigrants? I think I have seen in the newspapers that they are bringing in typhus fever and other terrible plagues.

Mr. COLT. That is a question that is in the hands of the Public Health Service and the President of the United States, and if the President believes the people are in danger of an epidemic, he may place an embargo upon all immigration; also the Public Health Service has the general power to safeguard the public health by the inspection and detention of all infected vessels. The question of typhus is a matter of public-health regulation and is not strictly a question of immigration, and the citing of cases of typhus on board ship only tends to prejudice the mind against the legitimate immigration problem.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to know whether the evidence developed with reference to that question does not justify Congress in taking some action at this time?

Mr. COLT. I will say to the Senator that there is a bill which has passed the House and which is now before the Senate for consideration which enforces very much more severe restrictions upon the departure from abroad of ships on which there is anything like an epidemic.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. COLT. Certainly.

Mr. CALDER. I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island, replying to the statement of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], that to-day the Public Health Service of the United States intends to take over the quarantine service at New York, a great port of entry. For years the quarantine station at New York was under the control of the State of New York, although the Federal immigration authorities checked up the immigrants and observed them to determine from what diseases they might be suffering; but after to-day, I believe, the Federal Government itself will have complete control of the matter. Government officials informed me as late as yesterday that they are taking every precaution to check in every way possible the matter of typhus cases coming into the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no thought of arguing the merits of the bill as reported from the Senate committee or of the bill as it came from the other House. I am extremely anxious to have the appropriation bills passed as rapidly as possible and to get as many of them enacted into law as we can. This proposed unanimous-consent agreement is to fix a vote six days hence on the immigration bill. It will not prevent any Senator from discussing the bill in the interval if he so desires. On the contrary, it secures time for that purpose. If that is not done, the bill will surely be discussed to the great detriment of the passage of the appropriation bills. I do not think anything will be gained by forcing the bill over until the next Congress; I think there will be much more drastic legislation probably then than now; but, however that may be, it seems to me that our first duty is to get the appropriation bills through. I am certain that if we can not secure a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the immigration bill, the appropriation bills will be greatly delayed and that some of them will be lost. For that reason I hope the Senator from Maryland will not make the objection.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I do not wish my objection to appear to be based on my opposition to the proposed legislation; I might not be opposed to it at all; but I fail to see how there will be any opportunity fairly to consider this most important measure if it is not to be made the unfinished business and if the great supply bills are to be passed between now and the closing days of the session. That is my feeling about the matter; that under the unanimous-consent agreement the immigration bill could not receive a fair consideration.

Mr. LODGE. I understand the purpose of the unanimous-consent agreement is to place the immigration bill in such a position that if any Senator desires to have it taken up and to discuss it he will have the right so to do.

Mr. FRANCE. It does not seem to me that a discussion of the immigration bill would necessarily prevent the passage of the big supply bills which must be passed.

Mr. LODGE. The passage of the immigration bill will do more to expedite the passage of the supply bills than will anything else.

Mr. FRANCE. It would seem to me that if all the supply bills are to be passed, there will be very little time for the discussion of the immigration bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think the discussion of the immigration bill will depend on the extent to which Senators desire to discuss it. If they desire to discuss it, they will get an opportunity to do so under the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. If they do not desire to discuss the bill, I am not going to urge them to do so.

Mr. FRANCE. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I had not myself thought of discussing the bill at any length, but I should be very glad to hear a discussion of it, for I feel that the Senate is under a very grave misapprehension in reference to the matter. For example, many Senators believe that immigrants are coming here to the capacity of the shipping facilities, though when we consider that it costs an immigrant from Germany or Austria between six and seven thousand marks to buy his passage, a sum which, generally speaking, would compare with six or seven thousand dollars here—I do not mean to say that six or seven thousand marks are exactly equivalent to six or seven thousand dollars——

Mr. LODGE. No; the value of 7,000 marks, I think, is at present about $70.

Mr. FRANCE. It is about $70; $70 here would be about 7,000 marks there.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I think so.

Mr. FRANCE. And the ordinary thrifty German or Austrian could almost live on the interest of twice that many marks.

Mr. LODGE. This is not the time for, and I have no desire to enter into, a discussion of the provisions of the immigration bill. I only know, as a matter of fact, whether they can afford it or not, that immigrants are coming here at the rate of 800,000 a year; and there is a great demand throughout the country for some limitation of that immigration. I think the immigration bill ought to pass. It is a temporary bill. There will be ample time for its discussion. Any Senator who chooses may speak upon it, if he desires to do so, upon a supply bill, as is frequently done. However, I am afraid, if we can not enter into the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, it will lead to the loss of several of the supply bills, and it is in their passage I am interested.

Mr. FRANCE. I will say that the demand for this proposed legislation on the part of the country is due to the fact that the people have not been informed upon the subject. Unfortunately we have a situation in this country which results in a very serious degree of misinformation on the part of the public in regard to public questions. The situation with reference to the press of the country is such that it is almost impossible for our citizens to receive full and accurate information upon public questions. I very greatly deplore that. However, it is true that from Washington, and from the floor of the Senate, the people can be informed as to the actual conditions if they will read the records of Congress.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Immigration, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], for whose learning I have the highest regard, has already stated that he does not share the apprehension which is so prevalent throughout the country that there will be a flood of immigration to our shores. That statement was made after the learned chairman of the committee had heard testimony from very many persons who have investigated the subject, and I consider that that opinion is of the very highest value. It is an opinion which should be carried to the country. I have not yet reached the point where I believe that the country should legislate directly; I share the views of the learned Senator, a learned constitutional lawyer, views which lead him and which lead me to believe that this body is charged with the responsibility of investigating these problems and with the duty of legislation. We can not, simply because there is a general feeling that there will be a flood of immigration from Europe to this country, pass a bill absolutely preventing immigration if our investigations prove that that feeling is not well founded.

Mr. LODGE. I do not propose to be drawn into a discussion of the bill at all, but if no immigrants are coming in, and could not come in, as the Senator from Maryland suggests, who will be hurt by the proposed limitation?

Mr. FRANCE. I must have very seriously misstated my position if I did say that no immigrants were coming into the country.

Mr. LODGE. No; the Senator said they could not come; that the cost of passage was too high.

Mr. FRANCE. I said I did not anticipate a flood of immigration from Europe because the exchange rates make the price of passage so high that only a very well-to-do Austrian or German can afford to buy his passage. The actual figures show that immigration now is less than in the years prior to the war, as I understand.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may say a further word, I repeat I want to get the appropriation bills through. We are now having a discussion on the immigration bill and not on the question of unanimous consent, whether we will try to facilitate

business. We are discussing the merits of the bill, and it is perfectly obvious that, if the Senator from Maryland is going to object, the proposed unanimous-consent agreement can not be entered into, and we ought to go on with the appropriation bill we now have up and see what we can do.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, if I may say just a word in reply to the Senator from Maryland, I wish to say that we heard testimony for about three weeks; so the opinion expressed by the committee represents what we regard as the opinion of the country. Without indulging in guesswork, it appears as a fact, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has just stated, that 411,000 immigrants have landed on our shores during the last six months. At that rate there would be over 800,000 during the year, and, if immigration should increase, the figures might run up to a million. It appears, therefore, notwithstanding the observation of the Senator from Maryland, that many citizens of foreign countries are able to obtain and have obtained passage.

I am not going into the question of the checks and the cross currents of immigration, for that would lead to a discussion of the whole subject; but, while I was originally impressed with the idea that there was no flood of immigration, I found upon examination, and after hearing all the testimony, including the testimony of witnesses who have made a study of immigration for years, that there was a danger in the next year, and perhaps in the next six months, not of a flood, but of an increase that would perhaps be beyond the large averages of the years from 1910 to 1914. Therefore, the committee, after much deliberation, recommended this bill; and in view of the notice from the other side of the determination on the part of a number of Senators to bring the immigration bill to a vote, which, of course, will delay the supply bills, I hope in the interest of the supply bills, and especially in the interest of the general demand of the country for control of immigration for the next year, that the Senator from Maryland will withdraw his objection.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I wish to add but a word. I am not, as I have said, opposing proposed immigration legislation. So far from that, I have been rather inclined to the opinion that some restrictive legislation in addition to that which we already have may be necessary. That opinion has been formed very largely as a result of consulting those who represent American labor. I have learned in my experience in public life to regard very highly the opinions of those who represent American labor. I have been inclined to the view that some further restrictive legislation may be necessary; but I have not been persuaded as yet that it would be wise to take this measure up without making it the unfinished business under a unanimous-consent agreement, which would perhaps prevent any fair consideration of the measure. I will say, therefore, that I am compelled for the moment to object to the request for unanimous consent, but I shall be very glad to consider the matter and, if a request should be made later, it might be possible for me to withhold objection. For the moment, however, I feel that I must object.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, objection being made, let us have the regular order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, immediately after the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill shall have been concluded, if I can get recognition from the Chair, I shall move to make the immigration bill the unfinished business, and, if I fail to get recognition from the Chair, and the chairman of the committee or the Senator from Vermont does not so request, I shall move to suspend the rules in order to put the immigration bill on the next appropriation bill as an amendment, so that we can get some action at this session.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15441) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 8, after line 3, to insert:

For the operation and maintenance of the aeroplane mail service between New York, N. Y., and San Francisco, Calif., via Chicago, Ill., and Omaha, Nebr., including necessary incidental expenses and employment of necessary personnel, $1,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 11, to increase the appropriation for travel allowances to railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks from $3,000,000 to $3,089,931.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 21, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the Postmaster General is hereby directed to investigate and to report at the beginning of the first regular session of the Sixty-seventh Congress the probable cost to the Government for the establishment of a factory for the manufacture of stamped envelopes and his opinion regarding the desirability of so doing.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, this amendment is one which was inserted in the bill at my instance when it was before the committee, at a time when the committee lacked definite information about the subject which was under consideration. I have since learned that this same end may be attained without legislation, and I therefore ask that the amendment may be rejected.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 9, before the words "per day," to strike out "$4" and insert "$5," so as to make the paragraph read:

For rental, purchase, exchange, and repair of canceling machines and motors, mechanical mail-handling apparatus, and other labor-saving devices, including cost of power in rented buildings, and miscellaneous expenses of installation and operation of same, including salaries of five traveling mechanicians and for per diem allowance of traveling mechanicians while actually traveling on official business away from their homes and their official domiciles at a rate to be fixed by the Postmaster General, not to exceed $5 per day, $462,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 2, to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That on and after July 1, 1921, the increased compensation provided in section 2 of the act approved July 1, 1918, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1919, and for other purposes, and in House joint resolution of November 8, 1919, entitled "Joint resolution to provide for additional compensation for employees of the Postal Service and making appropriations therefor," shall be continued in so far as it affects the employees of the mail equipment shops, such increases to be made a part of their base pay.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 19, to strike out:

For village delivery service in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class, and in communities adjacent to cities having city delivery, $1,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 16, to insert the following additional section:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, at his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to loan to any State of the Union, when so requested by the highway department of the State, such tractors as are retained and not distributed under the act approved March 15, 1920, for use in highway construction by the highway department of such State: *Provided*, That all expenses for repairs and upkeep of tractors so loaned and the expenses of loading and freight shall be paid by the State, both in transfer to the State and the return to the Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 16, after line 11, to insert the following additional section:

SEC. 3. That the joint commission authorized under section 6 of the act approved April 24, 1920, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," is hereby continued until June 30, 1922, to complete the investigation and to prepare a detailed report containing a summary of its findings thereof, and such recommendations as to legislation as it may deem proper.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I wish to inquire about the amendment just read. I understand that the last post-office bill carried a provision authorizing the appointment of this commission. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Michigan, just what progress has been made by the commission in connection with this work? I refer to section 3, on page 16.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the commission has been at work since some time last summer under the operation of the law. We have employed some efficiency engineers, who are making a thorough survey. We are to commence hearings upon their report before the commission next Monday morning. I have asked for partial reports from time to time, and am satisfied that we are going to present to the Congress some reforms, some economies, which will mount away up into the millions of dollars. I think I am safe in saying that the efficiency of certain parts of the department is going to be materially increased. In fact, some of the things that we have disclosed have already been adopted by the department itself. A member of the department is also a member of the joint commission. He knows something of what is being done.

For instance, the separation of the parcels post from the regular mail, providing facilities for the parcel post, separating it

from the first-class mail, is going to be of immense advantage to the efficiency of the mail service, and I believe economically advantageous. We are going to be able to make great savings on the automobile service in the cities of New York and Chicago. We are going to be able to disclose some of the disadvantages of the present service and some of the waste that has been practiced. I do not say that it has been knowingly done by the department, but nevertheless it has been done. We are surveying the whole field, as the law permits us to do. We have taken up the city of New York and the city of Chicago. We are now working not only in those cities, but in Boston, Philadelphia, and Detroit; and while the field is large, I think every member of the commission is satisfied that we are accomplishing great good for the benefit of the Post Office Department.

Mr. CALDER. Does the Senator from Michigan expect the commission to report during the present calendar year?

Mr. TOWNSEND. We expect before this Congress adjourns to make a report to the Senate of what we have accomplished up to date.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator may recall that when the Post Office bill was under consideration by the Senator's committee last year, I appeared before the committee and urged the incorporation in the bill of a provision for the construction of a tunnel connecting the Pennsylvania Station with the Grand Central Station in New York. This, as the Senator from Michigan knows, is not a matter local to New York. It affects the through mail coming from the East to the West and South, and I am sure from his investigation, as far as he has gone, he knows of the traffic conditions in New York with automobiles and how congested it is, and how our whole Postal System in New York needs a careful going over and much improvement.

Mr. TOWNSEND. There is not any doubt at all about that, and we are doing that very thing now. We have investigated the tunnel proposition and other propositions dealing with the same matter, and we are going to report on that subject in detail, as the law requires us to do, before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. CALDER. May I ask the Senator from Michigan if his commission has taken under advisement the utilization of the old tubes in New York?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It has. We are going to make a report on that, too.

Mr. CALDER. I want to repeat what I said last year, that because of the great traffic in New York the handling of mail is much impeded, and it seems to me the automobile service in that city is not nearly as effective as some underground service. In the last calendar year nearly a thousand people were killed in the streets of New York through our heavy traffic, and the Post Office automobile service has contributed somewhat toward that because of the fast traveling of its machines; and, really, that service is not as efficient as it ought to be.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am very certain the Senator from New York will be perfectly satisfied that the commission is not overlooking the very conditions to which he makes reference.

Mr. CALDER. I am exceedingly anxious that the commission shall report as early as possible, in order that conditions in that great city may be remedied at the earliest possible moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 16, line 20, to change the number of the section from 2 to 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I gave notice that I should offer an amendment to the bill which I desire to offer at the end of section 2. I wish to say that possibly that amendment may be subject to a point of order; but it is identical with a bill that passed the House of Representatives overwhelmingly, and I offer it now as an amendment to follow section 2 of the bill.

Mr. SWANSON's amendment was, at the end of section 2, to insert the following:

That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following additional sums:

The sum of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

The aforesaid additional sum shall be expended in accordance with the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That the aforesaid additional sum, together with any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto and not heretofore withdrawn from the principal fund, as provided by section 6 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1919, shall be available for expenditure in that State for the purpose set forth in such acts until two years after the close of the respective fiscal years for which any such sums become available, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of such acts shall be reapportioned in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916: *Provided further*, That in each State in which the percentage of total land area to which the title of the United States is unqualified or exempt by act of Congress from taxation in said State exceeds 10 per cent of the total area of all lands in the State the Secretary of Agriculture may reduce the ratio of cooperation required, but not to below one-half that which the total of the patented, tax exempt, and national forest land bears to the total area of all lands in the State.

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, for national forest roads and trails.

The said appropriations for national forest roads and trails to be available until expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads or trails within, partly within, or contiguous to the national forests when such roads or trails are necessary for the use and development of the resources of the national forests or desirable for their proper administration, protection, and improvement or for the extension of important main highways.

That any person, firm, corporation, member of any highway commission, or employee thereof that makes any false statement or representation as to the character of material used or quality of work performed in the construction of any project approved by the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of said act, with the intent to defraud the United States, shall upon conviction be imprisoned not to exceed five years or pay a fine not to exceed $10,000, or be punished by both imprisonment and fine.

That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make annual report to Congress of the amounts expended hereunder.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I shall have to make the point of order against that measure; but first I should like to say something to the Senate, if I could only have the attention of the Senate. I dislike very much, however, to talk to a very few Senators here, and then have some others come in, and, under a prearranged canvass of the Senate, decide the matter, as I believe they will have to decide it, without information.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as I am very much interested in this proposed amendment, and feel it my duty to oppose it, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that the Senators may be here to hear what the Senator from Michigan has to say about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Hale	McCormick	Smith, Md.
Borah	Harris	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Harrison	McNary	Smoot
Calder	Heflin	Moses	Spencer
Chamberlain	Henderson	Myers	Sutherland
Colt	Hitchcock	Nelson	Swanson
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Thomas
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Townsend
Dillingham	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Edge	Kendrick	Phipps	Underwood
Elkins	Kenyon	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Keyes	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
France	King	Pomerene	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Ransdell	Williams
Gay	Knox	Sheppard	Willis
Gerry	La Follette	Simmons	Wolcott

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

Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. SWANSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I dislike to yield, because Senators are here now, and I would like to say a word or two to them while they are here.

Mr. SWANSON. I simply want to put my motion before the Senate to suspend the rules. I gave notice about a week ago that I should make such a motion. I want that motion to be brought before the Senate now, because I believe the amendment is subject to a point of order. Consequently I gave notice that I would move to suspend the rules and ask that the amendment be made in order. That is all I desire to do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I am very anxious for the Senators to remain in their seats for just a few minutes, because I realize that there has been a very systematic canvass made in reference to the proposition which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] now offers to the Senate. I wish further to say that, if it is the sense of two-thirds of the Senate that this measure should be adopted at this session of Congress, I do not care to delay the action which they may finally take, and if I could know that in advance I would not

make the point of order. But I know of no way of determining that except by making it.

This is the proposition, Mr. President: The Roads Committee of the House reported the bill granting $100,000,000 appropriation to the States, to be distributed under existing law; that is, the States were to share in this appropriation according to population, area, and road mileage. The States were to put up an amount equal to that appropriated by the Federal Government.

This appropriation of $100,000,000 is for the year 1922, to continue the law already in existence. There has been much said to the Senate with reference to the necessity of this appropriation in order that road improvement may not stop—that the present State organizations may go on in the construction of roads—always on the theory that it is necessary in order to carry on road construction to have this appropriation.

The fact of the matter is, there has been appropriated since 1916 about $275,000,000.

Mr. McCORMICK. May I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCORMICK. A part of that sum has been expended for roads which are in no way permanent, has it not—gravel roads?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; I was going to get to that in just a moment. Of this $275,000,000 which has been appropriated since 1916, and made available, there still remains unexpended and unappropriated $117,000,000.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish the Senator would allow me to make my statement, and then he can interrupt me.

Mr. KELLOGG. If the Senator objects, of course, I will not ask him a question; but if he does not object, I will.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I would like to have the Senators who are now present hear me for a little while, until I get through with my statement; but I do not object to the Senator asking me a question.

Mr. KELLOGG. Go ahead; I will not ask the Senator a question.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I recognize the fact that many highway commissioners of the States have complained, and now offer the argument that much of this money has been anticipated by future plans which have not yet been approved by the Federal Government. It is very important that we should understand what those future plans have been and are.

Some of the States of the Union have wisely expended Federal-aid money; that is, they have expended it on a system of roads, having the ultimate view of a general plan of roads, which means service to the public. Many of the States, and those which are now insisting upon this appropriation, have no system. This has come to be in many States a pork-barrel scheme, worse than the river-and-harbor scheme ever was, because the money has been expended where there evidently was the greatest political influence; it has been divided pro rata among the counties of States, and those counties in many cases have expended the money on little strips of road, beginning nowhere and ending nowhere. The result has been that much of the money has been wasted—worse than wasted.

Let it be understood, Mr. President, that I am in favor, strongly in favor, of Federal participation in road construction. I have felt, and still feel, that roads of interstate importance, which serve an interstate purpose, which purpose is growing in importance every year, and the future of which no man can now predict, should be constructed. But I have felt, and still feel, that this money should be expended on interstate roads, and that there should be provision made for maintenance after the roads have been constructed.

As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] has suggested, much of the money in some of the States has been expended on very improper roads, roads that have been almost destroyed with the first storm, or with the first heavy truck that has passed over them.

I have felt, Mr. President, that there was money enough to last the States until next year in any proper scheme which they may develop or had developed. In the meanwhile I have wanted the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to have an opportunity to devise a plan, a scheme, a system, if you please, for the construction of roads which would conserve the money which the Federal Government has appropriated or is proposing to appropriate.

In the House there was recently introduced a bill known as the McArthur bill, which provided that this $100,000,000 appropriation should be expended only on roads of interstate importance. But there was substituted for that bill the Sells bill, which simply provides for an additional appropriation of $100,000,000, to be expended under the old or the present plan.

Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has made a motion to suspend the rules and make this House bill from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads proper as an amendment to this bill. It requires two-thirds of the Senate to suspend the rule. I am opposing it, because I do not know in advance whether two-thirds of the Senate wants this bill passed as it is or not. If I did know that in advance I would not interpose an objection for a moment, but would allow the Senate to have its way about it.

No man can go ahead of me or before me in his desire to have good roads in this country, and for the Federal Government to do its part. I have had a theory of my own, but I have not advanced it. I am not using it to block any legislation, but I have felt that there should be a national system of roads, a State system of roads, and a county system of roads. I have felt it would be economy to establish those.

The late Senator from Alabama, Mr. Bankhead, who introduced into the Senate the bill which is now the law, stated that while I, his colleague, was opposed to the system, that I felt that during the emergency when our boys were coming home from the war and we needed to offer employment to them, I should not oppose it, and he himself stated that he knew we should build a system of roads and that this should only be a temporary matter.

Now, the highway commissioners of the State say that they need the money in order that they can advance the present system which they have. All of the unexpended balance will be carried over after the end of the next fiscal year to be expended as the law permits now. I submit that it is my judgment, after looking into the matter very carefully, that nothing will be embarrassed. I know it is urged that there are some legislatures that will not be in session a year from now and that they can not make the necessary appropriations or provisions to match the Federal appropriations and that they ought to do that now.

I have been discouraged with some of those arguments because they have disclosed to me that many of the States are not appropriating a dollar except to meet the Federal aid. My State of Michigan and many other States have bonded themselves for millions of dollars, the State of Michigan for $50,000,000, to be expended on good roads. The little appropriation that comes from the Federal Government is but a bagatelle compared to the total amount. However, I repeat, there is disposition on the part of some of the States, and they are making the most noise about this now, to appropriate no money except to match the Federal aid. That was not the original idea. The original idea of making appropriations was to encourage road building in the country, to create a spirit of progress in reference to road construction, and it has done that in many cases; in some cases it has not. If I felt that the road construction policy of the country was to be interfered with or injured, I should even consent to this. I would prefer that it be $50,000,000 instead of $100,000,000. I can assure the Senate that it is a part of the program now that at the beginning of the next session the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which will not have fiscal legislation in charge and will not be held in the Committee on Foreign Relations or Committee on Finance, will take up the problem and have hearings upon it and try to present a scientific system or scheme for Federal participation in road building throughout the country.

I have said this much because I felt that I should like to have Senators understand my viewpoint. If the motion of the Senator prevails to suspend the rules, it will be decided whether we want to put the House bill upon the pending appropriation bill, and if it is so decided it will receive no further opposition from me. I simply desired to present the case as I see it. I think no Member of the Senate understands it better than I do, because I have given very careful attention to it and think I understand what I am talking about.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BECKHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I remember distinctly that one of the questions in conference several years ago when the legislation was adopted was with reference to the character of roads and the character of service to which Federal aid should be applied. Does the Senator have in mind now what the character of these roadways is that can be improved by the Federal aid?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Any road can be improved by the Federal aid.

Mr. POMERENE. One of the contentions, and I know I was one of those who so contended at the time, was that the Federal aid should only go to permanent betterment and not to matters of repair or to improvement which might be simply temporary in character. What is the provision of the legislation now in that regard?

Mr. TOWNSEND. There is no provision as to that except that it is practically referred to as permanent, but it is a relative matter, a matter of definition which the director of good roads must decide in cooperation with the State authorities who present the projects for his approval. As I said, good roads is a relative term. For instance, what would be a permanent road or a good road in one community—in a rural community, for instance—would not last overnight in some other community. What they ought to do, what they ought to try to do at least, is to build roads suitable to the use to which they are to be put. As it is now, frequently a very expensive road a mile long is built in some State or some county without any terminal facilities connecting any other good road, at an expense far out of reason, when taking into consideration the use to which the road is to be put, and when considering what it ought to have cost if a continuous system of roads had been constructed.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I am sure he does not wish to leave a wrong impression from his statement. Under the law Federal aid can only go to permanent roads. Under the law the State authorities must agree to keep those roads in repair. Is not that true?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is true.

Mr. SWANSON. In other words, they must agree to keep them in repair, to keep them in as good condition as the road which the money was appropriated to construct.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I answered the Senator from Ohio that that was a relative matter. The State of the Senator from Virginia follows that plan especially, and it is followed in other States of the country where they build their roads on a county system and the roads have not been maintained.

Mr. SWANSON. Let me call this to the Senator's attention, briefly, because I wish to speak later on the subject. The Senator would not advocate the building of a road costing $40,000 per mile if the people merely wanted the roads to go to their depots, to carry their produce there and ship it out to the country. The Senator would not advocate the Federal Government spending $40,000 a mile for a road where rural carriers on star routes operate, in order that the contractors might extend their business, because it is left to the State authorities under the law, which we fought here for nearly a month, to determine the character of the roads, but they must be permanent, and the State must agree to keep them in repair before the Federal Government will spend a cent on them. Is not that true?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Absolutely. That is the theory of the law.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator yield, that I may ask the Senator from Virginia a question?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. POMERENE. I am a little bit confused by what is meant by permanent roadway, and I should like some specific information on the subject. Assume for the sake of argument that there is a grading of a roadway, that it is crowned, and that there are the usual drainage gutters on either side. In the administration of the law would that be regarded as a permanent improvement?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit, I should like to explain what I understand the law to be. I was a member of the committee which prepared the law and a member of the committee that finally agreed to it in conference. There are four or five different classes of permanent roads. What is called a sand-clay road has been criticized more than anything at all, although a great many of them have been constructed; but if the State authorities and the Federal authorities agree that a sand-clay road is what is needed in a particular community, and that the money ought to be expended for that character of road, then they agree on the sand-clay road. It only costs about two or three thousand dollars a mile. The Federal Government furnishes its half of the money.

The State authorities agree to keep that road in repair, which means that the State authorities will spend enough money to keep it at all times in that condition. Further, the law provides that if they do not do that, if any State is derelict in keeping that promise, they forfeit their share of the next appropriation for Federal aid. That is true, is it not?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; for the next year.

Mr. McCORMICK. May I ask the Senator what will have become of the Federal moneys expended during the year preceding?

Mr. SWANSON. We lose them if they do not carry out their promise. If the road is built and the State authorities do not keep their promise and keep it in a condition of repair and make it permanent in that way, then the next year the State does not get any money from the Federal Government, because it has not fulfilled its obligation to the Federal Government. That is the penalty that is applied in a case of that kind.

Mr. POMERENE. Would it not be more accurate, under the state of facts which the Senator from Virginia has presented, to call that a permanent road, but not a permanent improvement?

Mr. SWANSON. Under the law we can not improve a road unless it is in such condition that it amounts absolutely to a reconstruction. The law has been misunderstood in that respect and to a great extent misrepresented. Under the law, as I understand it, we can not make an improvement on a road that is already constructed unless it amounts to a reconstruction.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator construe the law as permitting a State, or, let us say, a county, to lay out a new roadway in a section where there has never been a roadway?

Mr. SWANSON. It could do that.

Mr. POMERENE. Then I think we ought to have some further limitation.

Mr. SWANSON. All right. Take some of the States out West, where new cities and new communities are being built up. Conditions in Ohio are different from those in Montana, for instance.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Virginia was slightly inaccurate. He said that a State could build the road anywhere it sees fit. Under the act a plan must be laid out by the State highway engineer, and before the Government becomes obligated at all it must be approved in every particular, including the plans, estimates, and all, by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SWANSON. I thought that the Senator asked whether the Secretary of Agriculture could build new roads or not. He has the power of approval. The project must initiate with the State. Instead of the initiation starting here and simply building great big roads for automobiles, we let each State consider its conditions and its needs, and we do not try to have a great centralized system.

The initiation starts with the States, and they furnish half of the money under the present system. When the States say, "We need certain kinds of road or a certain amount of road and we are willing to spend half the money to construct this kind of a road," then it comes here to the Federal Government for approval or disapproval.

Mr. POMERENE. I am perfectly clear in my own mind as to this fact, that it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to determine specifically the kind and character of road to which Federal aid shall be applied. If we are not going to do that, we are going to have this difficulty, that the so-called backward communities will do next to nothing to build their roads. I am willing to give Federal aid to the extent that it is going to encourage backward communities to build their roads, but I am not willing that the Federal Government shall bear this burden, and that is what it will ultimately mean.

Mr. SWANSON. I have a report here which shows what has been done under the appropriation of $275,000,000, showing that the so-called backward communities are paying their part and the States are doing the same, and that the Federal Government is benefiting as much as the State by the construction of roads used by the rural carriers and various other agencies of the Federal Government. I have before me the testimony of Mr. MacDonald. I just wish to show how the system is constructed and how wonderfully it works and what great progress and development it has made.

Mr. MacDonald said:

> We made an estimate, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of construction last year that shows that the States, counties, and Federal Government together made available for last year's construction $633,000,000, of which the Federal aid appropriation available at that time was only about one-fourth, as I recall it.

In other words, these backward communities, these counties, these States raised four times what the Federal Government appropriated for the great road improvement work which is going on in the country. This matter has been misunderstood and misrepresented by people who wish to build $40,000-a-mile roads all through the country strictly and entirely for automobile traffic.

There is an estimate complete, clear, and specific. There have been $4 furnished in these backward communities, in the States and counties, for every dollar of Government money which has been provided. In other words, the States have provided for the star-route contractors, for the rural carriers, and for other agencies of the Federal Government which use

the improved roads twice as many miles of such highways as has the Federal Government which uses this road mileage.

Mr. McCORMICK. May I ask the Senator from Virginia a question?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. McCORMICK. Do I understand the Senator to say that the sum to which he refers was contributed only by the States which are not building permanent concrete or macadam roads?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I desire to say that some States are building permanent roads, while some are building sand and clay roads. In the case of roads around Richmond, around New York, around Chicago, or around Baltimore and Washington, where the traffic is heavy, the department passes on the kind of roads which are to be constructed and requires the building of concrete roads. Why? Because a macadam road or a dirt or clay and gravel road would not last a week under the heavy traffic which passes over the roads adjacent to the cities which I have enumerated. However, who is going to build a permanent road costing $40,000 a mile merely to go to a little depot when a sand and clay road or a macadam road is all that is needed?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Virginia, if I understood him rightly, described the States which have appropriated $4 for every dollar which has been appropriated by the Federal Government as backward communities. Did he mean to imply that those were the States which built sand and clay roads?

Mr. SWANSON. I did not say that so-called backward counties and States had contributed that amount of money, but I was referring to the aggregate contributed by all the States.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan a question with reference to the $117,000,000. My information is that last November there remained unexpended $117,000,000 for road improvement, and since that time there have been entered into contracts amounting to some forty or fifty million dollars for additional road work. I desire to ask the Senator if he has any information on that subject?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not have any report from the department on that subject. The latest report I have is for November 30 last. I have no doubt that some contracts have been made since then, which will, perhaps, be completed in two years. There is, however, a large amount of money—millions of dollars—that has neither been allotted nor contracts agreed upon for the construction of the roads. Two or three of the States, I think, have pretty well used up their allotments.

Mr. PHIPPS. Will the Senator from Michigan allow me to put in the figures in reference to this matter?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. PHIPPS. On that point I should like to call attention to the condition of the appropriations of Federal road money under the apportionments to the various States. I have in my hand the statement as of December 31, 1920, which shows that out of the original allotments available, amounting to $266,750,000, there were under construction at that date approved projects involving an expenditure of $149,690,630, leaving a balance available of $117,059,370. The statement gives the figures by States.

I have an additional statement which shows the amount that has actually been paid on account of construction of approved projects as of November 30, 1920, the latest date available. The total of that statement shows that out of the $266,750,000 available only $47,300,610 had actually been withdrawn from the Treasury of the United States and that there was on that date available for payment later by the Treasury of the United States $219,449,000.

Before asking that these statements be inserted in the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to the fact that out of the allotment for the State of Virginia of $5,451,730 that State had drawn down up to November 30 last, $750,757 on account of projects, leaving available to that State $4,700,972.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator permit me before he leaves that matter——

Mr. PHIPPS. If I may be permitted, I desire to give the additional figures.

Mr. SWANSON. Do those figures pertain to Virginia?

Mr. PHIPPS. Yes, sir; these figures pertain to Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I will state what is the situation in Virginia. The amount apportioned to Virginia from the $275,000,000 is $5,451,730.28. On the 1st of January, of this amount there had been assigned to projects under construction and partly completed $2,676,337, the projects being nearly one-half completed.

Since January 1 there has been assigned to other projects $91,000, and by January 1, 1922, there will be assigned to still other projects at least $1,684,303.28. The three sums last mentioned will exhaust the amount of the allocations to Virginia, and the fiscal year will still have six months to run; in other words, Virginia is in the same situation as a great majority of the States; six months after the 1st of July the Federal road money for the entire country will be exhausted, and during the last six months of the fiscal year from the 1st of July, 1921, to the 1st of July, 1922, there will be no Federal aid money coming to Virginia.

In this connection, while we are discussing the figures, let me make this statement: I have made a synopsis here of the situation. Prior to January 1, 1921, there had been apportioned to the States $266,750,000, which was the total of $275,000,000 less the administrative charge of 3 per cent. There has been paid, or was due the States on account of completed work, $83,632,282.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I hope Senators will keep in mind that, according to the Senator's statement, from the beginning there has been $83,000,000 of the $256,000,000 paid.

Mr. SWANSON. That is right; but let me complete the statement. The report of Mr. MacDonald is that the States pay the necessary amounts for road construction far in advance, and after they have paid on the contracts they draw months and months afterwards on the Federal Government, thus acting generously to the Federal Government in that respect; and now, although the States have acted generously in that way, their action is made the subject of criticism.

Now, let me go further.

There has been pledged on uncompleted contracts $66,050,825, thus leaving a balance of $117,000,000 in round numbers. The estimated commitals for the rest of the fiscal year—this is what was testified to before the committee in the House—on account of projects approved and in process of execution will be not less than $50,000,000, and probably considerably more. That is for projects the contracts for which have been approved and the specifications made. Thus there will be unexpended and unpledged on the 1st of July next at the outside not more than $67,066,893.

Now, what does that mean?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I will ask the Senator to wait a moment. Under present conditions $8,000,000 a month, or about $100,000,000 a year, is being expended, which means that at the end of six months, unless a further appropriation is made, this entire program will stop after the 1st of January, 1922, until the 1st of July, 1922.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, the figures which I have been quoting are official. I think they should go into the RECORD, and I shall make that request. Before doing so, however, I wish to state for the information of Senators that last year the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads held extensive hearings on the subject of good roads covering a period of about three months. Many witnesses from various States in the Union appeared before the committee and gave most interesting testimony. That testimony is a matter of record and is available to Senators. I believe I am safe in saying that the consensus of opinion of those witnesses was that the present methods which we have been following are not economical, but, on the contrary, are wasteful; that they should be discontinued and that a different method should be inaugurated in connection with the building of roads so that eventually there may be established a national system of highways. The opinion was also expressed that our expenditures at the present time were too largely devoted to inferior second and third class roads on which money was being wasted by county commissioners and State officials in order to get the mileage promptly, instead of deciding upon comprehensive plans that would give us what we should have, namely, permanent roads to serve the communities in the different sections of the country in the manner in which they should be cared for.

Mr. POMERENE and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to complete the figures which have been given. I have a letter from Mr. MacDonald, Director of Roads, dated February 17, in which he says:

On December 21, 1920, $149,683,107 was either under actual construction or completed, leaving $117,066,893 on that date available for new contracts. During the calendar year 1920, $91,168,733 of Federal-aid funds were put under contract for construction by the States. The present calendar year is expected to be one of still greater activity in road construction, and at the end of the year the balance of the Federal-aid fund should be practically exhausted.

That is the latest report on the subject. I desire to have the letter incorporated in the RECORD at this point if the Senator from Michigan has no objection.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Very well; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1921.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: Complying with your request by telephone for information regarding the status of Federal-aid road funds, it is stated:

Two appropriations have been made by Congress, one in 1916 for $75,000,000 and one in 1919 for $200,000,000; in all, $275,000,000. Three per cent was deducted for Federal supervision, and the balance, $266,750,000, was apportioned to States, as shown in the inclosed table.

On December 31, 1920, $149,683,107 was either under actual construction or completed, leaving $117,066,893 on that date available for new contracts. During the calendar year 1920, $91,168,733 of Federal-aid funds were put under contract for construction by the States. The present calendar year is expected to be one of still greater activity in road construction, and at the end of the year the balance of the Federal-aid fund should be practically exhausted. It is already practically exhausted in the States of Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Rhode Island, Washington, and West Virginia. Tennessee, on December 31, 1920, had $2,520,506 of Federal aid available for new contracts, the balance of its apportionment being already under construction or completed. Reports from your State highway department show $476,366 put under contract since that date, $550,000 which will be put under contract by April 1, and the remainder by July 1, 1921. In at least 7 of the States other than those given above the balance of the Federal aid apportioned will be absorbed by the end of the present fiscal year; in at least 15 other States the balance will be absorbed by the end of the present calendar year. Of the remaining 15 States all, with the possible exception of 1, will probably have absorbed the balance of their apportionments by the end of 1922.

The total amount paid or due States on December 31 for work actually completed was $83,632,282. On this date there had actually been paid out of the United States Treasury $48,049,783, so there was due the States on that date on completed work $35,582,499. During the month of January, 1921, $8,870,958 was paid out of the Treasury for completed work. There is a lag between the expenditure of the fund and the actual disbursements from the Treasury due to the fact that many of the States have been carrying the cost of the projects which are under way until they are nearly or entirely completed.

In considering the question of further Federal aid, it should not be forgotten that the State legislatures are now in session, that very many of them will not meet again in regular session for two years, and that in many of the States the sessions are limited to 60 days, so that if Congress does not appropriate at this session the road building organization in many of the States will go out of business, and road building in those States suffer very seriously.

There is also inclosed for your information copy of a table prepared by this bureau, showing the value of the basic products of each State for 1919, the percentage that the total of these for each State is of the total for the whole United States, and the percentage each State receives of Federal aid. On a separate sheet is given the position of each State, as indicated by the value of its basic products, and in the adjoining column the order according to amount of Federal aid apportioned.

Very truly, yours, THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Chief of Bureau.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. TOWNSEND. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Colorado, if the Senator from Michigan will permit.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Colorado stated a moment ago that it was the consensus of opinion of the witnesses who appeared before the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee that there was no sufficient scheme or plan for general road building, and, in substance, that a large part of the money appropriated by the Federal Government was being wasted. May I ask the Senator who those witnesses were and what were their means of information which led them to the conclusion which the Senator has stated?

Mr. PHIPPS. The principal ones I had in mind were the highway commissioners from different States of the Union. We had, as I recall, one very competent witness in the person of the official who is in charge of road construction for the State of Pennsylvania, and we had another from the State of Ohio, I believe. Many representative men, at the head of various automobile organizations in the different States, also appeared before the committee, as well as two or three from the national association, and others from the grange.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to ask him a question there. Did the highway commissioner from Pennsylvania complain of the waste in other States or in Pennsylvania?

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I should not like to answer that question offhand. His testimony is of record. I remember that he was a most competent and interesting witness.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The State of Pennsylvania have no reason to complain, for they are distributing their money and building their roads.

Mr. SWANSON. He has a right to veto any waste in his own State.

Mr. TOWNSEND. He has.

Mr. SWANSON. The highway commissioner of the State of Ohio has a right to veto any waste in his own State; but the highway commissioner might think $40,000 a mile ought to be spent for roads in the vicinity of some little western town to let the farmers bring their produce to the market. It is folly to advocate any scheme like that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator has repeatedly referred to that. I have never heard before of anybody advocating that notion. There is nobody complaining that you do not spend $40,000 a mile.

Mr. SWANSON. Take the case of a community where it is a question of carrying goods to small towns, where the Federal Government has its rural carriers and its star-route men traveling over the roads and is willing to contribute so that it can get the star routes served more cheaply and so that the rural carriers can cover more miles. Does the Senator think it would be wise to have roads of that kind constructed of concrete?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not; and I said that to begin with.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, the chief criticism that these commissioners make that I have read is that they do not build roads around small towns, and thus give them access to the market, like they do in the big towns, for truck service.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator is entirely mistaken. That was not their criticism at all. Their criticism is that that money is expended in driblets, here and there, without any general system, when they ought to spend their money on main roads, constituting systems of roads, and allow the counties and their smaller divisions to build these lesser roads.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I can see how in large communities that have developed like Massachusetts, like Pennsylvania, or like others of the same kind, that is the only kind of road you need, because they build roads to the depots in the little towns; but take a new community, and what do they need there more than anything else? And this is what the debate and the fight was over at the inception of this legislation. The first roads that they need are to get to the markets to sell their farm produce. The next roads they need are to get access to the little towns. As soon as these are built in the various communities of the country, they will be connected with these large interstate roads; but to start at the beginning with great, big interstate roads for automobile service when they can not get the farm produce to market, when they can not get to town what they raise, is wrong, and that conflict started at the inception of this legislation. Now, after we pass this legislation, I believe in supplementing it at the proper time with the character of legislation advocated by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is the statement that was made three years ago. The same thing was said then.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only wanted to say that I have listened to the criticisms that have been quoted, where these experts in road building have made criticisms about automobile roads, which the Senator from Virginia has overthrown so successfully at least five times. I think where they make a mistake is that they do not understand or make any allowance for the primary purpose of these expenditures.

The primary purpose of these expenditures is not the building of roads. That is the secondary point. The primary thing is to get a certain amount of money from the Treasury of the United States and spend it among deserving persons. That is the real purpose, and I think that is overlooked too much.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am fearful that that is too frequently the case.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will permit me, I do not know about what is being done in other States with reference to the construction of roads with Federal assistance, but I do know something about what is being done in my State. The legislature of my State is now in session, and it is considering a bill to appropriate $50,000,000 for road construction, and it is my understanding that it is proposed to construct hard-surfaced roads. Indeed, the governor of the State has made it clear that that is the only kind of road construction he will approve. I presume this bill will pass. Now, I am advised—

I do not know what the facts are—that unless some additional appropriation is made by the Federal Government, the allotment which will come to North Carolina will be exhausted by the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, let me remind the Senator of this: If this $100,000,000 should be appropriated, North Carolina would get about $2,000,000 of it. The Senator's State is proposing to have a bond issue of $50,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator anticipate that there will be anything in the way of his State proceeding with the expenditure of at least $48,000,000?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; but I do not understand that it is intended to be confined to road construction in North Carolina, built in cooperation with the Government. Many counties are also voting large sums for roads, and of course we could not expect the Government to match all these expenditures.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am very glad of it.

Mr. SIMMONS. As I said, I do not understand that it is expected that the Government will match all of the money appropriated in North Carolina by the State and counties for road construction, but what I intended to make clear was that unless there was an additional Federal appropriation the funds allotted to North Carolina out of past appropriations would not be available for cooperative road construction after the end of the present fiscal year; that is to say, the amount allotted will be either expended or contracted for by that time.

Mr. TOWNSEND. On the 30th day of November the Senator's State had $4,981,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; but the most of that is contracted for. The work is going on now.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It will take a couple of years to get it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know how long it will take to get it or finish the contracts that have been made or approved, but the point is this: We can make no more contracts after a certain time; unless the Federal Government provides an additional appropriation the scheme of cooperative construction will be interrupted and will have to be held in abeyance until the Government provides additional funds to match our contribution, and this would be unfortunate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Why, yes; possibly that is true; but I do not think that applies——

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator does not want the work stopped that is being carried on in North Carolina in cooperation with the United States. These contracts have to be made in advance. We are, as I understand, working on a State system in North Carolina. We are not working upon a county system. The counties are assisting, but it is a State system. In the first place, we propose to build a State highway extending the length of the State, which is 400 or 500 miles. Then it is probably proposed to build one or more cross-State highways. That is, in general terms, the scheme as I understand it; but we do not want to be in a position where, when we have spent the cooperative funds provided from past Federal appropriation, we can not, for lack of provision of additional Federal aid, make additional contracts looking to further cooperative construction, because you can not successfully prosecute a great scheme like this if the construction is intermittent. And unless the work is continuous it can not be either efficiently or economically carried on or completed in a reasonable time. Of course, that only applies to roads to be constructed with Government aid and to those constructed by the State and counties alone.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That will keep the Senator's State pretty busy.

Mr. SIMMONS. We are not only proposing to construct these main highways, but lateral roads contemporaneously with the construction of the main highways—that is what I understand the North Carolina road scheme to be—and we expect Government aid in constructing these main highways, in the construction of which the counties through which they pass as well as the State will probably contribute.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the State of North Carolina confine Federal aid to main highways, interstate roads?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know the provisions of the pending bill on that subject. I have not seen a copy of the bill. Of course, the counties are expected to build the purely local roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator is in favor of that, is he?

Mr. SIMMONS. I should think that probably would be wise until the main highways are completed. They would be interstate. I am not able to state, as I said before, to the Senator exactly the terms of the proposed bill appropriating fifty million, to which I have referred. I can state, however, that the present scheme with reference to construction with Government aid is to build great highways through and across the State, with the idea of making them State roads, devoted to serving the people of the whole State, and not particular localities.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As I understand, the allotment of the State of Washington is something over $3,000,000—I think nearly $4,000,000. The amount of that that has been allotted or constructed, I think very largely spent, is over $3,000,000, there being on hand about $108,000. Now, if no additional appropriation is made or authorized, that means that State and National cooperation in the State of Washington will practically stop. Is that correct?

Mr. TOWNSEND. If that is true, as I have stated, what I want to do and what I think can be done without any difficulty is at the beginning of the next session for the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to take up this question and pass a bill on the subject before July 1. I think we can do it while the other big committees are working on the finance bill and the foreign relations bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We might be in this situation in our State: Our legislature is now in session. Of course, we are doing a great deal of State building of roads, county building, and so forth. I think there is probably hardly any State in the Union that is doing more toward good roads than our State, but unless some provision is made to indicate what the National Government is going to contribute, our State legislature would not be advised as to what action it should take in order to meet probable cooperation by the National Government. Our legislature will adjourn early in March. It meets only every two years, unless called in extra session, and that seems to me to indicate rather the importance of having something definite so far as the interests of our State are concerned.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think there are several States—four or five, or maybe six, States—in the Union that are situated about as Washington is situated.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. TOWNSEND. Wait just a minute; please let me answer the Senator. I think possibly there are several States that are in that condition, but I am wondering how materially that is going to affect those States. In the case of the State of Washington, even under those conditions, it does not know positively now just how much money it is going to have from the Federal Government for next year when its money runs out; its plans are laid out now, practically. It has not let its contracts, but many of those highway commissioners have been very active to get just as many propositions submitted as possible for the purpose of forcing an appropriation now. I admire their zeal; it is all right, but some of their arguments are not good.

Now, you are going to get money from the Federal Government. I think that is the general disposition. The question is whether that money will be appropriated so that its expenditure will be confined to through propositions, as almost every thoughtful man thinks it ought to be, or whether we will continue to appropriate it under the present scheme, to be divided up as the States may suggest; for while it is true that the Director of Roads may have something to do about it he has practically nothing to do about it. He goes through the formality of approving certain projects that are submitted by the State authorities, and it is his business to see that those roads are maintained before they get another appropriation from the Federal Government; but let any man ride through this country over the roads that have been built by the States with Federal aid and are supposed to be maintained by the States, and see what condition they are in now. It is a shame.

What I am asking is that we let this matter go for a few weeks until we have had time to consider a real proposition; and that is the one matter of business that our committee has on hand now, the one thing that we propose to ask for at the very beginning of the next session of Congress.

Let us see if we can not devise a scheme for spending Federal money so as to get results for the people, and get the worth of our money, instead of expending it so wastefully, as much of it is being expended now. That is my plan; that is the proposition I wish to submit, and I think we ought not to put this on the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I listened very carefully to what the Senator had to say, and I listened with an open mind. I was at first impressed by his statement that there still remains something like $117,000,000 available to be expended. But that statement made by the Senator from Michigan does not accord with the report which I have here from the Director of Roads. He cites, in the first place, that there

are 11 States in the position of the State of Washington, referred to by the Senator from Washington, in which the appropriation has already been entirely exhausted. He refers to my own State, in which the appropriation will be exhausted this year, the work being nearly completed. Then, in addition to that, the Director of Roads says:

In at least seven of the other States, other than those given above, the balance of the Federal aid apportioned will be absorbed by the end of the present fiscal year. In at least 15 other States the balance will be absorbed by the end of the present calendar year. Of the remaining 15 States, all, with the possible exception of one, will probably have absorbed the balance of their apportionment by the end of 1922.

It seems to me, in view of that fact, unless we want to have a lapse in this work and a lapse of the appropriation, now is the proper time for Congress to take some action to make the work continuous. I realize that it is probably true that in some States the money has not always been wisely expended; but there certainly can not be any improvement in the law, which requires a concurrence of the Federal judgment with the State judgment in making that expenditure.

Another thing which must be taken into account is that the good roads in one State may meet one requirement, and a specialist in Pennsylvania may look upon a road out in Nebraska as not good, according to the specifications of a road in Pennsylvania, but the difference in soil, the difference in use, may make that road in Nebraska perfectly good for the purpose intended.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And the law recognizes that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Therefore the testimony of the witness from Pennsylvania, referred to by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], does not, in my opinion, have any weight. He does not criticize his own State. The representative from Ohio did not criticize his own State. He assumed to criticize some other States, of which he had really no knowledge, as to whether the specifications were adequate or not. It seems to me that this is an important work. It has been duly undertaken, and, according to the evidence of the director of the bureau, appropriations are exhausted in 11 States, and will be exhausted during this calendar year in many of the other States, and in the next fiscal year in all the other States.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, when we speak about having exhausted an appropriation, we mean that very rapidly during the last few months there have been projects approved which take a large amount. That money can not be taken out of the Treasury, or used, until the roads are completed, which will be two or three years from now. Propositions have been approved requiring the expenditure of this money, but the money can not be expended or the roads completed for two or three years yet.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That may be very true. I do not know about the requirement of two or three years to complete the roads, but it will be necessary, if other projects are to be undertaken, for the authorities in the various States to know whether they are to get the money, and if this is now defeated by the Senate they will not have that knowledge, and they can not go on with their preparations and the making of their plans and specifications. There is only one way to have this continuous, and that is for Congress to assure the States whether they can depend upon the money or not.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And the pressure will be made for all time to continue this work along that line, and contracts will be let extending into the future, and that notwithstanding the fact that these gentlemen know that when this bill was up for consideration three years ago it was considered temporary, as the Senator from Virginia now suggests, the question of some scheme for participation by the Federal Government in the building of roads which would mean good roads was then debated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want to ask the Senator if he has any data disclosing how much the various States have appropriated for road-building purposes over and above what they have been required to appropriate in order to get the Federal allotment?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not happen to have it with me. I think I have that information, however.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, this appropriation is supported by many—by all, I suppose, who do support it—on the technical theory that we can appropriate Federal funds to maintain post roads, but upon the real, material consideration that the Federal Government by participating will encourage road building in the States.

Can the Senator in a general way state from the figures which he says he has to what extent this program, since 1916, has induced the States to spend of their own funds, in addition to the encouraging of appropriations from the Congress, for road-building purposes?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I can not quite do that from memory.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Have they been tickled into any considerable activity by it?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Some of the highway commissioners have so testified.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator permit me to answer the question?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I would like to answer the Senator, when I start in to answer him, if I may be permitted.

This is what I can say to the Senator, that some of the States make no appropriations, even to match the sum allowed by the Government; but they have arrangements made with the local community, the county, to put up the money to match the Federal-aid money. Many of them rely upon their automobile licenses to keep the roads in repair. Some of the States have no State system. Maryland has a primary system of good roads. She has a secondary system of good roads. She is now laying out a third system of good roads. They are building according to some system in that State. They are building permanent roads, according to the use to which they are to be submitted.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And they were doing that before ever being incited thereto by Federal aid.

Mr. TOWNSEND. They were. Now, I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Director of Roads, Mr. MacDonald, was asked that very question. The advocates of this system insisted that it would be a great stimulation to good-road development in this country, at a wonderful rate. Here is what he said about the construction of last year:

We made an estimate, Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of construction last year, that shows that the States, counties, and Federal Government together made available for last year's construction $633,000,000, of which the Federal-aid appropriation available at that time was only one-fourth.

The figures showing that are given in a table somewhere.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I be permitted by the Senator from Michigan to comment upon those figures by saying that they throw no light upon the situation at all, because many, many States, like the State of Maryland, to which the Senator from Michigan has referred, had their road-building program going and well under way, spending millions of dollars, without regard to any Federal aid, because there was no such Federal aid at that time. In my State they have been spending money, as they have in Pennsylvania. Yet you have in your lump sum all the expenditures made by these States, regardless of whether the Federal legislation incited them to it or not.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, since this appropriation has been made, most roads have been constructed under the Federal-aid program. Before that, as the Senator well said, they did not spend a great deal of money. A great deal of the opposition to this bill comes from States which have previously spent money on road building.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, the States that have really a genuine road spirit in them will build their roads out of their local funds, and will not ask the United States to finance their road building.

Mr. SWANSON. The figures I read referred to the construction of last year, not of years before, when the Federal Government put up its money and the States theirs.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not think there was very much incentive to the States through Federal aid, though I think there was some.

The automobile, which has come into almost general use, has been the greatest incentive to road building in the country. Automobile owners have been active; they have required good roads, and there has been an incentive to road building, which pleases me very greatly. I am glad that it exists, and I am not discouraging Federal participation in roads to serve a Federal purpose. What I am objecting to is the present wasteful, unscientific method of spending Government money, and I do not believe any harm can come from postponing this for a few weeks, until we could give it proper attention.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. Referring to the question raised by the Senator from Virginia, I received from Mr. MacDonald a statement showing by States the difference between the total estimated cost and the Federal aid allotted in project agreements up to December 31, 1920, which I propose to submit for the RECORD. The total, however, shows $194,873,519.59, as against $149,-

690,630 to be advanced by the Federal Government. I desire to have the three statements printed in the RECORD.

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

Table showing by States difference between total estimated cost and Federal aid allotted in project agreements executed up to and including December 31, 1920. Amounts set aside by or on behalf of States:

Alabama	$2,001,705.70
Arizona	2,805,217.06
Arkansas	4,813,389.11
California	3,619,626.47
Colorado	2,114,828.19
Connecticut	1,572,341.82
Delaware	1,644,829.43
Florida	1,802,405.33
Georgia	6,172,960.30
Idaho	2,640,656.82
Illinois	11,378,521.09
Indiana	2,673,119.40
Iowa	9,271,258.51
Kansas	12,785,452.10
Kentucky	2,144,622.09
Louisiana	2,891,927.23
Maine	1,829,761.48
Maryland	1,996,618.79
Massachusetts	2,199,274.63
Michigan	3,973,728.75
Minnesota	8,463,541.43
Mississippi	2,007,412.90
Missouri	5,316,579.24
Montana	2,894,270.53
Nebraska	4,003,006.18
Nevada	1,279,578.83
New Hampshire	1,004,774.66
New Jersey	2,402,628.20
New Mexico	1,659,427.05
New York	6,532,589.01
North Carolina	4,743,190.84
North Dakota	1,539,703.42
Ohio	11,032,354.02
Oklahoma	2,704,940.91
Oregon	3,346,724.92
Pennsylvania	15,885,066.91
Rhode Island	593,941.09
South Carolina	2,713,269.71
South Dakota	1,576,694.30
Tennessee	2,902,920.12
Texas	12,494,889.78
Utah	1,107,657.36
Vermont	551,008.99
Virginia	2,527,698.63
Washington	4,176,025.11
West Virginia	3,052,898.74
Wisconsin	5,438,773.53
Wyoming	2,589,708.28
Total	194,873,519.59

Status of Federal aid funds, Nov. 30, 1920.

State	Federal aid allotment.	Paid on agreements.	Amount o. allotment. unexpended.
Alabama	$5,776,552.58	$908,449.07	$4,868,103.51
Arizona	3,771,351.69	668,375.05	3,102,976.64
Arkansas	4,619,929.47	553,147.22	4,065,782.25
California	8,384,354.57	1,413,170.38	6,971,184.19
Colorado	4,780,064.14	985,440.08	3,794,624.06
Connecticut	1,689,324.70	168,645.71	1,520,677.99
Delaware	447,654.83	149,637.42	298,017.41
Florida	3,150,112.48	226,770.92	2,923,341.56
Georgia	7,407,578.62	1,945,496.75	5,462,081.87
Idaho	3,360,388.86	723,403.40	2,636,985.46
Illinois	12,024,266.97	5,588,816.65	6,435,450.32
Indiana	7,415,292.61	722,645.06	6,692,646.55
Iowa	7,939,343.14	704,199.58	7,235,143.56
Kansas	7,895,309.07	852,000.17	7,043,308.90
Kentucky	5,370,064.79	712,373.23	4,657,691.56
Louisiana	3,742,524.57	836,551.87	2,905,972.70
Maine	2,645,963.57	232,086.00	2,413,877.57
Maryland	2,390,749.07	876,595.57	1,514,153.50
Massachusetts	4,032,565.09	539,420.66	3,513,144.43
Michigan	7,961,295.55	1,224,216.84	6,737,078.71
Minnesota	7,815,383.02	2,932,803.90	4,882,579.12
Mississippi	4,951,542.29	528,765.73	4,422,776.56
Missouri	9,322,075.71	220,165.83	9,101,909.88
Montana	5,498,827.31	432,900.08	4,565,927.23
Nebraska	5,866,761.66	1,681,847.37	4,184,914.29
Nevada	3,527,276.18	615,595.58	2,911,680.60
New Hampshire	1,143,088.99	477,939.41	665,149.58
New Jersey	3,265,209.02	578,208.39	2,687,000.63
New Mexico	4,389,794.61	482,764.32	3,907,030.29
New York	13,688,801.67	167,544.60	13,521,257.07
North Carolina	6,270,690.68	1,289,682.65	4,981,008.03
North Dakota	4,222,487.70	417,952.82	3,804,534.88
Ohio	10,202,947.71	2,249,194.41	7,953,753.30
Oklahoma	6,338,245.60	60,098.75	6,278,146.85
Oregon	4,332,178.26	1,594,509.19	2,737,669.07
Pennsylvania	12,632,644.29	3,745,685.62	8,886,958.67
Rhode Island	641,166.13	208,841.71	432,324.42
South Carolina	3,946,617.50	566,149.15	3,380,468.35
South Dakota	4,452,883.04	279,176.94	4,173,706.10
Tennessee	6,228,137.98	284,710.12	5,943,427.86
Texas	16,100,404.77	1,467,914.08	14,632,490.69
Utah	3,117,205.38	281,452.33	2,835,754.05
Vermont	1,242,103.73	127,657.73	1,114,445.97

Status of Federal aid funds, Nov. 30, 1920—Continued.

State.	Federal aid allotment.	Paid on agreements.	Amount of allotment. unexpended.
Virginia	$5,451,730.28	$750,757.75	$4,700,972.53
Washington	3,971,675.83	2,507,406.66	1,464,269.17
West Virginia	2,922,504.45	893,450.64	2,029,053.81
Wisconsin	7,004,280.67	872,876.38	6,131,404.29
Wyoming	3,378,558.17	1,053,024.23	2,325,533.94
Total	265,750,000.00	47,300,610.03	219,4 9,389.97

Bureau of Public Roads, United States Department of Agriculture—Status Federal aid funds Dec. 31, 1920.

State.	Total allotment.	Total amount under construction and completed.	Per cent of contracts completed.	Funds available for new contracts.
Alabama	$5,776,552.58	$1,629,970.00	59	$4,146,582.58
Arizona	3,771,351.69	2,240,459.00	68	1,530,892.69
Arkansas	4,619,929.47	2,467,619.00	44	2,152,310.47
California	8,384,354.57	3,447,320.00	50	4,937,034.57
Colorado	4,780,064.14	1,814,174.00	58	2,965,890.14
Connecticut	1,689,324.70	824,423.00	27	864,901.70
Delaware	447,654.83	284,980.00	68	162,674.83
Florida	3,150,112.48	2,234,194.00	16	915,918.48
Georgia	7,407,578.62	5,876,291.00	51	1,531,287.62
Idaho	3,360,388.86	2,969,138.00	51	391,250.86
Illinois	12,024,266.97	10,887,938.00	55	1,136,328.97
Indiana	7,415,292.61	2,699,368.00	41	4,715,924.61
Iowa	7,939,343.14	5,799,334.00	35	2,140,009.14
Kansas	7,895,309.07	4,292,693.00	39	3,602,611.07
Kentucky	5,370,064.79	2,390,680.00	44	2,979,384.79
Louisiana	3,742,524.57	3,633,023.00	29	109,501.57
Maine	2,645,963.57	1,485,277.00	42	1,160,686.57
Maryland	2,390,749.07	1,869,386.00	64	521,363.07
Massachusetts	4,032,565.09	1,842,322.00	54	2,210,243.09
Michigan	7,961,295.55	4,309,638.00	49	3,651,657.55
Minnesota	7,815,383.02	6,752,180.00	58	1,063,203.02
Mississippi	4,951,542.29	1,811,730.00	31	3,139,812.29
Missouri	9,322,075.71	3,003,597.00	24	6,318,478.71
Montana	5,498,827.51	3,057,461.00	50	2,441,366.31
Nebraska	5,866,761.66	3,255,126.00	88	2,611,635.66
Nevada	3,527,276.18	1,225,469.00	59	2,301,807.18
New Hampshire	1,143,088.99	909,827.00	73	233,261.99
New Jersey	3,265,299.02	1,447,027.00	68	1,818,272.02
New Mexico	4,389,794.61	1,875,151.00	42	2,514,643.61
New York	13,688,801.67	887,186.00	18	12,801,615.67
North Carolina	6,270,690.68	4,846,796.00	33	1,423,894.68
North Dakota	4,222,487.70	1,634,932.00	49	2,587,555.70
Ohio	10,202,947.71	5,059,982.00	38	5,142,965.71
Oklahoma	6,338,245.60	2,382,781.00	28	3,955,454.60
Oregon	4,332,178.26	3,920,461.00	49	411,717.26
Pennsylvania	12,632,644.29	10,802,353.00	47	1,830,291.29
Rhode Island	641,166.13	450,081.00	39	191,085.13
South Carolina	3,946,617.50	1,672,697.00	41	2,273,920.50
South Dakota	4,452,883.04	2,271,154.00	46	2,181,729.04
Tennessee	6,228,137.98	3,707,632.00	14	2,520,505.98
Texas	16,100,404.77	8,301,815.00	33	7,798,589.77
Utah	3,117,205.38	1,992,345.00	25	1,124,861.38
Vermont	1,242,103.73	498,922.00	17	743,181.73
Virginia	5,451,730.28	2,676,337.00	46	2,775,393.28
Washington	3,971,675.83	3,863,418.00	86	108,257.83
West Virginia	2,922,504.45	2,905,935.00	44	16,569.45
Wisconsin	7,004,280.67	2,909,681.00	57	4,094,599.67
Wyoming	3,378,558.17	2,570,309.00	53	808,249.17
Total	265,750,000.00	149,690,630.00	45	117,059,370.00

Mr. PHIPPS. Referring to the question of the Senator from Ohio as to the witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in the good-roads hearings, I will give a few of the names:

W. A. Alsdorf, secretary Ohio Good Roads Association.
Prof. T. C. Atkeson, representing National Grange.
C. M. Babcock, State highway commissioner, Minnesota.
Bennehan Cameron, president Bankhead National Highway Association.
J. D. Clarkson, general manager Jefferson Highway Association.
M. O. Eldridge, director road activities American Automobile Association.
L. A. Gillett, State highway commissioner of New Mexico.
Frederick Stuart Greene, State highway commissioner of New York.
A. M. Loomis, representing National Grange.
Judge J. M. Lowe, president National Old Trails Road Association.
John J. Malang, superintendent of highways, Missouri.
Lewis S. Sadler, State highway commissioner of Pennsylvania.
Henry G. Shirley, road engineer of Baltimore County, Md.
John L. Weaver, president National Association of Real Estate Boards.
F. R. White, chief engineer Iowa Highway Commission.
S. M. Williams, chairman Federal Highway Council, Washington, D. C.
Capt. P. St. J. Wilson, chief engineer Public Roads and Rural Engineering, Department of Agriculture.
Henry Wood, State highway commissioner, Oklahoma.
L. H. Wright, director State Highway Commission of Indiana.

Mr. President, as I have said, those hearings were most interesting and instructive, and I believe they gave to the committee very valuable information, which should be put to good use.

Unfortunately, the time passed on so that further hearings were not possible during the last session of Congress. Since the beginning of the present session the time of the chairman and other members of that committee has been fully occupied, so that it has been impossible to conduct further hearings. However, it is my hope that further hearings on this question may be had, and I believe that we should have them.

I believe that this matter of present appropriations could well go over until the expected extra session of Congress, and that the committee should be given an opportunity, together with the heads of the various Government departments, to agree upon some comprehensive plan which will give to this country the national road system which it should have.

Mr. KELLOGG. May I ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. PHIPPS. Certainly.

Mr. KELLOGG. Did not Mr. Babcock testify that the State of Minnesota had laid out a system of highways for interstate commerce, and that he thought it was economical and efficient?

Mr. PHIPPS. I believe Mr. Babcock, as I recall his testimony, was one of the very few who did state that they had interstate commerce in mind when laying out their principal routes; but I fear that the majority of them were thinking only of the territory within the limits of their own States.

Mr. TOWNSEND. May I make a suggestion? As I said at the beginning, if some arrangement could be made whereby we could have a direct vote on the question of adding the amendment to the bill and a two-thirds vote were secured for it, I should not make the point of order myself, but if it failed of a two-thirds vote I should then want some one who voted for that matter to move for a reconsideration, so that it could be subject to the point of order. What I am trying to get at is that if I were convinced that two-thirds of the Senate want to add the amendment to the bill, and can do it by a suspension of the rules, I should not interpose an objection, but if two-thirds are not for it I do not want it to be carried by any such method as I am suggesting.

Mr. SWANSON. If the rule is waived the amendment is then subject to amendment. It does not mean that this specific amendment is the only thing to be considered. It is in order, then, to amend the provision to any extent the Senate may see proper.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I realize that.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I am not going to detain the Senate very long to discuss the relative merits of the various programs for road improvement and road construction. The matter was debated here for nearly a month in the Senate when the bill was pending. The proposition which was passed by the House overwhelmingly was to continue for one year longer the present system by appropriating $100,000,000, which was the amount appropriated last year, and $3,000,000 for forest roads, which was the amount appropriated last year for that purpose, with an amendment extending the appropriation from one year to two years beyond the end of the fiscal year so that some States which have not yet been able to utilize their funds can have an additional year in which they may not forfeit the Federal appropriation. Those are mostly Western States.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PHIPPS. I should like to say for the information of the Senator from Virginia that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads reported out favorably Senate bill 4899 which carries the same feature referred to, the extension of time for an additional year.

Mr. SWANSON. Then the Senator will have no objection to this amendment?

Mr. PHIPPS. Not to that particular feature of the amendment, but as to the appropriation of $100,000,000 I certainly have objection.

Mr. SWANSON. Another feature of it is in connection with the Western States. A great many of the Western States have not been able to meet the Federal appropriation because they had so many forest lands, so many public lands, so many tax-exempt lands, that they have not been able to meet the fifty-fifty proposition.

Mr. PITTMAN and Mr. PHIPPS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SWANSON. I will yield to the Senator from Nevada, who rose first.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is my purpose to offer an amendment to the amendment for which the Senator from Virginia is now attempting to obtain consideration, for the purpose of bringing about an adjustment in that particular matter. As the Senator has said, there are certain States in the West where the Federal Government owns as much as 86 per cent of the land of the State. For instance, in the State of Nevada that is the fact. Only 14 per cent of the land of that State is taxable. I have now an amendment prepared which I intend to offer to the pending bill, either as an amendment to the amendment or as a separate amendment, which will relieve that condition, and which will provide that in such case, instead of the Federal Government being limited to the appropriation of 50 per cent of the cost of building those roads, they will pay 86 per cent of the cost of building the roads.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PHIPPS. I desire to say to the Senator from Nevada that Senate bill 4899, to which I referred a moment ago, contains a provision which covers the very point that he has raised, that is, giving credit to the public-land States for the area of unappropriated public lands within their borders, when the percentage of Federal aid which is to be advanced for good roads is figured out and taken into consideration. That bill I reported out for the committee, and I served notice that at the first available opportunity I should bring it up for consideration, and that I intend to do.

Mr. PITTMAN. There is a bill that has passed the House known as the Sells bill, which is now, I believe, pending in the Senate, which could be called up, if those who control the legislation in the Senate were willing to have it called up, and passed without any trouble. But does the Senator believe that those who control the legislation in this body intend at this session to permit consideration of any such legislation?

The Senator from Colorado is a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Has his bill been reported out?

Mr. PHIPPS. It has been reported out, and it is on the calendar.

Mr. PITTMAN. Why not have the House bill reported out, that has already passed one branch of Congress, instead of having a bill reported out to the Senate that possibly has no chance of ever being considered in the other body?

Mr. PHIPPS. My attention has not been called to any House bill that is comparable to the one I mentioned. The features of Senate bill 4899 are, first, the extension of time for an additional year, and, second, a change in the allotment to the public-land States of good roads funds. It carries no appropriation whatever.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I am satisfied that if the legislation does not pass and is not made a part of the pending appropriation bill, there will be no legislation at this session, and there will be none at the extra session in connection with road legislation. Senators may have sanguine views about what they will do when we meet here in April and what legislation will be passed before December, but this legislation must go through as a part of the pending appropriation bill or else there will be no legislation upon this subject, I am satisfied, until the regular session of Congress next December. I am satisfied, knowing the methods of legislating as I do, knowing the long time it will take for the tariff and other measures, and knowing that Senators will yield to the discussion of nothing else, that this legislation must go through as a part of the appropriation bill or else there will be no good roads legislation until the regular session of Congress next December.

What will be the result if there is no legislation? A great many of the States will forfeit what they now have unless their time is extended two years. States in the West will be compelled to put up 50 per cent or else suffer the forfeiture. Consequently we may as well face the issue, and it is useless to have hopes which will not be realized.

The legislation that we want with reference to good roads, in connection with the matter of Federal aid for good roads, must go through as a part of the pending appropriation bill or wait until the next regular session of Congress in December. Let us see what the proposition is. It is not the proposition that we have had heretofore to extend the proposition for five years. When the bill was enacted into law in 1916 we provided for a program of five years, extending to the 1st of July, 1921. The Senate committee has reached no conclusion. What is it that we undertake to provide? We say that we will continue the present law, with the modifications that I have indicated as applicable to the States where there are public lands, and extend the time two years before they shall forfeit on account of conditions that have previously existed. We say we will continue this for one year longer at $100,000,000 a year.

What is the platform of the parties on this? The chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads assaulted this

system. I believe that party pledges are made to be carried out and not to be violated.

Mr. THOMAS (to Mr. SWANSON). Do not forget that. I am going to remind the Senator of it in a little while.

Mr. SWANSON. I believe that party pledges are made to be carried out. Of course, some Senators may ridicule that. Let us see what was in the platform of the Republican Party. I do not know what was in the platform of the Senator from Colorado, but here is what the two great parties said, in convention assembled, listening to what the people wanted, with full knowledge of how this system would work out, with full knowledge of what it had done in five years.

I do not believe the leaders of the two great parties would meet, one in Chicago and one in San Francisco, and make a sober declaration of party principles unless they had known it was wise, and especially when indorsing something that had already happened.

Here is what the party of the Senator from Colorado said:

We favor liberal appropriations in cooperation with the States for the construction of highways—

"In cooperation with the States," which is the present system. The amendment which I have offered proposes to do justice to States like Idaho, Colorado, Utah, California, and other Western States which have large areas of public lands which are free from taxation. As I thought at the time, it was a great hardship to require them to pay fifty-fifty, but it was impossible to get the matter adjusted in conference.

In determining the proportion of Federal aid for road construction among the States, the sums lost in taxation to the respective States by the setting apart of large portions of their area as forest reservations should be considered as a controlling factor.

That is included in the amendment. Here is what the Democratic plank says:

We favor a continuance of the present Federal-aid plan under existing Federal and State agencies—

That is the Democratic declaration—

amended so as to include, as one of the elements in determining the ratio in which the several States shall be entitled to share in the fund, the area of any public lands therein.

Those are the declarations of the two parties. We have said that we can not have any road legislation at this time of a far-reaching character. The only question is whether we shall continue the present legislation for one year, or let it stop and have a lapse of a year. That is the issue. There is no chance of getting any road legislation through at the special session, and there is no chance of getting any legislation enacted now except what shall be carried on the pending bill. We had just as well face the issue.

What will be the result if we do not place this proposed legislation on the pending bill? First, as for the Western States, many of them will forfeit what has been heretofore apportioned to them; those apportionments will lapse at the end of one year, and the amendment proposes to extend the time for two years; second, it will be necessary from now on to continue the program of fifty-fifty—although a large portion of the lands of many of the Western States are exempt from taxation—which is not just and proper and which both parties have recognized as being a discrimination against that section.

Now, let us see what else will happen. Senators talk about there being no necessity to appropriate money at this time. The most conservative estimates are to the effect that there will be only $67,000,000 left of this fund for all the States—the Western States and all—on the 1st of July next. A letter has been read here by the Senator from Nebraska in which the director of public roads says there will not be a cent left on the 1st of July, 1921, of the appropriation for Federal aid to roads; that it will all be exhausted by existing contracts; and the whole system will be stopped.

Senators talk about the State legislatures meeting. I believe that there is hardly a commissioner of roads in any State who has not come here and disclosed what will be the condition if some provision for road legislation is not made at the present session of Congress. Mr. Duncan Buie, of New Orleans, stated:

The immediate necessity of such action is due to the fact that 43 State legislatures—

Forty-three out of forty-eight—

will convene this fiscal year, and over 30 will not be in regular session again for two years. The majority of these legislatures adjourn by March 15. In enacting State road legislation they will have to know definitely what the Federal road program is to be, in order that they may be able intelligently to provide State funds to match the Federal funds. Funds so appropriated at this year's sessions which are to be raised by taxation will not actually accrue to the State treasuries in most instances until June, 1922, which coincides with the date on which the present Federal appropriations will lapse.

What does that mean? It means that the State organizations, that the State engineers, that this great movement for road improvement must stop marching and halt and mark time for one year. Senators can not shirk the issue; they may have sanguine hopes; they may try to present it otherwise and hope that we may have legislation at the special session, but everybody knows we shall not get it. The question is, Are we willing to stop for one year the great work of road improvement, on which last year $632,000,000 were expended? Are we willing that the splendid engineering organizations all over the country shall be disintegrated, and that 43 legislatures now in session and anxious to match the Federal road appropriation shall be left without any action on our part to guide them?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from Virginia may have already stated it—if so, I was not present at the time—but I should like to know what amount is yet available for road work from appropriations which have already been made?

Mr. SWANSON. The amount which is available for new contracts out of the $275,000,000 appropriation is $117,000,000 as of the 20th of November last. The director of roads says, at the rate they are making contracts now and with the specifications for projects which have been approved and the specifications not yet made, after the 1st of July, 1921, there will not be any money available.

Here is the process by which the road work which is done by the Federal Government and the States is carried on. An engineer of the Agricultural Department in Washington, with the State officer of highways or the commissioner of roads, as the case may be, jointly decide on a general plan—the direction in which the road shall run and an estimate of its cost, and so forth. That plan is then sent here. If the road is deemed of sufficient importance on account of travel over it and other considerations to justify the expenditure of one-half by the Federal Government to match the half which is appropriated by the State, the Federal department approves the general scheme. Then reference is made to the specifications which have been filed for the road, the entire details are gone over, and must then be approved by the Federal department.

In the statistics which were submitted by the Senator from Colorado as to specifications for roads he showed that the general plans had been approved. The director says that on the 1st of July there will be no money available for road work, and, consequently, one year would elapse without there being any funds from the Federal Government to match State funds. He further states that 43 legislatures meet in January and adjourn by the 15th of March. They are all desirous of having road legislation before that date, in order that they may know what they may expect for the next year in the way of appropriations for road improvement. Roads can not be constructed on 30 days' notice; road construction requires engineers; it requires plans; it requires investigations; it requires State taxes to match the Federal expenditures. We all know we shall handicap the work if we put it off for one year.

I have offered my amendment to continue road construction and also to take care of the situation in the Western States. The appropriation of $100,000,000 would not be subject to the point of order, and no Senator would have a right to make it, as it is to carry out existing legislation. Any amendment proposing to carry out existing legislation is not subject to a point of order. I think the condition in the Western States is such that they should have this relief. The States where the changes are made should be given two years, and I have proposed to waive the rule in order to accord them that justice to which they are entitled.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KENYON. I do not want to ask a question in reference to the interest of the Senator from Virginia in the roads in the Western States, but I do wish to make another inquiry in view of what he has said as to the effect of suspending road work. I have been informed that the State of South Carolina in the last week or so has suspended its road work for some time. Is that correct?

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator will find here the States which have exhausted their apportionment of road money and suspended road work. The names of the States are given, and I can furnish the information to the Senator, if he will wait for a moment. I have here the names of the States that have already exhausted their funds and which will soon suspend work.

Mr. KENYON. The point I am trying to get at is this: My understanding is that the State of South Carolina has sus-

pended work because of the excessive burdens of taxation thereby imposed.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not know as to that.

Mr. KENYON. When the Senator from Virginia speaks of not being able to suspend road work, while we are all in favor of road construction, of course, the question arises whether, in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury, we ought not to follow along the same lines as the State of South Carolina is pursuing in protecting her own people from excessive taxation; whether or not we are not going to suspend the Federal Treasury if we continue these appropriations?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will recall, this money will not be available, as stated by the road director, until the latter part of 1922. As I said a while ago, now is the time to construct roads, for the price of material is going down and there is an abundance of labor. The director recognizes that this is a good time to continue road construction, and not to discontinue it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, without intending to dispute the last statement of the Senator from Virginia, I should like to ask the Senator if he has considered the question of the waste of the money appropriated by the Federal Government for road construction in various instances? I have before me an article from the Little Rock, Ark., Gazette of February 4, 1921, which is headed:

A million wasted in road building. Program planned to "serve selfish interests," charges the grand jury.

Taxes to be enormous.

"No apparent justification" for hog-thief highway, declares investigators' report.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I do not care to go into that. I know there is a road law in Arkansas under which the people are taxed at a very high rate.

Mr. KENYON. Is the Senator familiar enough with the situation to know whether the complaint in Arkansas grows out of the Federal appropriation?

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think it does. As I have said, they have in that State a law which taxes a farmer whose property abuts the road in such a manner as to make it very oppressive. It is something after the order of the schemes adopted in cities by which the property owners pay part or all for certain improvements. This course, I understand, has been pursued in that State, but the Federal law has nothing to do with that. All the Federal law does is to appropriate a given amount of money to the States for road building purposes, providing the States appropriate a like amount.

Mr. KENYON. They appear to have been overtaxed down there.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not know to what extent that is true.

Mr. KENYON. I know that the grand jury referred to in the article reported that the taxes on some of the farms have been increased almost equal to the value of the farms.

Mr. SWANSON. All I know is that there is not a State in the Union that does not desire Federal aid to continue the improvement of its roads, except the States which have already built their roads and have completed them, and which think perhaps that they are putting in a little more money than they get back. I know that is true, perhaps, as to some of the great centers of population.

Mr. KENYON. Probably that is true, but what is bothering me is this: What is the hurry? Why can we not take the road bill as it comes from the House, take time to consider it, and work out what is the best for all concerned? I am thinking a little about the poor old Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SWANSON. The amount that goes toward the improvement of roads is only 1.8 per cent of the Government's expenditures. The money proposed to be appropriated will not be available until the fiscal year 1922. The provision will simply continue for one year and is simply designed to prevent a lapse of one year during which road building shall be discontinued while we are discussing what system should be followed. Of course, if we desire to destroy the system, if we want it discontinued and are against it, we ought to stop it and serve notice on the States that they shall not continue to receive aid from the Federal Government for road improvements. If, however, we allow the appropriation to lapse for one year, it will bring about the disintegration of the engineering forces of the States and of the State highway departments.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. MOSES. Of course, I can understand the interest which the Senator from Virginia has in the road expenditures which are to be made in 1922; but when he points out that the State legislatures are now in session but will adjourn by the 15th of March, I desire to suggest that there is nothing to prevent any of these legislatures from making their appropriations conditioned upon the future action of Congress, which may be taken deliberately between now and 1922, a year in which the Senator from Virginia will have great political interest, as we all understand.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator need not run away now since he has made that statement.

Mr. MOSES. I am not going to run away.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator's suggestion were followed the appropriations would not be available at all, and the efforts of the State would be stopped until the Federal Government had acted. If the State action were conditioned as the Senator suggests, the State would not know what it could do until the Federal Government had acted through Congress in regular session.

Mr. MOSES. There is money enough now to carry on this work until 1922; there being, as I understand, a balance of $117,000,000 left from the appropriations already made by Congress.

Mr. SWANSON. The Director of Roads says that is not true; he says it will all be exhausted before the 1st of July, 1921. The Senator has made his statement; but the director says differently.

Mr. MOSES. I can only speak of the situation in my own State.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, in reference to the statement which was made awhile ago as to South Carolina suspending road construction, I desire to say that, so far as I know, that is a mistake. I have heard no intimation made to that effect, although the legislature is now in session. Furthermore, only a few days ago I received an application from the engineer of roads for more machinery. We have added to this bill a provision authorizing the War Department to turn over to the Agricultural Department considerable machinery, to be allotted to the different States to be used in the construction of roads. In view of that request for more machinery from the engineer of roads in South Carolina I think it is apparent that it is desired to continue road-improvement work.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President——

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PHIPPS. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia a question. Has he any figures from the highway commission of his State showing the rate at which it expects to expend the Federal-aid money? For instance, the figures show that up to November 30, inclusive, Virginia had drawn down only $470,000 of her allotment. How rapidly does Virginia expect to expend the remainder of about $6,750,000?

Mr. SWANSON. I read to the Senator at the time he made his first remarks the figures furnished Mr. MOORE, a Member of Congress from Virginia, I suppose by the highway commissioner of Virginia. If he wants me to do so, I will repeat them to him; but I read them to him before.

Mr. PHIPPS. It is not necessary, then; I shall get it in the RECORD.

I want to say that I am quite pleased to find that the Senator from Virginia is in full accord with me in the views I have maintained and set forth in regard to credit to public-land States for the unappropriated public land within their borders, and also for the extension of time that should be allowed on the Federal-aid allotments; but my own guess is that the Senator will find it quite necessary to make a further extension of at least two or three years beyond the time he now contemplates if Virginia is to expend her full allotment without allowing it first to go back into the general pot and be reapportioned.

Mr. SWANSON. When the Legislature of Virginia meets it will authorize the furnishing of funds sufficient to meet the road situation. An amendment to the constitution to that effect will be voted on at the next general election.

Mr. PHIPPS. Now, may I say to the Senator, as regards my own State of Colorado, that it voted a bond issue of $5,000,000 predicated upon Federal aid for road buildings. There is no reason why other States should not follow that example. It can be done. It is not necessary for the legislatures of these various States to adjourn without taking action on their road-building programs because the Federal Government has not yet appropriated for the year 1923.

Mr SWANSON. Mr. President, I am unwilling, so far as I am concerned, for 43 State legislatures to adjourn on the 15th of March without knowing what the Federal Government is going to do in connection with road improvement. If you have a lapse of one year, it will disintegrate the system. Senators may talk all they please about Federal aid not having aided, but there has been the most rapid road improvement since this legislation

was passed that this country has ever had. Over four dollars has been spent by the States, counties, and local communities to one dollar furnished by the Federal Government. This amendment simply takes care of one year, pending the investigation of your committee as to any amendments that should be made. It does not change the law that the platforms of both parties indorse, the cooperative plan. It does not increase what was spent this year. It simply continues the work for one year, so that the roads shall not disintegrate, so that the engineers will know what they can count on in the way of Federal aid for one year longer. There is ample time given to see the situation as it is and then make any amendments to the law that may be necessary. If this is not done, it simply means a cessation for one year. It is useless to shirk it. It is useless to have these hopeful statements made about what will be done here in an extra session of Congress before the 1st of July.

Mr. MOSES. It means a cessation of what, may I ask the Senator—of all work on roads?

Mr. SWANSON. It means a cessation of Federal aid to roads for one year.

Mr. MOSES. Very well. Then let the States go on as they did before, and spend their own money, as my State did, as the State of Vermont did. Let them build their own roads with their own money, and not ask the Federal Government for money.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator favors that, I have made the proposition clear. If the Senator is opposed to Federal aid, if the Senator wants it to stop, if the Senator wants that interregnum to come, let him vote that way. I have made it plain. I have not tried to shirk the issue. Those who are opposed to it can vote against the rule, vote against the amendment, and let it stop. Those who favor it, those who believe in carrying out the declarations of the platforms of the two parties, who do not want an interregnum of one year, ought to vote to include it in this bill, because that is the only way you can get it.

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

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PHIPPS. I merely desire to say, as a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, that that committee conducted hearings on the good-roads question and gave consideration to the question as to the best methods that could be followed in the extension of Federal aid, and were unwilling to favor the further appropriation of any Federal funds until this question could be thrashed out at length and a proper understanding reached which would enable the Congress, in connection with the departments of the Government, to decide upon a comprehensive plan for permanent road building, which we are not getting to-day under the present method of Federal aid expenditures.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the very law itself says they must be permanent roads.

Mr. PHIPPS. That is true.

Mr. SWANSON. The Federal aid law, under which it is done, is a law for the permanent improvement of roads. The law itself says that these must be permanent roads. This construction can not be temporary construction under the very law you have to-day. The States must agree to keep the roads improved and in repair before the Federal Government will aid them.

Mr. PHIPPS. I believe those two points have been thoroughly discussed, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. SWANSON. It is in the law.

Mr. PHIPPS. There is no doubt that it is in the law, but it is a question of the practice.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I desire just a few moments to give my views on this motion and my reasons for voting for it.

Two years ago the Congress deliberately adopted a plan to aid in the construction of roads, and made an appropriation covering two years, which expires on the 1st of July, 1921. Congress invited the States to appropriate an equal amount and to adopt and submit to the Federal Government for approval a plan of permanent improvement. This money can be expended only for the construction of roads under that plan. Whether it was right or wrong, we deliberately adopted it. I quite agree that men may differ as to whether the Federal Government ought to aid the States in building roads; but we inaugurated a program that will require several years to complete.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. TOWNSEND] and a member of the committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], say that the committee is now inquiring into a plan for the construction of Federal roads. It is well known to the Senate that the chairman of the committee is in favor of an entirely different scheme. His idea is that the Federal Government should actually build and maintain roads through the States, known as interstate roads, taking them out from the jurisdiction and control of the States. I do not approve of that at all. I would rather the Federal Government would not appropriate any money whatever for the purpose. I do not think the roads in a State should be built by the Federal Government or controlled by the Federal Government. The State authorities know best where to locate roads and how they should be constructed.

There is nothing to be gained by this committee spending any more time, so far as I am personally concerned, in evolving an elaborate plan for Government construction of roads. I would not vote for it under any circumstances. Furthermore, why abandon a plan which has been deliberately adopted and substitute another plan. Will you now notify the States, after they have arranged to carry out plans for certain roads, that the Federal Government will not lend further aid, but that the Federal Government intends to build other roads? Such a proposition will certainly conflict with existing plans covering roads that have been already laid out and partially built.

This bill, of course, is simply an authorization for an appropriation for 1922; and I would agree with the chairman that it is not necessary to authorize additional sums at this session if it were not a fact that if the States are to go ahead with the plans they have already made they must have a reasonable time within which to carry them out, and many legislatures are now in session. Take my own State of Minnesota. The State of Minnesota adopted a complete program covering roads to be built with State money and Federal aid. It was necessary for the State to amend its constitution, and at the last election an amendment was adopted to authorize the levying of taxes and the appropriation of money for internal improvements, so that the State might contribute an amount equal to that which has been appropriated by the Federal Government. Not only has the State laid out a complete and scientific system of roads over the State, to be built by the State and the Federal Government jointly—that is, by the State with Federal aid—but those plans are in process of completion. Contracts have been let, and so far as Minnesota is concerned—and I find that it is true in many other States—the entire sum which Minnesota receives under the act of 1919 will be completely absorbed by contracts on May 15, 1921.

The legislature of my State is now in session. It will adjourn in April. If the State is to construct these roads which have been laid out and partially completed it must know whether the Federal Government is to continue its aid, and it ought to know it at once. I do not think it is possible for Congress to outline plans for State roads beyond what has already been done toward requiring the approval of the Federal authorities in the adoption of those plans.

I realize the state of the Treasury, and I am as anxious as anyone to avoid any unnecessary appropriation; but we realize the fact that roads must be built. We realize that they are the greatest aid to commerce and to business in the rural districts, and we have deliberately adopted a plan which it is now proposed to abandon and scrap, notifying the States to finish the roads if they can, although they have appropriated money and levied taxes with a view to carrying out existing plans and completing the system of roads which they have already adopted.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that under the circumstances Congress now ought to authorize this appropriation leaving it to future Congresses to make the appropriation when it is necessary.

After the Congress had adopted this plan and appropriated the money, the Republican Party in convention assembled indorsed the proposition by this provision in their platform:

> We favor liberal appropriations in connection with the States in the construction of highways.

It was the plan which had already been adopted by the Congress that the Republican national convention approved, and I believe a similar approval was had in the Democratic convention.

I realize that party platforms are often mere matters of expediency to get votes. But this proposition was voted by Congress deliberately, appropriations were made, improvements were started, and the program indorsed by both parties, and now it is urged that the Congress discard the whole scheme and say to the States, "Build your own roads." We should have done that two years ago, if it was to be done at all.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not care to go into much more extended discussion of this question, although the statement of the Senator from Minnesota is entirely misleading, and, of course, he begs the question in order to have a basis for some sort of an argument. There is no proposition before the Senate—I certainly am not proposing any—to abandon Federal participation in the construction of roads. I have a notion

that when Congress has determined that a policy is wasteful it ought to take steps to stop the waste, if that can be done.

The platform the Senator has read from was adopted in order to cover any possible emergency which might arise. It does not commit us to the Federal-aid plan at all. No inference to that effect can be drawn from it. It does commit us to the proposition of Federal participation, to the expenditure of Federal money in the construction of roads.

The statement the Senator makes in reference to the conditions in Minnesota is one that can be easily met. If the State of Minnesota is interested in good roads it will appropriate money for the construction of roads. The Federal-aid money, if it is offered to it, will be matched by a part of the money which the State itself appropriates. The idea that we are going to stop road building in this country, in the State of Minnesota or any other State, because the Federal Government does not contribute an infinitesimal part of what ought to be expended on those roads, is simply ridiculous to me.

The State of Colorado has already met that proposition. Other States know how to meet it. We have all the money that those States can expend now, at least until the 30th day of June, 1923. Of course, you can lay out additional systems, and the State can make the argument that it can not lay out a system of roads until it knows that the Federal Government is going to contribute a small part. But that argument does not weigh with me. I am not committed to a plan which would prevent Federal participation in the construction and maintenance of roads. I have felt that it was my duty to study this question, and notice was served when this bill was passed originally that it was only a temporary matter. The record so disclosed. All that the States had a right to prepare for was to meet what the Federal Government had appropriated.

I want to go further. I want to continue the appropriations of the Federal Government, but I want the plans laid out so that they mean good roads, because I contend the Federal Government has no right to appropriate any money except for a Federal purpose, one of which is interstate commerce, because that is growing more and more in importance. The truck is here to stay. It is going to be one of the means of transportation, I think in time equal to that of the railroad, certainly equal to that of water transportation, and we should lay out our system of roads with that idea in view. I simply want the Federal Government to expend its money on primary roads.

The Senator from Minnesota says we are going to scrap everything that has been done, roads that have been built. There is no such proposition at all. Even the bill which I introduced for a national system of roads took into account all the roads along the main line which have been constructed by the States, and the amount of money that had been expended properly by the States was to be paid to the States to be used in the construction of other roads in those States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator just a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Is it not true that under the present system of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States they have in view that very proposition of utilizing the moneys and constructing the roads so that they may be used for interstate commerce and traffic?

Mr. TOWNSEND. A few of the States have taken that view, I am glad to say.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that in my State, for instance, we have built a road from Portland, Oreg., to the south boundary line of the State, and it is being extended from the south boundary line of the State to San Francisco, so that we have a hard-surface road practically continuous from Seattle to San Francisco which can be used, paralleling the railroad in some place.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If all the Federal money had been expended with the purpose in view, first, of establishing an interstate system, and then have the State connect with that for a State system, and the county system coordinating with the State system, there would not be so much conflict.

Mr. PITTMAN. I observe that in most of the Western States the practice is being pursued, at the present time at least, of first building the transstate road, connecting with interstate roads. In my State, for instance, there are three great transcontinental highways crossing it. It is those highways that are now being projected under this bill, and, of course, it was with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, because under this bill any plan which may be suggested, as I understand it, must meet with his approval, and it seems to me that that is the protection under the act.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. The argument of the Senator from Minnesota, as I followed it, gave me the impression that his State road authorities would be embarrassed because of contracts they had made on the supposition that the Federal Government would continue appropriations. Does not the present system require, before a State shall make a contract for continued highways, that the Federal Department of Agriculture shall approve the same?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Absolutely.

Mr. EDGE. And be prepared before such approval with an appropriation?

Mr. TOWNSEND. There is no question about what the law is on that subject.

Mr. KELLOGG. It may approve the plans for the road.

Mr. TOWNSEND. They approve a road before any appropriation is made for the road. If it were not so, then the States could go on and lay out any kind of system and any amount of roads and say, "The Federal Government is bound to make the appropriation."

Mr. EDGE. Then, Mr. President, how could a State be embarrassed unless they had really gone beyond the intention of the Federal-aid legislation?

Mr. KELLOGG. If the Senator will permit me to answer the question, the plans for these roads have been submitted to and approved by the Federal Government, but the entire roads have not yet been contracted for. The plans have been laid out for certain roads running, say, the whole length of the State, connecting with interstate roads, connecting with Iowa on the south and North Dakota on the north. Those plans have been approved, and the roads have been contracted for.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator mean to say that the Director of Roads would approve or have anything to do with a plan which would exceed the State appropriations or Federal aid?

Mr. KELLOGG. He would not approve an appropriation beyond that, of course, but he would approve a plan of which the appropriation was a part.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not think any such thing has ever been done.

Mr. KELLOGG. That would necessitate a separate plan for each part of the road that was built.

Mr. EDGE. Then is it not true that the only embarrassment to Minnesota, or any other State that has proceeded in that manner, would be, perhaps, on account of the delay, if they were waiting for Federal aid, or the opportunity to appropriate directly from their State, and, as the Senator from Michigan very positively stated, there was no intention at all on the part of the committee of which he is the head to in any way sidetrack Federal aid for roads, only to try to have it properly controlled, so that the money would be properly and wisely expended. There would be absolutely no embarrassment, though there might be some delay, if the States depended entirely on Federal aid. But the delay would be in the interest of real, proper construction, with the type of Federal supervision which would insure the proper type of highway.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am disposed to vote against the suspension of the rule in this matter. I shall be guided by what I conclude the chances are of having this road question before us later. As I understand the situation, this is not the last of this proposition, but there is a bill pending involving this matter, and investigation is proceeding with a view of determining what we shall do in regard to this very important subject, and also with a view to determining how much road we are building and how much money we are wasting. I have no figures, and therefore am not able to inform the Senate, but I have seen statements to the effect that we are wasting as much money as we are actually utilizing in the building of roads. I assume that is true, because it is characteristic of the Federal Government to do that. The money wasted on different matters during the last few years has run into the billions.

What I rose to say, Mr. President, is that whenever these matters which touch the internal development of the country come along there is always a very serious debate upon the question of economy, and where we are curtailing expenses we are curtailing expenses in matters which have to do with the internal improvement of the country, with the betterment of our industrial and agricultural conditions. We are practically un-

able to get any curtailment anywhere else. The people will have to make up their minds that they are not going to get any money for real internal development, or for taking care of those things which are so essential to industrial and agricultural conditions, until we do adopt a different program with reference to those things which are really taking the vast amount of the money which we here appropriate.

We had a bill before the Senate a few days ago which had to do with reducing the size of the Army. There was an effort to limit the size of the Army to 150,000 men. Had that been accomplished we could have saved $30,000,000 there. In my judgment, the size of the Army should be reduced to 100,000, and if we do so we will save the amount of money which we are here denying ourselves, and may deny ourselves later, for the purpose of improving the public roads of the country.

As I view it, if we are not to have an Army for other purposes than of domestic use, police purposes, and so forth, 100,000 men are just as available and just as efficient as 175,000 men. If we were building up an Army in anticipation of foreign trouble or difficulties with other nations, 175,000 would be no better than 150,000. We are carrying a much larger force than is necessary for police purposes or for domestic purposes, and a wholly insufficient force for anything else. We are paying out of the Public Treasury about $100,000,000 a year more than is necessary for that purpose.

Furthermore, I find from a letter which I have from the Secretary of War that with the 175,000 men, later probably reduced to 150,000 by the appropriation bill, we will have 13,662 commissioned officers to officer 150,000 men. Nearly 14,000 officers and only 175,000 or 150,000 men seems so utterly unnecessary and incongruous that I wonder it should be long tolerated.

Mr. LENROOT. There may be more than that. There is no restriction on the number of officers.

Mr. BORAH. But I was speaking of what we actually had on January 20, 1921. Contemplate seriously for a moment the fact that we have some 13,000 or 14,000 commissioned officers for an army of 150,000 or 175,000 men. This condition of affairs calls for rectification. We can not condone such matters and justify ourselves when the people ask us why we do not reduce their taxes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator knows that so far as enlisted men are concerned his views and mine are not far apart, but when it comes to officers I do not agree with the Senator, for this reason: Of course, if we only had to have officers to command an army of 150,000 men, we would not need that many officers. Of course, if we were just going to use those 150,000 men, we would not need 13,000 officers. But the Senator must recall that it takes three or four years to train an officer and it takes just a few months to train a man, and we have to have more of the officers so that the Army can be easily enlarged when trouble comes. I differ with the Senator about the number of officers.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I am sorry the Senator differs with me, but I still believe that the size of the official life of the Army is beyond the necessities of the Army and beyond anything the country demands. I happen to know that there are some men in the Army who are officers who think the same way. I do not know just how we could train or utilize to their good or the country's good 13,000 officers with only an Army of 175,000. I have undertaken to inform myself with regard to it and it is a mystery, the penetration of which I have not yet been able to achieve. The number of officers which we have seems to be conceded all around to be very large, and in a day or two I am going to take up the number of officers we have on the Rhine looking after our 14,000 or 15,000 men over there.

Mr. McKELLAR. We ought to bring them back. We have too many officers and men over there.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; we ought to. We ought to do a great many things which we are not doing.

The officers cost us $52,307,881 a year, so we have the Army alone eating up a vast amount of the appropriation. I trust sincerely that if the western men who are very much interested in roads should conclude to stand with our friends in studying carefully the question of expenditure upon the subject in which we are so deeply interested, that in a few days, when we get to the Army appropriation bill and the naval appropriation bill, they will manifest their deep sincerity in economy by doing the same thing with reference to those matters. There will be amendments offered with reference to which it will probably be necessary to suspend the rules of the Senate in order to get a vote. I hope at least that they will give us a vote upon some of the amendments which are coming along in a few days upon this question.

I wish to touch upon another matter, which I do not propose to go into at length to-day. The appropriation bill for the Navy coming over from the House carries $395,000,000. We are about to construct and are in the process of construction of some 16 capital ships, which cost about $40,000,000 apiece. I am advised that there are at least four or five of those boats which are less than 10 per cent and some of them less than 2 per cent upon their way toward construction. I am perfectly clear that we could suspend the building of at least six of these capital ships without detriment to the country and ultimately without weakening the Navy and thereby save $240,000,000. If we could cut a hundred million from the Army cost and two to three hundred million from naval cost, we would be cutting our expenses and making a saving which would mean something.

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

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator what portion of the $395,000,000 appropriation is for the construction of new work?

Mr. BORAH. Ninety million dollars, I believe.

Mr. POMERENE. And how much of it is for the completion of work now in process of construction?

Mr. BORAH. I can not give the Senator that figure. The new work is represented, as I am informed by the debates in the House, in the figure of $90,000,000, but it seals the proposition of an expenditure of $640,000,000. The contracts are made and if we go ahead with the appropriation for this year and ratify the program and appropriate $90,000,000 to carry it forward another year, manifestly it will be absolutely impossible to stop a year hence upon the construction of that program which we are just now beginning and which we ratify by appropriating $90,000,000 this year. Now is the time to act. If we go ahead this year the program will go to its conclusion.

So the bill as a matter of fact carries an obligation, which we must meet from year to year, for $640,000,000. That is only for one class of ships. Those two items are the only places where we can cut expenditure. The other cuts are mere negligible propositions. We can not economize anywhere except where great expenditures are made. If we refuse to economize there, it is as certain as night follows the day that we can not limit our expenditures at all.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator, if we have sufficient road funds to last until the end of the fiscal year 1923, why we can not economize now by saving this $100,000,000 and not appropriating it this year at a time when the Treasury is bound to be bankrupt, not only for this year, but for the next fiscal year, and at a time in which we shall have to issue bonds again in order to get enough money to run the Government? Why can not we save the $100,000,000 right now, and allow the States to go on with their work of building the roads that they have now in view? I have just been informed by the chairman of the committee that they have money enough there to last them for the two years.

Mr. BORAH. I am not sure but that the Senator is correct in his position, and have not taken a different position from that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I said when I rose that I thought I should vote against the suspension of the rules, but I coupled it with the proposition that I understand there is a bill pending in which the matter will come squarely before us after thorough investigation has been made as to what we should do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I simply desired to indicate to the Senator that we would also save $100,000,000 in this way.

Mr. BORAH. I do not wish to be understood, however, in voting against a suspension of the rules, as concluding myself in this session or the next session as to how we shall appropriate for public roads. We should not abandon road building. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is mistaken in assuming that there is a balance sufficient to meet State road requirements until 1923. I have already read into the RECORD to-day, I think, perhaps when the Senator was not here, a letter from the Director of Public Road Service, which demonstrates that 11 States have already exhausted their appropriations; that 8 more States will exhaust them during the present calendar year, and that all of the appropriations will be exhausted during the next fiscal year.

Mr. McCUMBER. Fifteen minutes ago the chairman of the committee stated that there would be sufficient in the funds to last until the end of the fiscal year 1923.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the chairman is mistaken.

Mr. McCUMBER. He stated that he had looked into it, so I assumed that he knew what the figures actually were.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. This letter from the Director of the United States Bureau of Public Roads is dated to-day, and I will read once more the language.

Mr. McCUMBER. Even if that were true, under the present state of the Treasury ought we not to eliminate those things that we can get along without?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is another question.

Mr. McCUMBER. At least until we could find the time in which the taxation will meet the appropriations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is another question. If the Senator admits the facts stated in the letter, it means that the road program in most of the States of the United States will have to be suspended unless this appropriation is made at the present time. If the Senator admits the facts stated in the letter, I have not any further question to raise.

Mr. OVERMAN. As I understand it, this is not an appropriation but is an authorization.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. BORAH. There is only one thing on which I take issue with my friend from North Dakota, and that is the suspending of the appropriations until we shall be better able to take care of them. There is no indication that within his lifetime or mine that will be true at the rate at which we are at present traveling. We are appropriating this year fully as much if not more than we did last year. I am told by a member of the Committee on Appropriations that we are appropriating more. That verges on madness. It is a form of insanity—that kind of insanity which arises out of delusions, and one of the delusions is that next year we will do better.

Mr. LENROOT. We are appropriating a good deal more; but I think we are spending a good deal less, because there are large amounts available from appropriations running away beyond July 1.

Mr. BORAH. Let us hope that is true. As hope is all we will likely get out of it, let us indulge in that luxury to our full content.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that there is about $225,000,000 that was appropriated during the war time, and it was appropriated to remain available until it was expended. I will say that in the fortifications appropriation bill, if we can not do it anywhere else, I wish to get the amount of all that is unexpended in the way of balances, and I desire a provision put into that bill repealing those appropriations and allowing the amount to revert to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BORAH. Those are all evidences of good faith that very seldom bear fruit.

Mr. SMOOT. I think they will bear fruit unless I am overruled by the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. What I mean is that in the end we will keep mounting and climbing with our appropriations. That, to my mind, is a certainty.

Mr. President, perhaps it is impossible to estimate the world's debt.

According to the figures which I have seen, the indebtedness of the world at the time of the close of the war was something like $200,000,000,000 or $250,000,000,000. Some have placed it as high as $348,000,000,000. Our own indebtedness, our public debt, is about $24,000,000,000. We are appropriating about $4,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000 for current expenses, and we are facing a deficit of some $2,000,000,000. The fever of spending which we contracted during the war is still raging. The joy riding in the Public Treasury is still our chief delight. This to me is a greater menace than any condition of affairs which we faced during the war. War has its menace and its threatening problems, but none more menacing than the shameless waste of public funds and the laying on of unnecessary burdens upon a people already bending under a fearful load. Do we here fully appreciate the situation, or must we confess our inability or unwillingness to deal with it?

Mr. President, this debt which now rests like a mortgage in process of everlasting foreclosure upon the brain and the energy of the human family really staggers computation, and in its demoralizing and deadening effect beggars description. We seek to estimate it in figures and speak to each other in terms of billions, but all this signifies but very little. It is when you undertake to measure this debt in foot-pounds of human toil that its magnitude becomes bewildering. The privation and the misery, the suffering and the sacrifice, the men and women bending in hopeless drudgery, the children starved in body and stunted in mind, the families discouraged and broken up, the pauperism, the crime, the suicide, which its everpressing weight and subtle tyranny imposes, place its size and its effect beyond our power to portray. The most exacting taskmaster in the world is the public debt. The most remorseless cruelty which a community as a whole can experience is this ceaseless, never-ending struggle to meet its obligations. If it has any advantages to bestow, it bestows them upon the few and well favored—those who are able to hold bonds and collect the interest. But it sits with the average citizen at his meals and accompanies him in his daily avocation to take from him all that he can be persuaded or driven to give and leaves him nothing in return. I have read of theorists who argue that public debts are really a benefit; that at least their evils are greatly exaggerated. I think the public debt a curse. It eats out the substance of the people, kills initiative, undermines and corrupts society, breeds discontent and disorder, and often destroys government itself. The immediate and most commanding task of all those who would see a composed world and prosperous and orderly communities and States is to devise ways and means to reduce it if possible, and in the name of humanity to see it goes no higher.

Sir, when the war ended, Germany was disabled; her army was reduced to a police force; her navy dismantled, broken up, sunk into the depths of the sea. Austria-Hungary was divided, parceled out, driven into bankruptcy and starvation. No nation, no power among the enemy anywhere was left to threaten or make afraid. The allied and associated powers were left masters of the world, dictators of the world's policies. They were the autocrats of statecraft. While they surveyed a world torn, tortured, and burdened, they nevertheless surveyed it without challenge. The most stupendous fact at the close of the war was the world debt. The most pressing and complex problem was how to stay its growth and, if possible, lessen its weight. But no move was made, nor has there been any move made in that direction in any of the allied or associated countries. The futile and absurd proposition that the cost of the war and the world's debt could be extracted from Germany was flouted before the people, while the expenditures for militarism and armaments were increased beyond anything ever before contemplated. With incontinent haste and reckless plunging we began to compete with each other in building for future wars. With our huge debt already upon us, with our current expenses greater than we dare lay taxes to cover, we surge ahead—plunge ahead toward universal bankruptcy. When are we going to lighten these burdens? How are we going to do it? Where is the program? Have we lost our cunning in everything in God's tortured world save that of appropriating public money? There must be a change of program some time, and in my judgment at no distant time.

The news dispatches advise us that before convening Parliament a few days since it was thought the part of safety to barricade, as it were, the streets and avenues leading to the House of Commons. Of course, it was immediately said that it was to guard against Sinn Feiners. But it now transpires that there was another factor in the situation, to wit, the discontented, hungry, unemployed workmen of England. In Japan the spirit of unrest and revolt is stirring everywhere among the masses as never before. In our own country business is worried and discouraged by crushing taxes, while 3,000,000 workmen are seeking employment. Taxes and appropriations, appropriations and taxes, will not cure such conditions. It is not a long step from the barricade around the legislative halls and unemployment to the point where popular power breaks in upon the rights of property and decrees are issued from the open forum. Unjust and oppressive taxation—this will destroy the morale of the most self-poised and patient people in the world and shake the foundation of the most noble and freest institution ever devised by sage or patriot. I ask again, and I ask in deep sincerity, if the suggestions and remedies I have proposed are inadequate, what is the program? What do we propose to do? To drift is a confession of sheer incompetency. The path of mere expediency is the path to disaster. If the program proposed is unavailing, then what is the program?

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, there is no Member of the Senate who disagrees or who would venture to disagree with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] as to the urgent need of securing if possible an agreement among the nations for the limitation and the reduction of armaments. There is none of us who does not know that the economic prostration and the misery of the human race in a great part of the world is due to the burden of taxation incident to the prosecution of the war and to the political and economic disorders which followed the war. There is a difference of opinion among us as to what steps should now be taken by the Government of the United States, and, more especially, by the Congress of the United States looking to negotiations not only for disarmament but for the liquidation of the differences which exist between the great powers.

The Senator from Idaho with characteristic ability argued that the fleet of the United States, including the ships now

building, was obsolete; he urged that the maintaining and building of a fleet at once so formidable and so obsolete would lead to war and to disaster! Therefore, if I understand him, the Senator seeks:

To have America pause in her labors for her own defense.

To substitute for tried and proved engines of war others of which the value is unknown and inestimable.

And to have the President invite the other naval powers to a conference on disarmament, after we have stopped arming, while Japan continues so to do, and while the British sea force is twice as powerful as the American. I can not agree with him. I can not agree that our shipwrights and gunsmiths should lay down their tools while Japan arms herself. I can not agree that the limitation of armament should be fixed on the basis of a British sea power more dominant than ever in modern history.

The Senator will not hold that he has any greater loathing for war than those of us who have beheld it with our own eyes, and who have looked upon the bloodied ground and the young bodies torn and still warm with the life just spent. He can not have any greater horror of the waste of war, of the ruin and hate which follow in its train, than we who have beheld and felt them. If his friends and admirers differ from the Senator from Idaho it is not because we do not share his purpose, but because unlike him we agree with the majority of the naval authorities; it is because unlike him we agree with the responsible naval experts as to the lessons which must be drawn from the Great War, and above all, because we believe—nay, we know—that if the Congress of the United States delay and hamper the present development of the Navy it will hamper and confuse the President elect in the discharge of the heaviest duty which he has to perform. If we pause now in the building of a Navy we shall compound the difficulties of the new President in securing a general limitation of armaments by sea and by land, in removing certain dangers to our security and no less certain obstacles to the renewal of our commerce abroad and to the restoration of our prosperity at home.

OPINIONS OF ADMIRALS WHO DID NOT FIGHT.

The Senator from Idaho, when he argued last Friday that the American Navy was obsolescent and that the American battle fleet was obsolete, adduced in support of his view the opinion of an American admiral, retired before the outbreak of the Great War, and of four British admirals, three of whom held no command at sea during the whole course of the conflict. These admirals may be able to destroy their critics in print, but they destroyed no enemies in battle. They are doubtless formidable in controversy, but we know nothing of their prowess in combat. It may ultimately be proved that they have rightly forecast the future evolution of aerial and submarine warfare, but they had little or no part in driving the enemy's shipping off the high seas, in making helpless his battle fleet, in destroying his few raiders who escaped the blockade, in mastering the submarines, or in safely transporting 2,000,000 troops across the Atlantic to the battle fields of France. These apostles of the new school of naval warfare would as eagerly put aside the traditions and lessons of the past, would as eagerly adopt the submarine and the airplane to the exclusion of the battleship, as those other evangels of the new day would have discarded the traditions of Washington and the doctrine of Monroe to adopt the covenant of the league and enter a union with Europe, in order to secure the independence and the peace of America.

The Senator from Idaho quotes Admiral Hall, of the British service, as saying that the war was won without capital ships. It is relevant to remark that Admiral Hall, as a submarine commander, appears to be biased in favor of the naval arm which won him distinction and promotion. We ourselves do not think or speak meanly of the Senate, however modest we may be about our own small merit. The Senator from Idaho tells us that Admiral Lord Fisher has written that the whole British Navy would better be scrapped and a new beginning made. He quotes to the same purpose Admiral Henderson, who by his own words confutes himself; for, if I rightly understand the Senator from Idaho, Admiral Henderson holds that the weaker fleet of capital ships will not come out against the superior fleet—a startling discovery by one of the admirals of the new day. I am no great seaman, although I can tell the difference between the hempen sheets of a four-master and the cotton sheets of a four-poster. But still I know that the smaller capital fleet of Von Scheer never successfully took the sea against the great fleet. It dared not; it could not.

THE GRAND BATTLE FLEET.

What are the indisputable facts regarding the service of the Grand Fleet, which during the World War rode at anchor or cruised off Scapa Flow? It contained the enemy fleet, held it blockaded, immobilized it, prevented it from taking the seas, and so rendered impossible any destruction of allied commerce by the German cruisers or destroyers. When the Germans, thus blockaded, builded submarines to work the destruction which their pent-up surface vessels had not been able to do, the Grand Battle Fleet, holding besieged in port the German Navy, kept the seas free and safe for the swift, small surface craft—the counter submarines—which convoyed the transports and the squadrons of merchantmen, which ceaselessly sought and sunk the submarines, until the German crews mutinied and refused to be condemned to a dark death under the waters at the hands of the enemy whom they could not even see to fight. I repeat the Grand Fleet made it possible for the light, swift surface ships freely to sail the seas and to destroy the submarine enemy.

ANGLO-JAPANESE NAVAL SUPERIORITY.

These are facts which may be disregarded by speculative admirals and literary seamen, but to which no specific answer has been made except that the British Admiralty is not now proceeding with the construction of capital ships. What, Mr. President, are the circumstances under which the Admiralty has curtailed or suspended naval construction? We must consider them no less than the imaginative and interesting speculations of naval inventors. There are to-day, according to Mr. Daniels' table, 26 British and 6 Japanese battleships of the first line, as against 16 American; there are 6 British and 4 Japanese battle cruisers of the first line, and under the American flag none; there are 44 light cruisers in the first line of the British Navy and 8 in the first line of the Japanese Navy, and none—none under the Stars and Stripes. Unaided by her Japanese ally, the British Empire so dominates the seas that, despite the judgment of the British Admiralty that battleships and battle cruisers are the very core of any navy, Britain can afford to pause in the construction of first-line ships until she can replenish her treasury; the more so as she knows that in America there is on foot an agitation to block the movement to build an equal American battle fleet before armaments are finally fixed and permanently limited by an agreement between the members of the Anglo-Japanese alliance and the United States.

It is not merely mistaken—it is sheer nonsense—to say that British naval policy is not profoundly influenced by trade depression, by unemployment, by the rate of exchange, by the indebtedness to America, and by the heavy drain upon the British exchequer. The British Government announced in the House of Commons on December 10 its plan for a reduction of expenditures, as follows:

1. Strict injunctions have been given to all the departments that any schemes of reform sanctioned by Parliament but not yet in operation are to remain in abeyance for the present. This will apply to certain important particulars of the education act of 1918.
2. Three departments are to be wound up before March 30, 1921: The ministry of munitions, the ministry of shipping, the ministry of food.
3. Military commitments are to be cut down as far as possible. Complete withdrawal from Persia by next spring.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, does the Senator expect that to happen?

Mr. McCORMICK. I know that the British Government has ordered the removal from Persia of all British women and children and has ordered the withdrawal of the British forces from northern Persia and northern Mesopotamia. I will not venture to conjecture as to what may be done abroad in the matter of disarmament. That is precisely the reason why I am opposed to disarmament by the United States until a conference of the powers can be had.

To continue with the schedule of retrenchment announced in the House of Commons—

Reduction of the troops in Palestine. Drastic reductions in Mesopotamia.
4. Utmost economy in air expenditure.
5. No naval program involving expenditure on capital ships to be undertaken until the Committee of Imperial Defense have inquired into and reported on the whole problem.

I say again that the necessity for economy and the present overwhelming preponderance of the British battle fleet join to determine British naval policy, however it may be influenced or suspended by the critics quoted by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator notices that the suspension of capital ships to which he has just referred includes battle cruisers as well as battleships. The chief controversy that has been referred to by the Senator from Idaho—in fact, practically the only controversy—is in regard to the usefulness of battleships. It does not include the battle cruisers. All of these critics are agreed that battle cruisers continue to be a most essential feature of their navies; so that it can not be through

any agreement or any conclusion that the ships have become obsolete that this program has been adopted.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Washington for his illuminating interruption. In that connection, let me interject that for the British Islands the problem of the submarine and the marine aircraft has an interest which it can not have for Japan or the United States. There are the ports of six powers bordering upon the North Sea and the British Channel from which aircraft or submarines may be sent out to prey upon British commerce or to endanger British cities.

BRITAIN, JAPAN, AND THE BATTLESHIP.

A study of the opinion of the British press will bear out my statement. Any inquiring traveler will learn as much. I do not say that in England, as here, intelligent experts are not studying and seeking to develop submarine and aerial engines of war, or that in England there has not grown up a school which is talking of the importance of small, swift craft. But I wish to remind those Senators who have not prejudged the case that it was Britain, long mistress of the seas, who invented first the dreadnaught and then the superdreadnaught, and finally the battle cruiser. The report of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs which the Senator from Idaho attacks concurs in the view expressd by the world's two chief naval authorities, the British Admiralty and the General Board of the American Navy. I call to witness another authority—the only other existing authority—as to the soundness of our conclusion. There is one of the great powers which during the world conflict put forth so little effort against the enemy, expended so little of her treasure in the prosecution of the war, that she was able actually to reduce the sum of her national debt during that time—Japan. Dai Nippon, great Japan, imperial Japan, has not waited for the report of the British committee of imperial defense to decide upon types of naval armament. Japan, her national debt diminished during the course of the war, has not awaited the judgment of the civilian members of any council of defense, but has accepted the judgment of the naval experts of the British Admiralty, now challenged by the literary admirals and my friend the great Senator from Idaho. Accepting that judgment, Japan has doubled her naval expenditures and is proceeding with all haste to build capital ships not only in her own yards but in the shipyards of her ally, Britain. I have already submitted to the consideration of the Senator from Idaho the overwhelming vote by which the Japanese Diet refused to consider the proposal to curtail this Japanese naval program.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator doubtless noticed that the next morning the minister of the navy of Japan said that that vote must not be understood as indicating the policy of Japan with reference to this matter at all, which was published in the public press of this country. Now, as between the two, I do not know, but he also stated that the vote as it was cast was only indicative of the standing, as I might say, of the gentleman who made the proposal, a matter with which I can sympathize.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, whatever the public utterance of the minister of marine in Tokyo or the vote in the Diet may have been, there are on the ways in Japan one and in Britain three battle cruisers building for the Japanese Imperial Navy.

Doubtless the art of war at sea will be developed. The Committee on Naval Affairs, as the Senate very well knows, purposes not only to continue the construction of capital ships, but in view of the great number of submarines and destroyers constructed during the war and of those still building, its members have contemplated appropriating sums once intended for the building of vessels of that type to the construction of two swift airplane carriers. The program to which your committee adheres is unqualifiedly indorsed by Admiral Sims and Admiral Fiske, the ablest of the critics of the present naval administration, who hold that we should go forward in the construction of battleships and battle cruisers as planned until the day when experiment may have proven that we can build such powerful submarine and aerial craft as will permit or compel the abandonment of capital ships. In the light of our experience in the war, dare we put aside the judgment of the chief naval authorities of the world, based upon experience, in order to confide the national defense and to intrust the lives of our men to the unproven devices the wholesale adoption of which is advocated by a small minority of enthusiasts?

EXPERIMENTING WITH MEN'S LIVES.

Senators can not have forgotten the tragic blunders of the War Department experts who, sitting in their offices, thought to invent artillery and aircraft superior to those developed on the bloody fronts. There are crosses in France which stand as monuments not only to the heroism of those who fell but to the theories of those who thought they knew better how to make war than those who had made it.

If I have spoken first, and briefly, of the military judgment and declared policy of the responsible naval authorities in Britain, in Japan, and here at home, it is not because that judgment alone upholds the report of your Committee on Naval Affairs, or alone should influence the decision of the Congress and the policy of the United States. We are on the eve of important negotiations which in part result from the decision of the people of the United States not to abandon tradition or proven and cherished policies for diplomatic devices put forward by gentlemen whose study and experience of international affairs were as insufficient as their assurance was great. I do not doubt that the new American negotiators will be realists no less than idealists, or that they will have some appreciation of the present as they seek to build for the future.

America is even more powerful to-day than she was when the conference at Paris first met, but the American negotiators after the 4th of March will be confronted with the alternative of success or failure as certainly as were those who went to Paris. The outcome of the negotiations will be in their hands, if we uphold them. Much has changed since the Paris conference, but the most important fact in all international politics remains unchanged. Here in America, Mr. President, is the world's great reservoir of credit and fighting man power. At this time the fleet is the expression of that power. The full success of our future negotiation, the future prosperity of our people, their peace and security in the years to come, the limitation of armaments by sea sought by the Senator from Idaho—aye, and that limitation of armaments by land which is necessary to the economic restoration of Europe and its peace—all may turn upon the decision of Congress to go forward now toward the completion of an American Navy comparable in power and varied fighting strength with any other.

THE TRUTH ABOUT FOREIGN RELATIONS—EUROPE ARMED TO THE TEETH.

We are come to one of those pauses in the development of international relations when plain, friendly candor is necessary to an agreement of will and purpose between the peoples rather than a mere agreement of words. Candor alone can beget that confidence which is the basis of peace. It is unprofitable, it is dangerous, to conceal from ourselves the truth that the peoples of Europe to-day are moved by a nationalism more passionate and a rivalry more bitter than before the Great War. That rivalry has engendered between old allies acrid animosities which are almost comparable with the hatred which old enemies bear one another. Despite the disarmament of Germany, west of Russia there are now, over two years after the signing of the armistice, well-nigh as many troops under arms as there were before the outbreak of the conflict in 1914. These armies are maintained not only against some possibly imminent military danger, but as political factors to support diplomatic movements in the present unsettled condition of Europe. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand that one power may hold assembled under its standards legions of armed men to serve as a diplomatic counterpoise to the armada of another. This is one of the consequences of the settlement attempted at Paris. I say "attempted," because the settlement comprised in the treaties of Trianon, St. Germain, Sevres, and Versailles can not last without a radical readjustment. Frontiers thither and yonder have been laid down upon utterly conflicting principles, while still other frontiers have been laid down upon no principles whatever—geographic, ethnic, strategic, or economic. The unrest and the economic prostration of Europe are ascribable to the treaties of peace as well as to the waste of war. We can not read the cabled dispatches from Vienna without recognizing that the impossible situation of Austria threatens the tranquillity of all her neighboring States. The achievement of something like an equality of naval armaments by the United States and the British Empire will serve to restore the balance of power in the world, to reduce armies on the European Continent, and consequently to diminish deficits and rehabilitate credits, to mitigate rivalries, and to demobilize hates.

It is not too much to say that the carrying out of our naval program will stabilize international relations, and so make for a steady market abroad for our copper and our cotton, for the products of our factories and our farms. That program constitutes one of the principal elements of America's strength and authority to-day.

Since the question of naval armaments confronts the three naval powers, let us bear in mind that precisely between those powers there is a commercial and maritime rivalry, and that there exist real differences between them which we seek promptly and amicably to dissipate.

OUR DIFFERENCES WITH THE ANGLO-JAPANESE ALLIES.

We wish to maintain our reborn merchant fleet upon the high seas in friendly competition with the merchantmen of Japan and Britain; we wish to establish a differential in the tolls charged at Panama; we wish (like Australia and Canada) to assure the acceptance—the uncontroverted acceptance—of our immigration policy; we wish by a mutually advantageous understanding to assure for ourselves as for our competitors a constant and adequate oil supply; we purpose to establish by agreement if possible, and otherwise if necessary, direct cable communication with continental Asia and central Europe, now denied us by France and Japan. We share the common hope that armaments may be limited, and we may well wish to learn from Britain that if we join her in the limitation of naval armaments she will cease to build not only on her own account but on Japan's account as well. There is one more question of which I wish to speak. The Anglo-Japanese alliance was formed lest the peace of the Orient be disturbed by the policy of the Romanoffs or the Hohenzollerns. They reign no more. Neither Russia nor Germany can challenge the peace and security of Japan or Britain in the Far East. There remains only one great power which might be affected adversely by the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese treaty—the United States of America.

Manifestly, we have important interests to preserve, even while we seek the most cordial relations with all the peoples of the world. It is trite to say that ours is a pacific people, and that, indeed, Americans are given to a certain generous and almost quixotic habit of mind which sometimes makes them forgetful of their own permanent and essential interests. It is this habit of thought which has led some good Americans in a spirit of impulsive generosity to seek to associate our foreign policy with that of some other power, even at the expense of our national welfare. This was as true in the early days of the Republic as it has been during these later years. George Washington wrote:

> Men are very apt to run into extremes. Hatred to England may carry some into an excess of confidence in France, especially when motives of gratitude are thrown into the scale. Men of this description would be unwilling to suppose France capable of acting so ungenerous a part. I am heartily disposed to entertain the most favorable sentiments of our new ally and to cherish them in others to a reasonable degree. But it is a maxim, founded on the universal experience of mankind, that no nation is to be trusted further than it is bound by its own interest, and no prudent statesman or politician will venture to depart from it.

So he wrote when France was the ally and England the enemy of the United States.

DISARM AMERICA? ABANDON HER POSITION?

Mr. President, we were unready for the Great War. We were unready for peace. It will not be long before the public learns how furtive and futile, how ignorant and arrogant, was our diplomacy at Paris. By every token which we can read the American people have condemned the policy of our quondam spokesman. They have demanded that we be guided by the wisdom of experience, the clear lessons of history. They would enter no sham Utopia. They expect no miracles, but in these trying times they have a right to expect common sense and common prudence on the part of their servants. Let us recall the homely counsel of the patriot and statesman who bade us "Speak softly and carry a big stick." Among the belligerents America by force of circumstance has been able the most readily to purge herself of hate. She is the readiest and the most able to soften the hates of the others, to help the conqueror and to help the conquered, but she can do so only if her statesmen are realists no less than idealists, only if she retain her power. If we cripple our Navy, if we abandon to other powers the domination of the seas, we shall limit the markets for our produce; we shall narrow the seaways for our shipping; we shall restrict the beneficent influence of our credit; we shall disarm the next President of the United States; we shall abandon the position which America holds to-day.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to occupy the time of the Senate again to any length. I only think it necessary to say a word in order that my able friend from Illinois may not, in his future addresses, misunderstand my position. His argument is addressed to the fact that some one proposes disarmament regardless of whether the other nations disarm or not. I have not heard of that proposition being made. The only proposition which I know of, and with which I am humbly connected, is the proposition of bringing together the great naval powers to see if possibly an agreement could be arranged or entered into by which the naval armaments of the different naval powers could be reduced. I have not proposed that the United States should disarm of her own motion or alone. I think, perhaps, the Senator has that idea in mind. I hope he will not associate it with my efforts.

Secondly, I have not proposed to dismantle our Navy. I have not even ventured upon my own judgment to propose that we discontinue the building program. I have said that in my judgment we should suspend for a limited period to ascertain whether we were building a modern navy or not. The more I read upon the subject, the more I hear it discussed, the more I am convinced that we do not now know what we are doing with reference to the Navy. I shall urge, when the naval appropriation bill comes before the Senate, that we suspend this expensive program for a limited period until we can ascertain whether we are building the kind of a navy which the able Senator from Illinois has in mind.

Thirdly, he refers to a number of "literary admirals." It is altogether probable that literary admirals have as good conception of the matter as the members of the Naval Committee, and in saying that I do not speak disparagingly of the Naval Committee. These literary admirals, so called, have all seen service in one of the greatest navies in the world, and some of them are spoken of with profound admiration even by those who differ with them as to the future policy.

I call the Senator's attention to one whom I think he will not regard as a literary admiral. I read from the Chicago Tribune of February 13, 1921, from the words of Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske:

> The so-called capital ship has seen its best days. The naval supremacy a year or two henceforward will belong to that nation which possesses the most powerful fleet of aircraft.
>
> It seems to me the future Navy will be vastly different from the fleets of to-day. It will probably consist of large vessels without smokestacks or masts, or possibly with internal-combustion engines. Every one of those ships will carry as its major weapons three kinds of airplanes: First, aircraft for scouting duty, both over water and over enemy coasts; second, bombing planes for dropping explosives on ships and fortifications; third, torpedo planes carrying projectiles to be launched against the hulls of surface ships.

Speaking of Sir Percy Scott, one of the literary admirals of England, he said:

> Scott wants to lose no time from profiting from the lessons of the World War. He saw, as the whole world saw, that fleets of mighty armored ships could not get closer than 10 miles to enemy coasts. He knows that the gun range of a battleship is limited. He knows that in speed aircraft has heavy ships hopelessly outstripped. In radius of action there is no comparison between them.

Further on it is said:

> It is the torpedo plane, he is convinced, that is destined to spell the doom of the big, costly surface ship. It is not easily seen, said the admiral, how a battleship can protect itself from an attack of a torpedo plane. A torpedo plane may attack without being noted until it is too late. High up it is invincible and inaudible. It can descend so swiftly that it can not be hit even if seen. It can come within close range of the battleship, launch its torpedo, and swoop upward again so rapidly that it is practically safe. Even if it were not safe, what is one man, one inexpensive plane, against the loss of a giant ship?

When we get Admiral Sims's testimony, we will find, I believe, that, like Admiral Fiske, he believes that the capital ship has seen its day. I am perfectly willing to grant that neither one of those gentlemen have urged that we cease building capital ships, but they have both stated facts which ought to convince any legislator that it is a very serious matter indeed to expend $640,000,000 for ships which, those men declare in effect, in two years will be obsolete, if they are not now. That question, I submit to my learned friend, is the only question I have submitted by the second resolution.

The third proposition is entirely too long to answer this afternoon, but upon to-morrow or soon I shall recur to the proposition stated that the Navy is a great negotiator in diplomatic affairs. Germany and England tried that from 1900 to 1914, and I am going to develop at the first opportunity that I have how that negotiation came out.

Fourthly, the Senator says that the program which I have proposed will embarrass the incoming President. I have no doubt that I have as profound respect for the judgment of the incoming President as has the Senator from Illinois. I have no desire to embarrass the incoming President, but how the Congress of the United States, in expressing its opinion upon a vital matter which concerns the Congress alone, and that is the matter of appropriations, can embarrass the President of the United States I am unable to understand.

There is a mystery surrounding this embarrassment which I am wholly unable to penetrate. The only thing the resolution does is to express the view of Congress that a conference should be called, just the same as we did in 1916. If the President elect has a program which he submits to Congress, how can it possibly embarrass the President elect when we have simply recorded our views as to the program which should, in our judgment, be adopted? The President will be free to suggest a wiser and better program.

Another thing: We have heard a vast amount of criticism in the last eight years about waiting upon the nod from the White House. Congress has been accused in the last eight

years of abdicating not only its judgment but its functions. I have not participated in that so much as some, for no one can make Congress a cipher except Congress itself. But let me say, with the utmost respect for the President elect, and with the keenest desire to cooperate with him, that I shall not abdicate my judgment in matters which devolve upon me as a Senator during the next four years any more than I have during the last eight years. If the Congress of the United States sees fit to advertise to the world that upon this question which involves the future welfare of the human family, that it has no judgment, no opinion, no conscience, and no conviction until the President elect nods, the Congress may do so, but I shall not be a party to the program. The President elect has his duties to perform as an executive and he has declared with commendable clearness and courage he and not some one else will perform them. We have our duties to discharge and our obligations to meet, and it will be a pitiable spectacle if we loiter around like satellites of royalty until we are bid to act and to profess and pretend to think.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to give a written notice of a motion to suspend the rules to-morrow.

Mr. THOMAS. It may be read, so far as I am concerned, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has examined the rule and thinks there is no requirement that it shall be read.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be printed in the RECORD, and the Chair will rule that it has been read.

Mr. PITTMAN. Very well.

The notice referred to is as follows:

I give notice that under Rule XL I will, on February 18, 1921, move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI in order that I may propose and have considered the following amendment to H. R. 15441, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, to wit:

At the end of the bill add another section to read as follows:

"SEC. —. That section 6 of an act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes, approved July 11, 1916, as amended,' is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 6. That any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this act shall, by its State highway department, submit to the Secretary of Agriculture project statements setting forth proposed construction of any rural post road or roads therein. If the Secretary of Agriculture approve a project, the State highway department shall furnish to him such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates therefor as he may require: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve only such projects as may be substantial in character and the expenditure of funds hereby authorized shall be applied only to such improvements. Items included for engineering, inspection, and unforeseen contingencies shall not exceed 10 per cent of the total estimated cost of the work. If the Secretary of Agriculture approve the plans, specifications, and estimates, he shall notify the State highway department and immediately certify the fact to the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon set aside the share of the United States payable under this act on account of such project, which shall not exceed 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof, except that in any State in which the percentage of total land area to which the title of the United States is unqualified or exempt under the Constitution or laws of the United States from taxation by or under the authority of such State exceeds 10 per cent of the total area of the land in the State, the Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the ratio of cooperation on the part of the State the percentage that the area of the said land to which the United States has unqualified title, together with the land area so exempt from taxation in the State, is to the total area of all lands in the State. No payment of any money apportioned under this act shall be made on any project until such statement of the project, and the plans, specifications, and estimates therefor, shall have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"'When the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that any project so approved by him has been constructed in compliance with said plans and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State the amount set aside for said project: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time, make payments on said construction as the same progresses, but these payments, including previous payments, if any, shall not be more than the United States' pro rata part of the value of the labor and materials which have been actually put into said construction in conformity to said plans and specifications; nor shall any such payment be in excess of $10,000 per mile, exclusive of the cost of bridges of more than 20 feet clear span. The construction work and labor in each State shall be done in accordance with its laws, and under the direct supervision of the State highway department, subject to the inspection and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and in accordance with the rules and regulations made pursuant to this act.

"'The Secretary of Agriculture and the State highway department of each State may jointly determine at what times, and in what amounts, payments, as work progresses, shall be made under this act. Such payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury, on warrants drawn by the Secretary of Agriculture, to such official or officials, or depository, as may be designated by the State highway department and authorized under the laws of the State to receive public funds of the State or county.'"

KEY PITTMAN.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the discussion which has just ended is very interesting and very important. It is not very germane, however, to the subject which the Senate has under consideration, that being a motion to suspend the rule in order that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] may propose an amendment to the pending bill, and, if possible, secure an additional appropriation of $100,000,000 for road building. I have no disposition to postpone a vote upon the notice and the motion of the Senator from Virginia, but the views which I entertain regarding the wisdom of the appropriation justify me in outlining my objections to it, which I shall, if the motion is carried, present to the consideration of the Senate as well as I am able to do so.

I am as anxious to see the pending and other appropriation bills enacted before the expiration of the present session as is any other Member of the Senate, and I would not interpose the slightest objection to their speedy and successful consideration were it not for what seems to me to be the need of limiting the amounts in the appropriation bills somewhere within the range of the committee's consideration as they come from the committee to the Senate.

Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion since the amendment was offered by the Senator from Virginia, and it has been confined almost entirely to the need of the appropriation at the present time and to the consequence of its denial; in other words, the wisdom or practicability of the appropriation at this time seems to constitute the distinguishing feature in this body of the discussion as to whether or not the rule should be set aside. Not until the Senator from North Dakota, in questioning the Senator from Idaho, suggested the unwisdom of making the appropriation at this time because of the condition of the Treasury was the public interest concerning it mentioned at all. The interest of the Government of the United States in the appropriation, the effect of the appropriation upon the burden of the taxpayer, the condition of the Treasury—these things seem to be entirely subordinate to every other consideration when the enormous sum of $100,000,000 is involved.

Mr. President, I think that the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota constitutes the crux of the whole situation; and the appropriation should be made or it should be defeated upon grounds which affect the country and upon the manner in which it may affect the public revenues. I am opposed to it, because I not only believe but I know—and so does every Senator upon the floor—that we can not afford at this time to make any appropriation which is not absolutely necessary to meet the obligations and expenses of the Government properly administered.

I do not want to speak too severely, but I think I am fully justified in saying that the making of appropriations such as are here contemplated is little short of a legislative crime at this time. The chairman of the committee is absolutely correct, if figures mean anything—and he is presumed to know as much about the situation as does any Member of this body—when he declares that the sum is not at present needed. The Senator from Massachusetts is also correct in declaring that its primary purpose is to secure appropriations to be expended in the various localities and districts of the United States; and I might add, Mr. President, and still be within bounds, for such political benefit as always follows in the train of local expenditures of public funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Colorado has said that this appropriation will not be needed.

Mr. THOMAS. I said so, and I think that is right.

Mr. McKELLAR. The report of the chief of the bureau, Mr. MacDonald, is that the present appropriation will be substantially exhausted by the 1st of July next.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, my colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], who is on the committee, has just put into the RECORD figures and statements, official in their character, from the department which, if true——

Mr. McKELLAR. The statement I have quoted is from the head of the bureau.

Mr. THOMAS. Which, if true—and I have no doubt of their truth—absolutely disposes of that statement. I copied some of the figures, and particularly those showing the state of the fund in Virginia, which has as its allotment under existing appropriations the sum of $5,451,730.28, of which there has been paid up to the 31st of December, 1920, $2,676,337, leaving unexpended for the State of Virginia out of existing appropriations $2,775,393.28, or more than half of the total appropriation which has been allotted to that State.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. PHIPPS. The figures last stated by my colleague represent the amount allotted on approved projects; but the actual

amounts that have been withdrawn from the Treasury for payment on account of the allotments to the State of Virginia up to the 30th of November last, which was the last date available, total only $470,000, as I stated earlier in the day.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank my colleague for making the additional statement.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. It may add somewhat to the discussion if I call the attention of the Senator from Colorado to a statement made by the same Mr. MacDonald in a letter to me, in which he says—I will only read two sentences——

Mr. THOMAS. Will not the Senator from Ohio give the date of the letter?

Mr. POMERENE. It is dated February 17, 1921. Mr. MacDonald says:

On December 31, 1920, $149,683,107 was either under actual construction or completed, leaving $117,066,893 on that date available for new contracts.

Now, as applying to Ohio he says:

Ohio on December 31, 1920, had $5,142,966 of Federal aid available for new contracts, the balance of its apportionment being already under construction or completed. Reports from your State highway department show that $1,000,000 will be put under contract by April 1, 1921, and the remainder by July 1, 1921.

Mr. THOMAS. That letter sustains the statement which the chairman of the committee made this morning. The sum of $117,000,000 is still available out of the previous appropriation.

Mr. POMERENE. That amount was available on December 31.

Mr. THOMAS. It was available on December 31.

In addition to that, we are deliberately asked by a very considerable number of Senators to make an appropriation at this time of another $100,000,000 for good road purposes, and we are told that that is in accordance with the program; also that in the event this appropriation fails it will very seriously interfere with, if not suspend—and in many cases will suspend—the program of public road building in the United States.

Mr. President, if that is true—and I can not believe it; I say that in all kindness toward those who make the argument—it is to my mind the most potent reason that has yet been given for defeating this appropriation, for if with $117,000,000 of unexpended money, plus the amounts which the States have furnished or must furnish as their proportion of expenditure under the bill, road building is to be interfered with or embarrassed or suspended unless it can secure this additional $100,000,000, then those who have charged that the road-building projects have become a part of the "pork-barrel" system of the United States are right. It is incredible and inconceivable to me that with an enormous unexpended balance, much of which, according to the official statement, is so largely available, our system of national and State road construction yet depends upon an appropriation of $100,000,000 from the Treasury.

In my State the allotment is $4,780,064.14; amount allotted, $985,440.08; still available, $3,971,184.19. I think I am perfectly safe in saying that we need no money in my State at the present time. My colleague and I have both been bombarded with telegrams and letters and requests to support this measure, and I have no doubt that the Senators from other States have received similar messages; but we are confident that at this time it is not wise or prudent or necessary to add to the burdens of the National Treasury by voting another appropriation.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] warns us in the most solemn manner imaginable that if this measure is defeated the program of Federal aid will fail, because the next Congress will do nothing upon this subject before next winter. Mr. President, if that is the case, let it fail. I am almost tempted to say, if that is the condition of road building in the United States, it ought to fail. But I have heard the Senator from Virginia utter a great many sepulchral prophecies before when some of his appropriations were in danger; and I venture the assertion that the extra session will not be many days old before my distinguished friend the Senator from Virginia, in that blithe and persuasive way of his when appropriations are desired, much of which will redound to the benefit of his State, will be urging a renewal of the consideration of this appropriation, and if it is not provided for at the next special session of the Congress, it will not be the fault of the Senator from Virginia.

When the chairman of the committee assures the Senate that this subject is under its consideration, that the committee is giving its close and careful attention to it, and that it proposes after it has secured the needed information to prepare and present a bill on the subject, I am disposed to accept his statement. I have known the Senator for a good many years, and an abler or more useful Senator does not occupy a seat in this Chamber. When he gives that assurance, I know that the Senate can depend upon it; and when such a bill is evolved from that course of procedure—the only course which should be taken as the basis of so large an appropriation—I have but little doubt that the Senate, by a majority upon both sides of the Chamber, will be inclined to support the bill. But this is a measure that seems to have been rushed through the House by whip and spur, and then hurried over here in order that it may be attached to the general appropriation bill for post-office purposes, and during the closing hours of this session of Congress be enacted into law.

If this motion carries, I shall deem it my duty to oppose the proposed amendment upon its merits to the best of my ability. As I said before, I do not want to interfere with the course of legislation—and it is very important—which is upon our calendar; but I think it is worth while to take a little time, even as valuable as time is now, to defeat an added appropriation of $100,000,000 before we adjourn if it can be done, and I know of no better service that I can render than to aid in doing it if my aid becomes necessary.

I remember when the first bill appropriating $75,000,000 for road purposes was enacted. Some of us opposed it. The Senator from Utah then predicted that the $75,000,000 measure was the beginning of a series of appropriations, each perhaps greater than its predecessor, and resulting in financial legislation compared with which the experience of Congress in the rivers and harbors bill would be practically insignificant; and he is right.

The armistice had scarcely been announced before the Post Office bill was reported here with an amendment carrying $250,000,000 for good roads. That, we were told, would be the limit of Federal appropriations. We thought at the time that the Government's finances could not stand or ought not to be required to endure this added burden; but as usual, Mr. President, the supporters of the bill fell back upon the very effective but old, old refrain that "it was for the benefit of the soldiers," the boys who had borne the brunt of battle across the seas, who had stormed the German trenches upon Flanders fields, and who would soon return by the hundreds of thousands to be given employment through the operation of this system if backed by an appropriation of $250,000,000. It was during the consideration of that bill that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] asked the Senator having charge of the bill, Mr. Bankhead, where he supposed the money for the appropriation was coming from, to which the Senator answered that that was the business of the Finance Committee and not of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; and this appropriation also will be the business of the Finance Committee if it becomes an appropriation, either at this time or at any other.

Some one has said that this is not an appropriation, but an authorization. Mr. President, I do not care what you call it, the purpose is to get $100,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States. "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet"; and the securing of money out of the Treasury of the United States, by whatever name it may be called, will reduce the available amount of the public funds to the extent of the appropriation.

The Senator from Utah has called my attention to the amendment. It provides that, subject to the provisions of the Federal aid road act of July 11, 1916, as amended, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, for the construction of rural post roads, and for the said fiscal year the sum of $3,000,000, to be available until expended, for the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads or trails within or only partly within the national forests.

I think the States should be required very largely to build their own roads. There are some States, like that represented by my friend the Senator from Nevada, whose material resources will not permit of that burden, and there are others needing Federal appropriations; but, Mr. President, the assets of good roads are State assets much more than they are national ones. The great State of California began a system of road construction before Federal aid was granted, and, I think I am safe in saying, before it was applied for. That State is literally gridironed with the most magnificent system of highways in the world, practically all constructed at State expense. As a consequence, Mr. President, it is the great holiday ground, the great pleasure ground, the great attraction to all classes and conditions of men. The amount expended by the State is of the most inestimable value to it, and, on the other hand, it is of practically little value to the United States as a whole. My State has voted bonds, as my colleague has said, and we propose to do our share in the matter of road building, and are

doing it; but I warn the Senate that the more we carry out this custom—because it is becoming a custom—of voting huge annual appropriations from the National Treasury for road-building purposes, the more certainly will come the day when the States, following their usual course in such matters, will demand that the Federal Government bear the whole expense, and relieve them from this as they have asked to be relieved from other burdens naturally belonging to them.

Of course, there is a ground upon which the requirement of national aid can be justified, apart from that which I have already mentioned and cited the State of Nevada as an example. There is the right or the duty, perhaps, of establishing post roads for public purposes. There is the interstate-commerce feature of it, to which the chairman of the committee has referred; but, fundamentally, road building belongs to and is valuable almost entirely to the States in which the roads are located, and consequently the greater burden of their construction should be upon their shoulders.

Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] suggested that if we were to retrench at all in our public expenditures we would have to begin with the Army and the Navy. I hope there will be a beginning somewhere. I have expressed that hope so often, and that hope has been deferred so long, that it has rather had the effect of making my heart sick. It will not be in my time in public life that any evidences of economy will appear; but I think this is a good place to begin, as the Senator from North Dakota suggested. One hundred millions saved is perhaps as good as one hundred millions earned.

The other day I had occasion to refer to the fact that the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill was increased before it left the Senate by the added sum of $268,000,000. The amount carried by this bill, as I remember, is in excess of $550,000,000. Of course, much of it will be returned, perhaps most of it, from the receipts of the post-office business and administration, but not this money, and I think it would be an excellent thing for the dominant party to determine, regarding appropriations in the future, that where unexpired and unexhausted appropriations exist, no further money shall be diverted in those directions as long as previous appropriations, or any part of them, are still available.

So, Mr. President, I believed that I owed it to the Senate to outline my position regarding this amendment before the vote was taken upon the motion to suspend the rules, so that after the rules are suspended, if that should be the result, Senators need not be surprised if I elaborate what I have stated at somewhat greater length than I have spoken heretofore.

Mr. HEFLIN. Before the Senator takes his seat, I would like to ask him a question. I gather from the remarks of the Senator, that if he had it in his power, he would stop this cooperative method of road building.

Mr. THOMAS. No; not entirely. I would limit it, however, to closer restrictions than now obtain.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator heard the statement of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. That the States and the Government had expended about $600,000,000, and that the Federal Government had contributed about one-fourth of the $600,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and he was giving the figures of the total expenditures for I do not know how many years before this system began, and that is not a fair statement. The figures should correspond to the dates of the Federal appropriations. California expended, for example, although I do not want to be extravagant, I think over a hundred million dollars upon roads before Federal aid was given at all.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I will occupy the time of the Senate for only a moment or two, but I want to say at this time that the Federal Government, under the leadership of my predecessor, who has been properly called the father of the good roads system of the United States, has laid out a program of road building. That program has reached into every State in the Union. This cooperative work is being carried on and is now going on, and I have been astounded, as I sat here to-day, to hear Senators on that side seriously suggesting that this program should be abandoned.

This road construction aided by the Federal Government reaches into the communities of every section of the country. There is no other general program of public policy which benefits so many people as this road-building system that we seek to continue. These roads, which will lead from the farms up to the market places, to the railroad stations, carrying the produce of the farmers to the great railroad lines and then carried out to the consuming public in every section of the country are of vast benefit not only to the people in the community where the road is constructed but of benefit to the people of the whole country, and yet some Senators, in their efforts to economize, are now reaching out into the counties of the rural districts and they are ready to strike down this great road-building enterprise which benefits the people generally more than any other one thing, I dare say, that this Congress can or will do.

I suggest to Senators on the other side that they start somewhere else with their program of economy. It will be a difficult thing to keep from building battleships in abundance, and I want it understood that I am in favor of building all that are necessary. But those who furnish battleship material are going to make millions out of the building of battleships, and they are going to be heard by this and the other branch of Congress; they are going to exert their influence, through the newspapers and otherwise, to accomplish their purpose. But the men and women back at home in the States that we represent here, who are to be benefited by this great road-building system, thousands of whom are benefited already by what has been done, are not heard here except through us, and I regret to say that some Senators, after they remain here a while, seem to forget the people and interests back home. In the multitude of things that come up for consideration the propaganda that flits before their eyes in designing newspapers day after day seems to take hold of them, and the interests back home, with nobody here to carry on such a propaganda in their behalf, are almost entirely forgotten.

Mr. President, the allied countries owe us $10,000,000,000. I have not heard the Senator from Colorado say a word about collecting that money. If this great Government can smile and be silent on questions of economy while foreign nations owe it $10,000,000,000, it seems to me that the Nation that sent its sons across the sea to win the war, which could not have been won without them, is too big and generous to complain when only $100,000,000 is requested by the people here at home to build up the highways which reach from county to county where these boys live who won the war.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to interrupt to say that when those loans were made, and ever since they have been made, I have contended—and if I were the son of a prophet I would prophesy—that none of the money involved in those loans will be repaid, and that ultimately, whether we make a gift or not, that money will be lost to the United States. In other words, the debtors of the United States, our recent allies, struggling under the enormous burden of taxation for meeting the interest upon their other debts—and they will never pay those—and their necessary expenses of administration, find themselves utterly unable to pay a cent. Hence I have said nothing about collecting those debts, because I know them to be uncollectible.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, when those boys went away many of them gave up lucrative positions, and somebody else at home took those positions, and some of those boys, when they returned, could not find employment. Some of them are being employed in this road work, and more of them can and will be so employed.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] complains that two or more millions of people are out of employment; and yet they are preparing to strike down a program of public road building which furnishes thousands of people with employment, and will furnish it to thousands more. I suggest to the Senator that this is a good way to give those people something to do, and at the same time build up the public highways of the country. This country owes it to the people who live in it to build public highways. We ought to have, and we will have in the near future, a great system of public roads reaching from one State to another, and throughout the States. I shall do all in my power toward the accomplishment of this great work. I want to say, before I sit down, that the House has already passed this bill and the Senate, if it does its duty, will pass it. It will be a mistake and a serious blunder to stop this legislation. It will be a distinct injustice to the people of the country out in the rural districts and elsewhere. If the other side of this Chamber takes the responsibility of defeating this bill they will hear from the people in the next election, and they will condemn, as they should, your failure to do justice by them.

Mr. MOSES. Then the Senator ought to welcome such action.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, just a word relative to this proposed amendment. As a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I have found myself in accord, for the

most part, with the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee as well. But in regard to this proposition, I do not feel that I can stand with the committee.

I think I have been of the same impression as the Senator from North Dakota was, according to his statement this afternoon, namely, that there was yet a vast fund from previous appropriations which could be devoted to good road work. I saw a statement the other day, which came from apparently an authoritative source, to the effect that the Federal contribution which could yet be made, together with the State appropriations which would be made to meet the Federal contribution, would amount to $450,000,000, more than could be spent within the next two years.

But, Mr. President, that is not according to the facts as disclosed here and as disclosed by the reports. The fact is that there is $117,000,000 of Federal money not yet used. But the fact also appears that all Federal appropriations will be exhausted by July 1 of the present year.

What will result? The legislatures of 43 States, meeting once every two years, are in session now. They will not meet again for two years, and the States are left not knowing what to do because of uncertainty as to Federal aid. They can not make appropriations, and the good road work will necessarily be stopped for at least one year because of the failure of this Congress to pass the necessary appropriations.

Mr. President, a word in regard to the merits of the proposition for Federal aid to good roads. I do not believe there is any undertaking in which the Government can engage which means more for the public welfare than an enterprise of this kind, and Federal participation in it. It means, Mr. President, greatly added commercial facilities for all the people of the country. Good roads are contributions to the national wealth.

I know the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], the chairman of the committee, has in mind a bill he has introduced, a great and comprehensive scheme of interstate roads built for purposes of interstate commerce. But, Mr. President, consideration of that measure is impossible now, and I think the enactment of it, although it is interesting and in a way fascinating, because of the greatness and beneficence of the scheme, will be probably impossible at the extraordinary session of Congress.

Government aid here asked for will result in greatly added commercial facilities for all the people of the country. It will add to the national wealth and a consideration not to be forgotten is that it will give employment to thousands of men throughout the United States who otherwise would not have employment.

I think, on account of all these considerations, we should now adopt this amendment calling for an appropriation of $100,000,000. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] says that under the conditions we ought to save. If it were a mere matter of saving, I would agree with him, but it is more than that and different. The appropriation of $100,000,000 is an investment from which the Nation will get large returns, and we ought to look upon it in that light. I shall vote to suspend the rules in order that the Senate may vote on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Virginia to suspend the rule.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am informed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and by others that there is a desire not to vote to-night on the motion to suspend the rule. I am very much disappointed, because it seems to me that we ought to finish the work in hand. However, I recognize that if we can not make progress it is not of any use whatever to proceed. I therefore ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, at not later than 12 o'clock meridian, we shall vote on the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That takes into consideration that we will take a recess to-night until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, so that there may be some opportunity for further debate?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; it is with the understanding that we will recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to the agreement proposed. Some Senators left this evening with the idea that there would be no vote to-day upon the question.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not know why they should have entertained that thought, because it was thoroughly understood that we wanted to vote and get through. But it is a fact that the Senator has stated, and therefore I submit to the inevitable.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to voting at 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered to vote at 12 o'clock noon to-morrow on the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as I understand, an agreement has been made to vote on the motion to suspend the rule covering the question of roads, I think it would perhaps serve the progress of the bill to dispose of one or two amendments now. I have an amendment to the pending bill, which I desire to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The READING CLERK. Insert in the bill, at the proper place, the following:

That that portion of the act reclassifying salaries of postmasters and postal employees, approved June 5, 1920, which provides "that hereafter substitute clerks in first and second class post offices and substitute letter carriers in the City Delivery Service when appointed regular clerks or carriers shall have credit for actual time served on a basis of one year for each 306 days of 8 hours served as substitute, and appointed to the grade to which such clerk or carrier would have progressed had his original appointment as substitute been to grade 1" shall be amended by adding the following: "*Provided*, That clerks and carriers in the intermediate or automatic grades who were appointed to regular positions before June 5, 1920, and are receiving less than the maximum grade of salary shall receive credit for all time served as substitute on a basis of one year for each 306 days of 8 hours served as substitute and be promoted to the grade to which such clerk or carrier would have progressed had his original appointment as substitute been to grade 1: *Provided further*, That clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and substitute clerks and substitute carriers who served in the military or naval services during the World War and have not reached the maximum grade of salary shall receive credit for all time served in the military or naval services on the basis of one day's credit of 8 hours in the Postal Service for each day served in the military or naval service and be promoted to the grade to which such clerk or carrier or substitute clerk or substitute carrier would have progressed had his original appointment as substitute been to grade 1.

The provisions herein shall be effective as of date of passage of the original act of June 5, 1920.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the amendment covers two very distinct points. The bill as it stands provides for crediting hereafter to substitute carriers such time of service as they have given while substitutes. The man who comes in to-day gets credit, assuming that to-day is the date of the passage of the bill. The man who went in yesterday does not get credit for his service as a substitute. I do not believe that is just. I think they ought both to get the credit.

The other point is one upon which I sincerely trust we may take action, and that is to credit those clerks, carriers, and substitutes who went into the war, the time which they spent in the service in the Army of the United States, placing it to their credit for their service in the post office. It was certainly generally understood that young men who went from the Government service into the Army should be allowed to count their military service in their post office or other governmental service record, and I think that privilege ought to be accorded to them. It has seemed to me a very great injustice to deny it to them.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Do I understand——

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think the amendment is subject to a point of order, which I propose to make just as soon as I get the floor, and I shall then give my reasons for doing so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan make the point of order?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am going to make the point of order, and I shall state why I do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I still have the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. LODGE. The Chair, in the midst of my observations, recognized the Senator from Michigan to make the point of order and sustained it, as he could not possibly do otherwise than sustain it, but, Mr. President, despite what the Chair has done, I desire to finish my remarks by expressing my regret that the chairman of the committee feels bound to make the point of order, particularly as it affects those men who I think ought to have the time that they served in the Army accredited to them. I think they are suffering from a very great injustice that ought to be remedied, and be remedied now. We delay all we do for the soldiers so long that they will all be old men before they will get any benefit.

Mr. POMERENE. Do I understand that the purpose of the amendment is to count the time so as to give these men the same benefit in promotion in the service that they would have had had they continued in the service?

Mr. LODGE. It is to give them the same benefit in the service, or if they were substitutes the same effect as substitutes, in the way of longevity pay that they would have received if they had stayed at home.

Mr. POMERENE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I am in very hearty sympathy with the object which the Senator from Massachusetts

and other Senators have in view. This, however, is a proposition which we have not considered, and which, I am informed by the department, would create some confusion unless it were properly worked out. I believe I introduced a resolution in the Senate at the beginning of the World War providing that the men who served in the Army should be recognized and promoted, and that they should take the place they would have taken had they remained at home.

There is another situation, however, which we should consider. The House Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has had taken away from it all the power to report appropriations. It is insistent that it shall retain the right to report legislation. It is considering legislation, as is the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate, in regard to some of these very measures. Some of the rulings of the department, which we felt were entirely contrary to the intent of Congress in passing the postal reorganization bill, have been considered, others are being considered, including the ones that are embraced in the proposed amendment. I am just as confident as I am that I stand on this floor that if this provision shall be included in the bill the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in the House will object to it and will delay the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill. I can assure the Senate that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads is going to consider the legislation embraced in the amendment. We are at work upon it now on a bill embodying general legislation to correct some of the irregularities in the postal reorganization bill.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I made the point of order; because I recognize that the adoption of the amendment would simply delay matters now and would possibly complicate a condition which ought not to be complicated.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I understand that an agreement has been reached to vote at 12 o'clock tomorrow on the motion to suspend the rule. I simply wish to say a word or two as to my vote on that motion.

The State which I have the honor in part to represent is in the forefront in road improvement and development. We recognize the very great benefit that comes from good roads. I feel that the money of the Government can not be expended much more advantageously than in the construction of good roads, which will enable the products of the farm and the factory to get to market as cheaply as possible, but the situation that confronts us at this time is a very serious one from the financial standpoint, and I am going to vote against the motion to suspend the rule, and that notwithstanding the fact that the money allotted to my State under the appropriation has been largely contracted for and largely disbursed. I understand there are about $108,000 left.

Our legislature is in session. I am sure it will make provision for the prosecution of good road work by the State and will also anticipate any possible action by Congress now or in the future; so that, even though the legislature may not be in session, the State will be ready to join with the National Government when Congress provides the funds. That we shall provide the funds I have not any doubt. The chairman of the committee has assured us that early in the extra session this matter will be taken up. I am satisfied that if the constructive plan which the chairman of the committee has in mind is not enacted into legislation other provision will be made, so that the work of building good roads upon the part of the Government and the States will not stop.

Feeling this way, Mr. President, and appreciating, I think, pretty fully the situation that confronts the Treasury of the United States and the taxpayers of the country, I believe that the best and wisest thing for us to do at this time is not to suspend the rule and not to add to the pending bill the proposed hundred-million-dollar appropriation.

DETROIT RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 4903) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a bridge across Detroit River within or near the city limits of Detroit, Mich., and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is anxious to have the bill passed to-night.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 1, section 1, line 5, before the word "maintain," to strike out the word "own," so as to read:

That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to American Transit Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Detroit River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, within or near the city limits of Detroit, Wayne County, Mich., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 3, before the word "years" where it first occurs, to strike out the word "two" and insert the word "three"; so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within three years and completed within seven years from the date of approval hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I move that the Senate now take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, February 18, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *February 17, 1921.*

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

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pastor of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, life is sweet. It is very dear to us. Yet behind it is a solemn mystery. Help us, in our ignorance, to learn of its compass, its dignity, and its possible achievements through obedience to Thy holy will. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

LOAN TO THE BROOKLYN RAPID TRANSIT CO.

Mr. VOLK. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of House resolution 671 and ask that the resolution be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from the further consideration of House resolution 671 and asks that it be passed. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 671.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury submit to the House of Representatives all papers, correspondence, records, minutes, and data pertaining to and relating to the loan by the War Finance Corporation to the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Co. of $16,566,900 during the year 1918, and all papers and correspondence bearing on the negotiations relative to said loan; also statement showing what part of said loan has been paid and amounts of interest paid and amounts of principal or interest due and owing to said War Finance Corporation on said loan.

Resolved further, That the said Secretary of the Treasury submit an itemized statement showing all expenses, including commissions, incidentals, fees, bonuses, and expenses of any nature, in connection with the negotiations and placing of said loan and to whom paid.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What is the date of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. A week ago; February 7.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I reserved the point of order in the first place, and I would like to make this inquiry to dispose of the point of order. The resolution requires that the Secretary of the Treasury transmit original papers to the House. I wish to ask the gentleman whether that is what he intended, or whether what he wants is copies of the papers?

Mr. VOLK. What I am seeking, Mr. Speaker, is information regarding this loan.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The question is a simple one. The resolution requires the transmission of the papers on file in the Treasury Department. That is not copies of papers. I do not know whether such a resolution is privileged. But what I wanted to ask the gentleman is whether that is what he designed to accomplish or whether he wanted the Treasury Department to transmit copies of the papers on file in the Treasury Department?

Mr. VOLK. Well, if I am correct in my interpretation I believe that all these papers are delivered to the Clerk of the

House. The law requires that a quarterly report be made, and I am asking for the information on this particular loan. These papers must be——

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The law does not require and does not permit, usually, the sending of original papers. Certainly that would not be in a report—the original papers on file in the Treasury Department. It would be a very dangerous thing to order files in the Treasury Department transmitted to Congress. They would very likely be lost.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask some gentleman from the Committee on Ways and Means whether this resolution has had any consideration by that committee?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would say to the gentleman that it is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. TILSON. I have attended the meetings very regularly, and I have not heard of it.

Mr. GARRETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the situation, and particularly in view of the difficulty suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], does not the gentleman from New York think it would be wise to withdraw his resolution for the present and put it in form where it will not involve the difficulties suggested by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. VOLK. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the point raised is the possibility of loss of papers, if they transmit the original papers and the information. I do not require the original papers. Copies would do just as well for the purposes of the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. But that is not what the resolution says. I make the point of order that inasmuch as it is the duty of the Secretary to retain the originals, the resolution calling for the original papers is not privileged.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee on that point.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me, in view of the doubt that has been raised as to the advisability, at least, of calling for the original papers, I think the gentleman from New York is disposed to withdraw his resolution for the time being.

Mr. VOLK. I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

ENROLLED BILLS 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:

H. R. 13606. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 15011. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to offer for sale remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in segregated mineral lands in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 15131. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Troy, in the county of Rensselaer, and the city of Cohoes, in the county of Albany, State of New York;

H. R. 15271. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Majestic Collieries Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River at or near Cedar, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky.;

H. R. 15750. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River, in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Burnham, in said county;

H. R. 12157. An act to amend act of Congress approved June 30, 1913; and

H. R. 14311. An act to authorize the improvement of Red Lake and Red Lake River, in the State of Minnesota, for navigation, drainage, and flood-control purposes.

BAYOU COCODRIE, LA.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following Senate bill, the House having reported a similar bill before it came over.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4582) to declare Bayou Cocodrie nonnavigable from its source to its junction with Bayou Chicot.

Be it enacted, etc., That Bayou Cocodrie, from its source to its junction with Bayou Chicot, in the State of Louisiana, is hereby declared to be not a navigable water of the United States within the meaning of the laws enacted by the Congress for the preservation and protection of such waters.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Senate bill be passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LAZARO, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House bill of similar purport lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the similar House bill (H. R. 14850) will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashbrook	Ellsworth	Kennedy, Iowa	Rowan
Bacharach	Elston	Kennedy, R. I.	Rucker
Baer	Emerson	Kiess	Sanders, La.
Bee	Evans, Nev.	Kitchin	Sanford
Bell	Ferris	Kleczka	Scully
Bland, Mo.	Focht	Lonergan	Sears
Britten	Gallagher	McCulloch	Small
Brumbaugh	Gallivan	McGlennon	Smith, Ill.
Candler	Gandy	McKenzie	Stoll
Cantrill	Ganly	McKiniry	Strong, Pa.
Caraway	Goodall	McLane	Sullivan
Carew	Goodwin, Ark.	Maher	Sumners, Tex.
Casey	Goodykoontz	Mann, S. C.	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Gould	Mason	Tinkham
Clark, Mo.	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Vare
Classon	Green, Iowa	Milligan	Vestal
Copley	Griest	Montague	Vinson
Costello	Hamill	Moon	Ward
Crowther	Harreld	Mooney	Watkins
Currie, Mich.	Harrison	Mudd	Welling
Dallinger	Haugen	Rainey, John W.	Whaley
Davey	Hersman	Ramsey	Wheeler
Davis, Tenn.	Hull, Tenn.	Randall, Calif.	Wilson, Ill.
Donovan	Husted	Randall, Wis.	Wilson, Pa.
Dooling	Igoe	Reavis	Wise
Doremus	James, Mich.	Reber	Woodyard
Doughton	Johnston, N. Y.	Riddick	
Eagle	Juul	Riordan	

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

FORTIFICATIONS.

On motion of Mr. SLEMP the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the fortifications appropriation bill, H. R. 16100, with Mr. DOWELL in the chair.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time there is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour and a half on each side.

Mr. EAGAN. My record shows that we have an hour and forty minutes remaining on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The record at the desk shows that each side has 1 hour and 30 minutes. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOX] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SLEMP. I yield to the gentleman from Texas five minutes additional.

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

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when interrupted by the rising of the committee I had hurriedly suggested that the present immigration is dangerous in numbers and character, that the numbers and the danger are increasing, that the loudly proclaimed limitation upon shipping will not protect the country, and that the poverty-stricken and diseased condition of many of the immigrants calls for public attention.

In this connection history is again repeating itself. I read from volume 2, page 592, of the report of the Dillingham Immigration Commission, dealing with the situation which arose from the famine in Ireland in 1845 to 1850 and the great immigration resulting from it:

Famine-stricken Ireland was also fever ridden; * * * the disease was carried aboard ship, where in the overcrowded and poorly ventilated steerage quarters thousands died of ship fever and thousands more survived the voyage only to die after landing.

Thousands of Irish and other British emigrants died during the voyage to Canada, and at Grasse Island, near Quebec, where the Canadian quarantine station was located, as many as 7,000 emigrants perished from ship fever and cholera in 1847 alone.

Many parts of Europe are now famine stricken, and some are fever ridden. Some of this fever has already come over with

the immigrant ships. The extreme destitution which breeds disease is abundant in Europe and on these immigrant ships.

Mr. H. F. Hunter, general agent of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., before the Senate committee, in speaking of the immigrants now coming and why they congest in the cities, page 321 of the hearings, said:

In the first place, they don't have enough money. There is no one of them that has money enough to pay his railroad fare west. In the next place, they do not want to go on farms.

Mr. E. C. Leedy, general agricultural and development agent of the Great Northern Railway Co., said:

* * * I found that from 75 to 85 per cent of the people who are arriving have no money and have no desire to go to the farms. A great majority of them are going to the cities and are not the class of people that we can use in our Northwest States. (P. 327.)

The House committee has had evidence of the coming and too frequent admission of weak-minded persons and those infected with infectious and loathsome disease.

I now point you and the people who read what I say to some of the difficulties which oppose efforts to protect this country. First I give you the names of some of the interests which appeared before the Senate committee in opposition to this legislation, or in favor of proposals to have it so amended as to admit more: The Chicago Cigar Manufacturers' Association; the Italian Chamber of Commerce, New York; the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, of New York; Associated Dress Manufacturers, who represent 600 firms engaged in the manufacture of dresses, employing some 50,000 employees, and who frankly say they want to employ aliens and want them to come so that they can employ them (hearings, p. 96); American Jewish Committee; Holly Sugar Co.; Great Western Sugar Co.; Utah-Idaho Sugar Co.; American Beet Sugar Co.; Hebrew League of New York; Wholesale Sash and Door Association, of Chicago; National Association of Manufacturers, representing 6,000 manufacturers, whose representative denied that there is any immigration emergency (p. 274) and said, "We can not find a satisfactory supply of unskilled adult labor in the United States," at a time when millions of our own people, including thousands of men who recently fought to save the Nation, are out of work (p. 275 of Senate committee hearings); Frances Kellar, vice chairman of the Interracial Council, whose activities and financial backing I presented to the House recently; National Association of Merchant Tailors, of New York; Phelps Bros. & Co., owners of steamboat lines; Panama Pacific Railway Co., of New York; Trans-Atlantic Passenger Conference, of New York; Cunard Steamship Co. (Ltd.), of New York; Anchor-Donaldson Lines, New York. Let us keep in mind the fact that a great part of shipping engaged in this traffic is owned by Europeans. These are not all, but a representative part of the opponents of the measure before the Senate committee.

For the purpose of enabling you to contrast the interests represented in these hearings, I present the names of some whose names appeared in the Senate hearings as favoring the suspension of immigration: State Council of Independent Americans, of Pennsylvania; Washington Camp, Sons of America, Drexel Mills, Pa.; Spanish War Veterans of Tacoma, Wash.; Sons and Daughters of Liberty of Suffern, N. Y.; Civic Club of Sumner, Wash.; Allied Patriotic Societies of America; Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Morris Plains, N. J.; International Reform Bureau, Washington, D. C.; Western Forestry and Conservation Association, Portland, Oreg.; Ohio Council No. 9, Sons and Daughters of America; American Legion Post, Caspar, Wyo.; Women's Club of Pineville, Ky.; Sons of American Revolution, Washington, D. C.; Gen. Custer Camp, Sons of Veterans, Seattle, Wash.; New Jersey Society, Sons of the American Revolution; Women's Clubs of Kentucky; United Spanish War Veterans, Tacoma, Wash.; Buffalo City Federation of Women's Clubs; Washington Heights Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of New York; Sons of the American Revolution, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Daughters of the American Revolution, of Washington, D. C.; Women's Club of Fort Thomas, Ky.; Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Vienna, Ind.; United Spanish War Veterans, Seattle, Wash.; Pennsylvania Sons of America. These organizations of our own people, moved, not by greed but by motives of patriotism and service in their very names and character, show the character of the contest in striking colors. Neither of these lists is complete, but they are full enough to be of some value to the country in its effort to understand the situation. These names are taken from the record of the Senate hearings. Those appearing in the record of the hearings of the House committee and in the files of Members of Congress present much the same suggestion. On the one hand, are members and posts of the American Legion, Spanish War Veterans, farm bureaus, labor unions, patriotic societies, civic organizations, women's clubs, and individual citizens, whose concern is for the present and future of the Nation. On the other, are hyphenated racial groups, commercial and financial interests, whose purpose and paramount interests are evidenced by their activities and their statements.

In this connection I read from the statement of Mr. H. F. Hunter, appearing for the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad Co., at page 323 of the Senate hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. But it is a large country. Supposing that the manufacturers of the Middle West and the New England States demanded foreign labor to run their mills, labor of a different class than what you are speaking of, labor from southern and eastern Europe. Would you limit immigration to the class of immigrants that you are speaking of from northern and western Europe?

Mr. HUNTER. Absolutely not.

I said yesterday evening that truth and sound judgment usually speak in tones of moderation, but it is also true that sometimes truth has to scream in order to be heard. I specially invite the attention of Members of this House to the hearings on this subject as conducted by the Senate committee. I sincerely hope that this important question will not be forgotten and lost in the scramble and the noise in and about Washington. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has the gentleman any information to the effect that the health authorities of the city of New York are now charging that the Federal Government in the present typhus outbreak is trying to unload the expense of the quarantine there on that city?

Mr. BOX. I have heard something to that effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course, in theory the steamship companies are supposed to pay for the expense of quarantine, but I venture the assertion that Uncle Sam will pay a big part of it.

Mr. BOX. Oh, if America looks for protection to the steamship lines, many of which are owned by foreigners, whose only purpose is to get the American dollar, with board of directors sitting in Liverpool and Berlin, America will be disappointed. If we look to them for the protection of the sacred interests that the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution and other country-loving people like them are trying to preserve, we will look in vain. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the early part of the gentleman's remarks he made some reference to the present typhus situation in New York and probably called attention to the charges made by the health authorities against the Federal authority. But has the gentleman stated anything to the effect that in class B immigrants examined by our United States health officers from July to December, 1920, at Ellis Island alone, and certified to the number of 10,002 as afflicted with disease or defect which would affect their ability to earn a living, 9,979 of them were admitted to the United States?

Mr. BOX. No; but I am willing to have that inserted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD certain statistical matters and reports in regard to the efforts of the Federal authorities to quarantine against typhus.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to insert some statistical matters in reference to this matter in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. As I understand, this is statistical matter only?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; largely matters to be copied from the recent hearings of the House Immigration Committee with regard to the quarantine situation.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD].

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I speak at this time to answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who on February 10 accused me of misstating certain facts as absolutely false and untrue and denying statements which I made here on February 7. It appears in the RECORD of February 10, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KENDALL] quoted a part of my speech which reads as follows:

Nearly 100 veterans, about all of them tubercular and most of them gassed or wounded on the other side, were sent for treatment to a place at Markleton, Pa., situated in a low, marshy river bottom, with a lot of railroad tracks and cinder piles hard by. A great tuberculosis expert sent there to examine the place, after the boys finally protested, said that "they might as well have sent them to a coal mine for treatment." F. W. Galbraith, jr., national commander of the American Legion, after visiting the place, demanded that the men be removed. He said that their condition there was "unbelievable"; that men "were dying off like rats in a hole, with moldy clothing on their backs."

His remarks would seem to discredit the use I made of the quoted statements of F. W. Galbraith, the national commander

of the American Legion, as to his attitude and that of the Legion to the treatment of tuberculous patients who are ex-service men at Markleton, Pa.

I would like to say that the statement accredited to Mr. Galbraith was taken from the American Legion Weekly, the official organ of the national organization. Furthermore, I hold in my hand a copy of the Philadelphia Public Ledger of Sunday morning, November 21, 1920, in which the following statement made by Mr. Galbraith is quoted:

In a hospital at Markleton, Pa., I found service men with moldy clothing on their backs, dying of tuberculosis. They are eliminating tuberculosis there all right. Tubercular patients who live in mold won't last long. There never was a greater outrage in the history of the country than the manner in which the Government is neglecting to care for thousands of its disabled.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this in substance vindicates my position with reference to Mr. Galbraith and his attitude toward Markleton. I tried to get in touch with Mr. Galbraith personally or by phone, but I was unable to reach him. I am informed by John Thomas Taylor, vice president of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, that he is handling the matters with reference to Markleton for the national organization by direct order of Mr. Galbraith. Mr. Taylor informs me that the position of the legion is that tuberculous ex-service men were not getting proper treatment at Markleton; that Markleton is not a proper place for a hospital for these men; and that it should be evacuated. This, Mr. Taylor informs me, is the position to-day of the national commander, Mr. Galbraith, and the legion as a national body.

I hold in my hand a petition to the United States Public Service Hospital, dated August 18, 1920, and which appeared in the Daily News Standard, Uniontown, Pa., Saturday evening, October 30, 1920.

The petition reads as follows:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL NO. 47,
Markleton, Pa., August 18, 1920.

To whom it may concern:

We, the undersigned patients of this hospital, hereby ask you a favor, in God's name to try and give us a fair deal, we who gave all that we had for this country, and we firmly believe what our people of this country want us to have is a fair and square deal.

We are isolated in a valley 100 miles from civilization, where nobody can come to look to our interest, and we know if we were located near a large city, when people could see the condition that exists in this place it would be closed in 10 days or less.

We have had several boys—namely, MacLoughlin, Betak, Metzgar, and Montgomery—who have taken hemorrhages caused by the dampness and improper nourishment.

We get the very poorest grade of milk and eggs obtainable, and we do not wonder why this hospital is classed the cheapest hospital in regard to food.

The drinking water is very bad; also we don't have a change of pajamas for weeks at a time.

We have had several inspectors here, but some one has a more powerful political influence than we, and evidently the inspector was put wise.

We feel that it would have been better if we had sacrificed our lives on the other side than to have come back broken in health and get abused, because some one has enough pull to keep us in a place like this.

No doctor gives the boys a diet according to his physical condition, he having to eat what they give him or go hungry.

The fog from the river is terrible and not fit for a well person, let alone a boy who is suffering with tuberculosis.

We feel that it would be a big benefit for everyone's health and for the betterment of the public service to close this unfit place and find a dry and more healthful place for us, so that we may prolong our lives a little longer.

We have written Congressman KENDALL of this, the twenty-third district, to come to our assistance, but we could not get any reply from him; but he could come to the call of the owner of this place on a couple of hours' notice when we had an inspector on the place.

Thanking you in advance for any way you choose to help us, we remain,

Your comrades, who are broken in health,
John F. Wall, Willbert H. Hertzog, Frank O. Miller, Frank J. Llvyich, Samuel Robinson, James E. Brien, Patrick J. Friel, Arthur J. McIntyre, Clarence J. Harman, Michael J. McGiven, John Pawlowski, William R. Berry, Hawly Koch, John Ross, Peter Seres, John Nisutski, George Lyons, C. T. de Hegh, William Leopold, Frank Y. Bale, jr., Newton Sondheim, Paul E. Mahon, Ben Haneck, Andrew Soltes, Thomas Murray, Lon Patterson, Lishi Nidwell, Anto Loranta, John Zamytis, John Kayser, Francis P. Stasen, Joseph J. McLaughlin, John C. Phillips, Harry L. Barton, Walter S. Weaver, Thomas Walter Long, A. H. Bowie, H. C. Wilcher, C. W. Cant, J. J. Buchannan, Arthur B. Scott, John J. Hagan, John William Flaherty, Lawrence M. Barrett, George Eckert, Albert Eckert, John W. Montgomery, Joseph D. Wood, E. W. Hykes, Joseph O'Brien, Adam Brown, Pasquale Giannore, John Hennessy, Adolph Saltman, Warsil Rayko, Jacob Brown, Alan J. Donlon, Fred J. Mark, Melvin H. Dinen, Frank V. Key, Pasquale Diribo, Harry H. Hickel, James J. O'Donnell, Jacob Nachman, Robert J. O'Connor, Vincent J. Wiercinski, William Ungerer, Frank G. Dowds, B. Cadiz, Joseph Rogles, ——— de Fabio, Guisseppe Zeoli, Thomas G. Holland, Paul Chuvarsky, Lawrence Ludorric, Trevor Curril, Barney Bijeski, Paul Menges, An. Phlepchuck, Charles Baulovich, E. J. WestBurg, Ralph Drapen, Morris Kaminsky, Willard T. Woods, H. M. Speraw, R. C. Myers, Leon Lustkeivicz, Frank M. Conrad, Frank W. Golas, George Baird, Patrick Henry, Antonio Sierziega.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEOD. No; I have not the time, my time is too limited.

I here have a photostat copy of the investigation of Markleton Hospital, of Markleton, Pa., made at the request of the Treasury Department by the Public Health Service. It reads as follows:

The honorable SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your committee composed of the undersigned were instructed by you to inspect the Public Health Service hospital for tuberculous patients at Markleton, Pa., and to report answers to the following questions:

1. In the circumstances, is the locality a suitable one for a hospital in which to treat tuberculous patients?

2. If it is, is the plant of such a character as to justify the Government in the expenditure of the funds necessary to put it in satisfactory condition?

The committee, accompanied by Capt. Charles H. Scott, to represent the Hon. S. A. Kendall, Member of Congress from the district in which Markleton is located, arrived at Markleton on February 5, at 3.22 p. m. and remained there until 4 p. m. the following day. During our stay we examined the hospital area and adjacent land, all of the buildings (with the exception of two small unoccupied bungalows), and the clinical charts and records of patients. We conferred with Maj. Williams, the medical officer in charge and members of his staff, and we interviewed privately each one of the 16 patients now at the hospital and the resident director of the Red Cross unit.

Then it goes on to state about the site. It says the hospital is situated in the small hamlet of Markleton, Somerset County, Pa., 56 miles northwest of Cumberland, 94 miles southeast of Pittsburgh, on the western side of a narrow valley inclosed by deep wooded hills and traversed from north to south by the Casselman River, near the western bank of which are the double tracks and sidings of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad adjoining the hospital grounds, and on the opposite side of the river the Western Maryland Railroad.

The area occupied by the hospital buildings consists of a small level tract extending about 100 yards from the river, on which are the Red Cross Assembly Hall and two unfinished buildings designed for vocational training, and ascending from this level a moderately sloping piece of ground on which are the main buildings, 130 yards more or less from the railway tracks, which it faces, and the various other buildings. Immediately back of this gradually sloping ground rises abruptly the steep western hillside, almost abutting which are ward barracks of the familiar army "lean-to" type of wooden construction, the floors of which at the upper part are nearly level with the ground and considerably above it on the lower side, owing to the slope of the land.

As the part of the property now occupied by buildings is already crowded, any considerable extension for building purposes would have to be by acquiring the use of additional land to the north, where the relations to hillside and the railway would be similar.

South of the buildings there is a low lying ground in which are two separate areas containing standing water, affected, it is said, by the rise and fall of the river. (Here we were told mosquitoes breed and it is obvious that they might do so.) These areas could be drained or filled in.

There is little opportunity on the hospital grounds for exercise, recreation, or occupation for the patients, and at present the only available place for them to walk on level ground is by the side of the railroad tracks. The grades of the hills are too steep for such patients. Paths might be made on wooded land to the south.

Sunlight: It is obvious from the foregoing description of the site that there must be some diminution in the amount of direct sunlight reaching this narrow valley. On the sunny afternoon of February 6 we observed that at half past 3 the western wards were already in the shadow of the hill, and at 4 o'clock the sun was setting, as seen from the bottom of the valley.

Atmosphere and moisture: While we should not be justified in drawing conclusions regarding atmospheric conditions from a stay of only 24 hours, during which it was rainy, foggy, and cloudy until a few hours before our departure, nevertheless one would expect from the conformation of this shut-in river valley, bounded by well-watered steep hillsides, protected from winds, with impervious soil, and receiving at times much smoke from railway engines, that the local atmosphere, especially in cloudy weather and in the early mornings and evenings, would often be saturated with moisture, appearing as fog and mist. The testimony that this is the case from both patients and doctors was concordant. In fact, dampness was the most general complaint of the patients.

So far as we could learn, the only local meteorological observations—and, of course, only local observations are significant on this point—which have been made are the incomplete ones recorded since January 1 by Maj. Williams which accompany this report.

The grounds of the hospital area we found saturated with moisture and rivulets ran from the steep hillside beneath and between some of the buildings. Much of this could be prevented by a proper system of drainage.

The general impression of dampness which we received is, of course, not incompatible with the occurrence of bright, clear sunshine and pure air at other times, and even prevailing at some seasons of the year. We are, however, of the opinion that excessive moisture of the ground and of the atmosphere are present sufficiently often and to a sufficient extent to render this condition a weighty consideration in determining the suitability of this site for a hospital for tuberculous patients.

Noise from proximity to the railroad: We have already called attention to the proximity of the hospital grounds and buildings to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. We regard the smoke and noise from this source as a most serious drawback from the use of this site for a tuberculosis hospital.

We are informed from the statement kindly furnished the committee by the president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad that 18 to 26 freight trains and 16 passenger trains pass Markleton in both directions within 24 hours, and that he expects the traffic to grow heavier. The grade is such that heavy trains going east require two engines. The noise is not merely from whistling, which can be partly obviated, but is not likely to be wholly so, as there is a block tower at the station which may arrest a train which signals by whistling to call

in the rear brakeman, but is also from the exhaust from the engines on the upgrade and the rumbling of the heavy trains. We found this latter so marked as to interfere with conversation in a front room of the hospital with windows and door closed while a heavy train was passing. The noise is magnified by the narrowness of the valley and reverberating hills. The physical examination of patients is seriously interfered with by the noise from passing trains in the front rooms of the hospital.

Individuals react differently to such noises and many become accustomed to them and are not disturbed. There are, however, a sufficient number, especially of the more seriously ill who are awakened from sleep at night or are disturbed by the noise from trains to make this condition a very strong objection against the use of this site for a tuberculosis hospital.

Smoke from engines: We saw a great deal of smoke, some very dense and black, emitted from passing or standing engines of the two railroads. From conditions already described this is at times not quickly dissipated, and it may be mingled with the mist or fog. A number of the patients voluntarily called our attention to the blackish color of their sputum and nasal secretion. Soot collects noticeably on exposed window sills, furniture, and fabrics, as we were able to observe, and next to dampness, smoke was the most frequent complaint of the patients whom we questioned.

It is not to be inferred that the atmosphere of Markleton is continuously smoky. It is more often clear and pure, but one must regard the presence at times of a smoky atmosphere like that described as decidedly objectionable for a tuberculosis sanatorium.

Other conditions relating to location: Little requires to be said regarding other local conditions. No objections can be raised on the ground of range and variation of temperature, altitude, protection from winds, and general accessibility.

a. Water supply: We did not visit the sources of the water supply, but have every reason to believe these to be ample and pure. The presence of colon bacilli in water from the pipes and their significance require further investigation. At present the water is protected by chlorination. There are obvious sources of fecal contamination of the river water above the place, where the pipe supplying the hospital is laid in the bed of the river, in which it is exposed to damage from timber or other objects carried by the stream especially when in flood. We were shown pieces of water piping removed from the building blocked by some mineral incrustation or deposit.

The large dining room in the main building is dark, the windows on one side looking against a wall a few feet away.

The kitchen is small and we should expect difficulty in its operation with the hospital full to capacity.

The laundry occupies an auxiliary building back of the hotel, and is very crowded, poorly lighted, and badly ventilated.

The ice house and storage rooms in an adjacent building are delapidated and in no way satisfactory. An adjoining retaining wall was braced and fenced off on account of the danger of its falling. There is great difficulty from rats, so that barrels containing meat had to be surrounded by lye to prevent the rats gnawing through the barrels.

There are six Army "lean-to" ward barracks of temporary wooden construction without porches. They would require a good deal in the way of repair if put into use again, and are adapted only for ambulatory patients under present arrangements.

At the south end of the occupied property are the garage, poorly adapted for the purpose, and a power plant, on which we can not give a technical opinion, but it is worthy of note that there is not sufficient strength of electric current to operate properly the X-ray apparatus, which furnishes an important means of diagnosis of tuberculosis.

The heating is partly by steam from the power house and appears to be satisfactory where it is supplied, although with considerable wastage from the overhead pipes from out of doors, depriving places of their insulation covering, and partly for the main building by hot water from furnaces in an unfinished part of the basement and is very unsatisfactory.

In general, the plant is dilapidated and badly in need of repairs, renovation, and new construction.

Fire risk: This impresses us as serious for the main building, the interior construction of which is of wood, lath, and plaster, with only a central stairway and elevator. There is a dumb-waiter shaft from the first to the fourth story, with openings on each floor, and a ventilating shaft from the second to the fourth story. There are many electric wires, some of which are dead, some exposed on cleats, and some concealed. It is true that there is abundant water with high pressure, but a fire which had gained headway would be difficult to control. Patients confined to bed should not be quartered above the ground floor.

This report is somewhat lengthy and I shall refer only to one or two things in it and to the conclusions. In reference to isolation, they speak as follows:

c. Isolation: With so small a hospital so located there is a feeling expressed to us by several patients of isolation and loneliness, of remoteness from places of interest, and of lack of diversion. This may partly account for the fact that over half of the patients received since the opening of the hospital have left voluntarily or deserted.

* * *

The kitchen is small and we should expect difficulty in its operation with the hospital full to capacity.

Therefore the hospital has never been full to capacity. Coming now to the conclusions, I read further:

With the present facilities not more than 200 patients could be accommodated with efficiency.

We do not regard the site as a suitable one for a permanent hospital for tuberculous patients.

The principal disadvantages are:

a. Proximity to two railways, with the resulting noise and smoke;

b. Dampness under conditions described above; and

c. The limited extent of level ground. At present the patients can exercise only by walking along the railway. There is no opportunity for expansion without encountering the same disadvantages as those of the present site.

It is to be emphasized that these strictures apply to the immediate situation of the hospital and not to the general region or district.

2. Inasmuch as these disadvantages are not and could not be offset by the character and condition of the hospital plant, even if these were much more satisfactory than they are, we do not consider that the Government would be justified in the expenditure of funds requisite to put the plant in satisfactory shape.

There are certain considerations which bear on the subject of this report, although perhaps not strictly called for by the questions submitted to us.

The men who signed this report are William H. Welch, who is director School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University; president Maryland State Board of Health; president National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis (1910–11); president board of directors Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research; Gordon Wilson, professor of medicine, University of Maryland; and Thomas McCrae, M. D., professor of medicine, Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, Pa. The official weather report of the location shows that only three days were clear in the month of January.

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

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. McLEOD. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. The other day when the Langley bill was up for consideration I took the position that inasfar as the appropriation was concerned, it was all right, but I thought the Congress was making a very serious mistake in locating the hospitals. I understand that the Senate has stricken out that provision and also has increased the appropriation. I have always taken the view that there is only one way to relieve the situation and give these boys the service to which they are entitled, and that is for us to appropriate the money and leave it to the Public Health Service to send these boys where they ought to be sent and give them the treatment they are entitled to. What is the gentleman's position on that?

Mr. McLEOD. The Public Health Service at the present time—that is, the Treasury Department—has at its disposal $43,000,000, which they can not use for renovating hospitals and they can not take over certain buildings which are accessible at the present time.

Mr. PELL. Why not?

Mr. McLEOD. I do not know why not.

Mr. LAZARO. And that is why the gentleman's resolution, spoken of in the morning paper, ought to be passed?

Mr. McLEOD. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. In other words, the gentleman wants to get rid of this red tape and do something for the boys.

Mr. McLEOD. Absolutely.

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

Mr. McLEOD. My time is very limited.

Mr. BLANTON. It could not be left to the Public Health Service, because for six months they have had a bunch of boys at Houston, Tex., dying of tuberculosis and will not move them.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, as everyone knows, the official representative of the ex-service man is the American Legion, and the official organ of that legion is the American Legion Weekly, the largest newspaper published in connection with the American Legion. Mr. J. W. Rixey Smith, possibly one of the best-qualified writers for this paper, after making an investigation of pretty nearly every hospital in this country, and also in Germany and France, makes this statement in respect to Markleton:

Another dark spot on the disabled ex-soldier's map is a place as black as a coal pile (which is about all it is), notwithstanding the fact that it was selected by the United States Public Health Service for treatment of 93 tubercular ex-service men.

Hardly a worse place than a coal mine itself could have been found for a hospital. Down in a valley a hundred miles from anywhere, with low, marshy land, river bottoms, huge coal and cinder piles, and railroad tracks surrounding it, there is little wonder that the ex-service men shipped to this town for treatment issued a public protest and appeal, demanding to be removed.

"We feel it would have been better," they said, "if we had sacrificed our lives on the other side rather than to have come back broken in health to be abused because some one has enough pull to keep us in a place like this."

The Public Health Service gave an order to evacuate the men. Then an amazing thing happened. Before a patient could be removed several Members of Congress, representing the Washington end of the "pull" to which the men referred in their protest, set about to prevent the evacuation. These Congressmen raised such a racket that the place was not evacuated. Instead, all of the tubercular ex-service men, with one or two exceptions, were sneaked away in batches of two and three in order not to offend the Congressmen.

That is about all I have to say in respect to the matter, except to read the following telegram, which I received on the 14th of February:

NEW YORK, *February 14, 1921.*

Hon. CLARENCE J. McLEOD, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

At request of Surg. Gen. Cumming tuberculosis sanatorium at Markleton, Pa., was inspected October 28 by myself and T. B. Kidner, institutional secretary of this association. Report, now in hands of Surgeon

General states, "After very careful consideration, your attending specialist and his colleague are strongly of the opinion that the use of this hospital should be discontinued at the earliest possible moment and beg respectfully to make recommendation to that effect."

H. A. PATTISON,
Supervisor Medical Service, National Tuberculosis Association.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat, will he yield to another question

Mr. McLEOD. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. Does not the gentleman think that if the money were appropriated and left to the medical authorities that they could appoint a board of medical experts on tuberculosis who could make a rapid survey of the situation and make a report, so that these boys could be sent where they ought to be sent and treated at once?

Mr. McLEOD. All I can say is that in my estimation somebody ought to be able to eliminate some of the red tape, because it takes too much time before any relief can be obtained. [Applause.]

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO].

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to offer any criticism, at least of the intention of the gentleman who has just finished his discussion of the situation at Markleton. I know the intentions of the gentleman are the very best, and I know that he only voices the sentiment of every Member of this body when he urges us to do everything within our power to take proper care of and give proper treatment to every disabled man who saw service in the World War.

But there is a misapprehension going around, the result of propaganda originating in the Public Health Service regarding the institution of Markleton. Now, Markleton was used during the war by the Army as a place where they sent tubercular patients, and this place stands second in the record of recoveries of all the places used by the medical department of the Army. Markleton is one of the great sanitariums of the State of Pennsylvania, a private sanitarium, and has been run for years for the benefit of people who are able and willing to pay any price necessary to secure the best treatment, in the best climate, and the best location. It is located 1,400 feet above sea level in the Allegheny Mountains along the Casselman River, and looking at the place so beautifully located, one can not help but wish it were possible that he might spend a few weeks or a few months at this wonderful institution. Now, I am convinced from my investigation of this subject that certain officials of the Public Health Service did make up their minds they were going to make this sanitarium impossible, and these same men have run it in such a manner as to bring forth the very condemnation they desired.

Mr. McLEOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. I have but a minute or so, but I will yield.

Mr. McLEOD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is familiar with the weather report which took place——

Mr. CRAGO. I am not only familiar with that, but I am familiar with the climate, because I have spent practically all my life in this section of the State of Pennsylvania, and the Member of Congress [Mr. KENDALL] who so ably represents that district lives within a few miles of this place and has lived there practically all his life.

Mr. McLEOD. Then the gentleman knows that there were only three clear days in the month of January?

Mr. CRAGO. That might be true of any section of the country in the month of January in this climate. But the point I am making is this: The gentleman from the twenty-third Pennsylvania district [Mr. KENDALL], one of the most industrious and patriotically inclined men we have ever had to represent this district. and who has worked as hard as any man [applause] to get proper treatment and proper care for these disabled soldiers of his district and of his State, has asked, not that soldiers be sent there from other parts of the country but that our own boys be sent there, especially when they ask to be sent there. I think I know these boys well enough to know there is not any place that would always, at all seasons of the year, appeal to them as being ideal—it is characteristic, especially of men who are suffering with this disease, to believe that their surroundings are not exactly what they ought to be—and perhaps, owing to mismanagement, they are not as good as they should be at Markleton. But while we are short of beds for these men, and it is being said that some of them are walking the streets because of a lack of beds, what better can we do than to utilize this place which has been used for years by people willing to pay their own money to go there for treatment? Why is it not better to correct the management and utilize this place rather than turn these men away and say we have no place to keep them? Now, I know all about the situation at Markleton. I know what a beautiful spot it is and I know the propaganda which has been going around against it. It is not being put forth by Members really interested in the welfare of these men from any ulterior motive. I know the gentleman who preceded me has no motive other than the one I have; namely, to do the very best he can for these ex-service men who fought the battles of our country. But I did not want this false impression regarding the situation at Markleton to go unanswered because I know, and I know that an unprejudiced committee will say, that there are very few places in this country more suited, if properly run and properly managed, than Markleton for the treatment of these boys, but any place put in the hands of men who are determined to close it up would be assailed; and I think the main reason these officers of the Public Health Service do not want to stay there is because of the fact it is a quiet spot where they are not able to amuse themselves socially or bask in the bright lights of the city streets. They do not want a quiet spot, yet this is what they should have for the proper treatment of these men who offered all for their country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLEMP. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, it is self-evident that the continued efforts of my young colleague from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD] and the day-by-day attention he is giving to measures for the relief of those injured in the late war must meet with the gratitude of the men formerly in the service, but as a Member of the House I feel he is entitled also to the gratitude of Members of Congress for his efforts put forth in giving us correct information about conditions that surround the care of these men. We Members of Congress want to give these men the best care that can be given them, but we are handicapped all the time by the difficulty of getting correct information, and I hold that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD] is entitled to the thanks of the Congress for the constant efforts he is making to get the real facts before the Congress. Why, we, of course, are all human; we, all of us, are affected by local interests and local pride, and must be actuated somewhat by it, but God forbid that the care and aid of these soldiers should ever become the football of a pork-barrel policy in the Congress. [Applause.] I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back four minutes.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire briefly, and I shall have to be very brief, to comment upon the address made yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM]. I shall not have time to follow in detail all the subjects covered in the address which have come under the observation of Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Investigation of Expenditures in the War Department. The gentleman from Illinois, in concluding his remarks, said:

> The carefully staged performance recently brought to our attention, where one high in the councils of this administration struts and swears, and swears and struts, and throws about the miserable grafter and incompetent official the sheltering mantle of the glorious deeds of our boys across seas is to this end. The captious heckling from our Democratic brethren about the payment of certain bills is for the same purpose. I charge you, my colleagues, that behind the screen there are thieves and grafters going unwhipped of justice and pillaging the Public Treasury.

And that received applause.

Mr. Chairman, I challenge the accuracy of that statement and demand proof. I hope I may say without offense, because no offense is intended, that I do not believe one in a responsible public place should make such a statement without having proof of the facts to sustain it. Such statements are calculated to create a spirit of unrest, to destroy the confidence of indiscriminating people in their country. This expenditures committee has worked for more than a year and a half. It has had the moneys of the Treasury of the United States at its disposal. It has employed whatever of experts it needed and whatever of legal counsel it desired. It has expended some $150,000 in investigating, and never yet has one of those subcommittees come before this House and pointed to a single individual and said, "Prosecute him." That general statement ought not to be made unless the record justifies it, and, in my opinion, the record does not justify it.

The gentleman said:

> In these latter days much has been said about water that has gone over the wheel.

That expression, as well as the expression about swearing and strutting, referred to Gen. Dawes. Now, my recollection

is that the exact expression of Gen. Dawes was "water that had gone over the dam"—at least, I know he used that last word in some connection during the time I was present. [Laughter.] The gentleman refers to him as one who stands high in this administration. That is news to me. I am not aware of the fact that he has any connection whatsoever with this administration. He was in the military service in France in a very responsible capacity. I did hear at one time that there was strong prospect of his standing very high in the next administration, but what the future holds, of course, I do not know.

Let me point out in this connection one of the extremely unfortunate results of these loose statements made from time to time on the floor of the House by members of the expenditures investigation committee reflecting upon the integrity of men, without having gone to the bottom of the question. Some of you may remember that back in December, 1919, there was some discussion in the House about the settlement of claims. In the course of that discussion the matter of a claim of the Standard Steel Car Co. arose for discussion. Subcommittee No. 5 had made some investigations concerning that at Chicago. I was not satisfied about that settlement. I stated upon the floor of the House that I would not discuss it, and I gave the reasons, because it had not been fully investigated, and, further, because the War Department was itself looking into it at that time. At a subsequent time—in June last—when my friend from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] made the speech which was so widely distributed over the country as a campaign document, he referred again to that Standard Steel Car claim, and he said:

As has been said, this company contracted to build nine hundred and sixty-four 9.50-inch howitzer carriages. Although the Government prepared several contracts, they would never enter into one. Mr. GARRETT, Representative from Tennessee, states he will not enter into a discussion of this matter. I do not blame him. It is so permeated with fraud and corruption that I do not wonder that any defender of this administration would not care to discuss it.

That statement was made by the gentleman from Illinois last June. Now, what has developed from that statement?

Here is an assertion, published in one of the great newspapers of the United States this morning, and later on in the same newspaper article it is pointed out that the officers of this company are J. M. Hanson, president, Pittsburgh; R. L. Gordon, vice president, New York; P. H. Gillespie, treasurer, and William Bierman, secretary, Pittsburgh. Its directors are John M. Hanson, W. L. Mellon, R. B. Mellon, A. W. Mellon, and William Bierman, Pittsburgh. It seems to be impossible to find a man suggested by the next administration as Secretary of the Treasury who has not come under the criticism of the Committee on Investigation of Expenditures in the War Department. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What I complain of, if I am permitted to complain, is the method with which these expenditures investigations have been conducted throughout. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] has my respect. He knows that. And in these latter days he is having my sympathy [laughter], because I know that the gentleman from Illinois was put there to do a particular thing. He was put there to create campaign material to detract the attention of the people of this country so far as possible from the glories which this Nation had won, and by creating suspicion in the public mind of the honesty of those who had been connected with civilian service during the war it would create distrust of the party which was in power while the war was being fought. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] succeeded in that effort to a very considerable extent. There is no doubt of that.

And now, after the election is over, after it has ended, after he has accomplished so well the purpose for which he was put there by the responsible leadership of this House, to find himself coming under the constant condemnation and being subjected to the constant kicks of such men as Dawes and of the Republican press all over this country, which was closed to us at the time, is a situation which causes me to sympathize with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Illinois referred to many subjects yesterday. I shall have to dismiss most of them with a very general statement. He referred to olive drab duck, to mosquito bars, to frozen beef, to shirting flannel, to gauze, to underwear, and to lumber, among other things. All the testimony there is before the committee concerning most of those subjects is the testimony of Maj. W. O. Watts, who was formerly connected with the department. I am not going to enter into any criticism of Maj. Watts. I have no desire to criticize him. But his testimony was taken, his charges were made, and the gentleman from Illinois rested content upon that. Why? Because he was not proceeding to this matter as an investigator; he was proceeding to this matter as an able prosecuting attorney, and he was satisfied when he thought he had made out his case. As a matter of fact, as appears from the record, there was a complete investigation of every one of those matters and those charges made by the Inspector General's department of the Army, a wholly independent department, not connected in any way with the Director of Sales Division. And this committee, investigating the greatest achievement of the Republic, did not even send for the report of the Inspector General, which it had taken two months to make—the investigation and report—and look to see what the Inspector General's department had found. The gentleman states that certain shirting—flannel—was sold to Mr. Sigmund Eisner, of New Jersey, without advertisement. Maj. Watts made that statement. He had previously made that statement in a newspaper article in the New York Globe. The attention of the New York Globe was called to it, and they investigated it, and corrected that statement months and months ago. And yet we find it reiterated here in a speech made from the floor of the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

The question which the gentleman discussed at greatest length was that of the leather contract, and I wish to talk about it for a few moments. The minority report made some days ago on this subject really contains substantially all that I have to say. When the armistice was signed the War Department found itself with a tremendous amount of surplus leather on hand. It is alleged that entirely too much leather was bought. It sometimes seems that way to me.

Of course, this all depends upon the point of view. One of the troubles with the majority members of this committee throughout has been that they seem to have proceeded upon the theory that those in responsible positions should not have looked any further ahead than on the date when the armistice was signed, although no one dreamed that the armistice was to come at the time that it did come. If you measure it by that, if persons are supposed to be supernatural and could know positively that the armistice would be signed on November 11, 1918, why, of course, there was too much stuff bought. That is true in every line. But I believe that it was the solemn duty of those charged with supplying the armies of the United States with those things, without which the armies would have been worse than useless, to anticipate every possible contingency and have on hand, ready to supply the armies and make them effective, all that might be required had the war continued as long as the military experts all over the world believed it was likely to continue. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But this surplus was left on hand, and the effort is made to create the impression that certain gentlemen have been guilty of a wrong to their Government, have been guilty of illegal action, because they finally formed a company and took over the surplus leather material.

These men were Maj. Joseph C. Byron, Col. George B. Goetz, Capt. Azel F. Cochran, and Capt. Henry W. Benke. They organized the United States Harness Co. They organized it for the purpose of entering into this contract, which they did enter into. They were at times during the war—practically all the time during the war—connected with different phases of the Government's leather activities.

Upon that basis and upon that alone you are asked to let suspicion petrify into conviction. The gentleman from Illinois seems to proceed upon the theory that it is not necessary to prove wrong; that all you have to do is to prove that there was an opportunity for wrong, and let wild imagination do the rest.

Byron was a graduate of West Point and served in the Army for many years. He retired in 1901 to enter private business as a tanner, and he did so with great success. When the war came on he was called here because of his great ability, and he went on one of the committees of the War Industries Board dealing with leather. Throughout the war he served in that capacity. It was his duty to survey the entire hide and leather output of the country and attempt to bring about that coordination which would insure the materials both for war and for industry. There has never been placed in the record, there has never been privately intimated, so far as I have ever heard, a single suggestion that in that responsible place Maj. Byron did not render to his country the very highest order of patriotic service, and in every instance protect the interests of the Government that he was serving.

Goetz was a member of a comparatively small harness manufacturing concern down in West Virginia. He came into the service at the request of somebody—I do not know who—be-

cause of his knowledge of the leather situation. By reason of his ability in this respect he became the head of the purchasing department after it was organized, and bought, or had bought under his direction, practically all of the leather goods after a certain period.

Capt. Benke was also a leather man who came into the service, and he was an inspector. Capt. Cochran for a time had something to do with the buying. There is not very much about Cochran in the record; there is nothing to his discredit.

Now, this thought you must get clearly in mind: The gentleman from Illinois on yesterday at three different places in his speech said of these men, in substance, "they bought to excess." In other words, there is not a citizen of this Republic who, reading that speech of the gentleman from Illinois made on yesterday, would not conclude that these men who subsequently obtained the material were responsible for the amount that was purchased, although the gentleman's colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE], sought to have him state plainly the facts. As a matter of fact, not one of these men ever at any time in any way had the slightest discretion in determining the requirements that they had to order. They did, by the exercise of almost arbitrary power, modify and reduce orders which came to them from the Requirements Division, but never at any time did they increase an order, nor did they at any time have discretion in determining what should be ordered.

And that is an important fact to bear in mind in considering this contract, because remember this: They violated no statute law in entering into this contract; it is not claimed anywhere, so far as I know, that they violated any statute when they entered into this contract, or that they did not have a full right legally to exercise their rights as citizens and make it.

So the question therefore depends or is to be determined upon the matter of ethics, and that element as to their having to do with excessive purchases, of course, constitutes an important element when you consider it from the standpoint of ethics.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. My time is very limited, but I never like to decline. I will yield.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman whether these officers were still in the service when they made this contract with the Government?

Mr. GARRETT. I think that Col. Goetz was. I think this contract was signed, as I remember it, on the 3d of September, and Col. Goetz resigned from the Army on the 4th of September. The others were not in the service. But that is immaterial, taken in connection with all the facts.

Let me tell you something about this: As soon as this contract was entered into and publicity given to the fact, the harness manufacturers all over the United States began at once to enter their protest. Failing in other courses, they turned their attention to this committee. They made their threats openly throughout this country that through this committee they would obtain action looking to the rescision of this contract, in order that that product should not be put upon the market in competition with them. They besieged Members of the Congress, who in turn besieged this committee. All of this attack upon this contract comes from that source. It is not based upon ethics. It is not based upon any belief on their part that this contract is unfair to the Government. It is based on the fact—which is human nature and perfectly natural on their part—that they desire to keep this material off the market. Fortunately, even the majority members of the committee balked at making a recommendation that would thus play into the hands of those interests who had profited from the Government while the war was on. [Applause.] And we have no recommendation here. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], speaking as an individual, believes the contract ought to be rescinded, although he criticizes the harness manufacturers themselves for their attitude. So far as I am concerned, I do not stand willing simply to slap the harness manufacturers on the wrist and then turn and advocate the doing of the very thing which they have persistently tried to have done in every department of the Government that they could reach.

There is no charge that Goetz, Benke, or Cochran ever at any time in their official capacity betrayed a single trust. But it is found by the committee that in one instance Goetz sent an order to his own firm, and he did. Let us see about that. Goetz, as the purchasing agent, bought probably $50,000,000 worth of leather and leather materials throughout the country.

After searching the records with a fine-tooth comb, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] discovered and put into our record the fact that at one time he sent an order to his own house down in West Virginia for $19.80 worth of saddletrees. [Laughter.] My, my! how the Republic did rock to its foundations when that order was given. [Laughter.] What was the situation confronting the country? There was probably $500,000 worth of stuff bought in all from this Goetz house out of the $50,000,000, but what was the situation? The Government of the United States was drawing upon every leather resource to be found anywhere in the country. Not only that, but it was creating new facilities as rapidly as it could. If, by reason of Goetz's connection with it, it had refused to use the facilities there, it would have been deprived of just that much of the resources of the country, and Goetz had no more to do with the fixing of the price which his company received than did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] or myself, because that was fixed by the price-fixing committee, of which he was not a member and with which he never had the slightest connection. That is the situation in regard to the contract.

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

Mr. EAGAN. I yield to the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Thank you.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DEWALT. I heard the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] yesterday, and he made the distinct charge that he was satisfied as a lawyer that from the proof Goetz could be convicted of high crimes. What is the gentleman's opinion in reference to that, and what proof has the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] quoted a statute which provides that no officer or agent of any corporation, joint-stock company, or association shall be an employee of the Government to deal with his own firm, and upon that I presume he relied. So far as I am concerned, I think the rule de minimis non curat lex—that the law does not care for trifles—would apply to this discussion. He was guilty of no moral wrong. He violated no ethics. That is an old statute. Consider the conditions under which the country was struggling at that time, drawing upon every resource everywhere for almost everything. I do not think any court would entertain a prosecution. But is it not a remarkable fact that after working for a year and a half, after spending $150,000 with experts and lawyers and accountants, raking the department from end to end as with a fine-tooth comb in the effort to find something that would stain the country's honor, they come down finally to the point where the only recommendation they make as to the prosecution of a single individual is that of a man who, while buying $50,000,000 worth of stuff in the country, bought $19.80 worth from his own firm. [Laughter and applause.]

What about the contract itself and its fairness to the Government? You observe that the committee do not recommend that it be rescinded. Why? Because in their hearts they know that that contract presented the best solution of this problem that had been devised. These harness people throughout the country gave no aid to the Government in the effort to dispose of this surplus. They did not want it on the market. I am not criticizing them. That is human nature. The only suggestions that they have offered about its disposition were, first, that it be sold abroad, or, second, that it be greased and laid away for the next war. [Laughter.]

The first was impossible; the second was unreasonable and ridiculous. There was no help to be had from them. Five separate times list after list of this material was advertised in an effort to sell it at public bid. Never was there a time, except in very rare instances of a very few cheap articles, that there were sufficient bids to take up at the minimum price fixed anything approaching even the relatively small amounts that were then offered. Not only that, Morse, the director of sales, went to Mr. Rosenwald, of Sears, Roebuck & Co., and went to other concerns in an effort to obtain some sort of assistance in the matter of the disposition of this material. His testimony will be found, I think, at page 4883 of our record. He failed there. Here was a surplus amount, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] said yesterday, of somewhere between $27,000,000 and $150,000,000. We do not know how much it was. What was to be done with it? They entered into this contract. Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] says that it might have been done at the Rock Island Arsenal by the Government itself. Of course in other reports the gen-

tleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] has been particularly vigorous in opposition to any sort of government interference with private industry. Whether the location of the Rock Island Arsenal has anything to do with the gentleman's views upon this subject, of course, I do not know. I am just reminded that—

'Tis sweet to hear the honest watchdog's bark
Bay deep-mouthed welcome as we draw near home.

[Applause and laughter.]

What is the situation? Let us discuss that. That is the only constructive suggestion which has been offered.

Criticism is never attended by the difficulties which mark construction.

It is easy to tear down. It is easy to hold one's self in a position that whatever is is wrong, without offering any intelligent or intelligible proposition to take its place.

But let us analyze that Rock Island for a moment. This harness has to be remade in order to be commercial. The testimony before the committee is that it will cost $8 to $11 a set to remake this artillery harness which you saw here yesterday. I mean that it will cost that for the new material to go into it. It has to be all torn to pieces in order to turn an artillery harness into a plow harness. Now, what would be the result? It would require for the purchase of material to remake that harness $2,000,000 to purchase the material alone. That would require a direct appropriation by Congress. They have no authority under the decision of the comptroller to take any of the funds derived from the sales and put it into material for remaking or repair of the harness. So it would require a direct appropriation. As a matter of fact, it would cost $30 a set to remake those harnesses, and that would require an appropriation of four or five million dollars. What do you suppose would have been the result if the War Department had sent in an estimate of $4,000,000 to remake these harnesses? I will tell you. The gentleman from Wyoming would have risen to show where the Republicans had saved the Government a tremendous expense by reducing the appropriations below estimates. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Now, this contract provides for a minimum price. The material must be taken by the United States Harness Co. at the minimum price within a fixed time, but whenever it is remade and resold by this company, no matter when, there is a return to the Government of 60 per cent of the price received, including the price for all the material which the company itself put in. Of course, we do not know what it will net. From the best estimate I can make the Government will probably receive a return from the artillery harness of something like 19 per cent on the original cost and upon the H. T. G. harness a considerably higher per cent. The contract is not unfair to the Government. There is no claim that it is not being honestly executed, not even an intimation of it. As a matter of fact, under the terms of the contract itself the Government has its representatives in the factories constantly, watching every move, and I understand from one of those responsible officers who has been there that there is absolutely no waste, or that the only waste that comes out of the material are a few shavings here and there out of the leather as they re-form it.

Dishonest? No, indeed. Oh, gentlemen, it has never been denied that in times of war under the stress and strain of great movements there is waste; that there was extravagance when you measure things by normal time and normal conditions. Waste? Extravagance? Why, certainly; they had too many Republicans down there to get away without a considerable amount of that. [Laughter.] But dishonest? No. Mistakes in business judgment? Yes; they have been made; certainly. Errors of judgment? Why, of course. But in all the history of wars in this country there has never been one which was so singularly free and clean of graft and fraud as the recent war. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not blame Gen. Dawes. I can imagine the indignation he must have felt. He was criticized about cussing. Well, as a matter of fact, gentlemen, Gen. Dawes did not say anything except what the minority Members have been saying all the time, except that he added some language which the parliamentary situation did not enable us to use. [Laughter.] We were not able to get to the press about these matters, but it seems somehow or other he got there. It brings to my mind the old quotation:

For it comes to pass oft that a terrible oath, with a swaggering accent sharply twanged off, gives manhood more approbation than ever proof itself would have earned him.

[Laughter and applause.]

Let me say just this in general about the matter of sales and surplus. There has been sold to date—that is, up to the evening of February 11—$1,250,468,998.15 of material. That is what it cost the Government. That includes everything from needles to lands for camps. It includes material of every character and kind which the Government acquired during the war. I mean declared surplus, and the return upon this material, exclusive of the amount which has been turned over to the Government at cost, amounts to 57 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, fortunately the literature of this war will not be confined to the reports or the committees investigating the War Department's expenditures. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Time will unfold what plaited cunning hides.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have taken this additional time for the simple purpose of again calling your attention to the matters I referred to yesterday and in answer to the remarks made by my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

I want you to observe as my first thought that in what the gentleman from Tennessee stated he did not deny any of the facts that were developed by me yesterday; that the statement I made as to the facts, borne out by the record, stands uncontradicted by the gentleman from Tennessee. If these facts are true I leave it to you as logical, reasonable men whether the deductions I drew yesterday are not properly deducible from such a state of facts.

He makes several statements which I want to refer to briefly. First, he states that in this investigation it seemed to be the theory of the gentlemen of the majority of the select committee investigating war expenditures that the war would end in November, 1918, and that we are going upon the theory that excessive purchases were made because we thought the war would end at that time. Whereas he asserts that the military experts of the country thought it would extend for years, and therefore excessive purchases were justifiable. He makes quite a point of that proposition. If that was the theory of the majority of this committee, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and I want to ask all of you gentlemen on the Democratic side, what has been the theory of your representatives on this committee since the initiation of this work? There were five of the best men from the Democratic side selected to serve on this committee, and I challenge you to name one example or one instance anywhere, where one of the five men has agreed to condemn anybody at any place along the line. We have brought in a report from one of our committees condemning the graft and thievery that went on in the camps and cantonments of the country, and you gentlemen have defended it on the floor of the House. We brought in a report here calling the attention of the country and your attention to the fact that the Army's foods were being kept off the market to protect the canners and the packers of those foods, and you gentlemen have defended it on the floor of this House. We have brought to your attention that thousands and thousands of automobiles were rotting in the camps of this country, and you gentlemen came on the floor of this House and defended it. We brought to your attention that settlements of war claims were being made unjustly by the War Department, and you gentlemen came on the floor of the House, and the eloquent gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] was among them, and defended the War Department. Do you know what has happened since this committee that I have been the chairman of has begun its investigations of war claims that we claim were fraudulent? Gen. Lord, Director of Finance of the Army, has had paid back from men who had already been paid on settlements of their claims over $24,000,000, which was paid wrongfully. [Applause on Republican side.]

I heard him swear to that before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations the other day. This same man Byron, about whom I spoke to you yesterday, testified before our committee that its investigations had been of incalculable benefit to the country, because they had stopped practices that otherwise would have existed. What have you done to help us along; what has been your attitude; what has been the attitude of the brilliant gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], whose splendid mental attainments have won my admiration? From beginning to end, whenever we have pointed the finger of suspicion at anyone in this House he has defended him. The gentleman from Tennessee does not believe that it is good public policy to permit a contract like this contract with the United States Harness Co. to exist. He does not believe in that. He is too inherently honest, and he does not say on the floor that he believes in it. When I told you yes-

terday that such a contract was bad, he knew in his heart that what I was saying about the contract was true, and so did all of you.

Gentlemen, this has not been an easy job that this committee has had. We have had not only the undivided opposition of you gentlemen on the Democratic side, but every time we got close to anybody who was a constituent of somebody we had opposition on our own side. We have had our troubles, but we have done these things because we thought they were right, and we have presented these things to you because we have thought it was our duty to do so. I want to say to the country now and I want you gentlemen on the Democratic side to understand that in all of this you have occupied a position of unflinching opposition to everything we have done. It would have been much better from even a party standpoint for you to have helped in some of these things that needed correction.

Let me tell you about some of the things that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] referred to. He spoke about this man Goetz, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], whom I think to be one of the best minds in this House, rose to a very pertinent question. He said that the gentleman from Illinois, meaning myself, had made a charge that this man Goetz had violated the law, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania asked the gentleman from Tennessee what he thought about it, and what did Mr. GARRETT say? Did he deny it? He said he thought perhaps the man could not be convicted because of the particular circumstances that arose in the war, and he speaks of an order of $19.80 worth of saddletrees. Mr. Chairman, if that were all, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] that perhaps it would be captious to raise the point, although it is a direct violation of the law; but that is not all. If you will take the hearings of this committee, you will find, on pages 4778 to 4783, a long list of letters and correspondence running between Col. Goetz and his own house about these orders that had been given to his house and about which he was corresponding with it.

It is true he signed only one of these orders that we can find, but he was in correspondence with his house right along about business that his own house was transacting. I believe I am correctly informed when I say that in the year 1918 the worthy colonel paid an income tax of $50,000 on his immense profits. When he went into the war he had a little one-horse harness establishment, and now it is a great big thriving institution, made so by war contracts that he helped accumulate while he was in his position here. I have no particular bone to pick with Col. Goetz. I have nothing more to say about him than I would say about anyone else in similar position. I understand he is a Republican, and that makes it all the worse from my standpoint.

The gentleman from Tennessee speaks about remaking this harness. He says that it must be remade at an expense of $8 to $11. Gentlemen, it does not have to be remade, and there is the joker. They can take it just as it is and pay the minimum price for it if they want to. Do you know what the Government is doing? To-day at Schenectady and at New Cumberland, Pa., this harness is stored. Government men are tearing it to pieces, putting the breechings in one box, the saddles in another box, the blankets in another box, the breast collars in another box, tearing it all apart at the expense of the Government, and then they are treating it with neat's-foot oil, reconditioning it, and they are boxing it and sending it wherever the United States Harness Co. tells them to send it, in the original boxes, to their customers, at Government expense, except the freight. All that the harness company has to do is to sell the harness in its original condition and collect their 40 per cent commission. Do you gentlemen think that is a proper contract? Do you think that is the right kind of a contract for the Government to make? As I said yesterday, I have no use at all for those who are trying to keep this harness off the market. I have never condoned their practices. I do not defend them now. But I do say that the practice which was indulged in by these Army officers in doing this thing is an outrage and ought not to be permitted.

The gentleman from Tennessee says these other things I have spoken of were developed by the testimony of Maj. Watts and that this matter had been investigated by the Inspector General down there at some time.

Mr. GARRETT was a member of our committee. When those statements were produced by Maj. Watts, if further evidence was desired, the gentleman from Tennessee had the right to have anyone called before the committee, and he would have been called at once upon his say so. The testimony in the record is to the effect as I have given it. There is no contradiction of the facts.

Now, I have not much more to say about this thing. I do want to say one thing, gentlemen of the committee, as I said yesterday. I am not going to confine my remarks about this sort of thing to the present administration. If something is not done, I am going to keep it up in the future [applause] until there is some justice in this thing. I have not a bit of political motive on earth at this time, and I want to tell you frankly that, so far as I am concerned, I never did have. You may not believe it; it may be a joke to some of you, but I have tried to do this thing as conscientiously as I could. We have tried to go into these investigations as thoroughly as we could, but it has been an immense job.

Mr. LINTHICUM rose.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Not now, Mr. LINTHICUM. It was an immense job to look into expenditures aggregating $18,000,000,000. We have done the best we could with a hard situation. I am simply calling attention to these facts in order to see if in the next Congress—there is no time for it now—if in the next Congress some of the remedial legislation asked for yesterday can not be enacted to stop these practices in the future. I think that is all I have to say about this. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, had requested a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. PENROSE, Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. WILLIAMS 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 bills of the following titles:

H. R. 9521. An act to prevent hoarding and deterioration of and deception with respect to cold-storage foods, to regulate shipment of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 15130. An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, and had agreed to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 127, 132, 151, 198, and 223.

FORTIFICATIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN]. [Applause.]

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, when the road bill was recently before the House only 20 minutes was allowed for discussion on each side of the question. Therefore I take advantage of this opportunity to register with the Congress some of my views regarding the construction of rural public highways. I have long had an abiding conviction regarding this important question, and as the years advance I become more convinced of the advisability and feasibility of Federal aid for such purpose. I believe it is one of the most important questions confronting the Congress during peace-time legislation. It is not a new question, but is one practically as old as the Government itself. Both Washington and Jefferson were advocates of Federal aid in the construction of public highways, and at the early period of 1806 the Government undertook a Federal-aid program. For some reason, I know not why, it was discontinued, but not to the entire satisfaction of the public. In a published statement announcing my candidacy for Congress, June, 1916, I advocated Federal aid for public highways. At that time there existed no Federal legislation for such purpose. At a later date during the same year such aid was granted by the Congress. The first appropriation made for the present Federal-aid program provided $75,000,000 for allocation among the several States and to be expended in a period of five years. This was a mere bagatelle considering the need for Federal aid in construction of our rural public highways. It was not until the appropriation of $200,000,000 February, 1919, that any substantial aid was provided. I became a Member of the Congress in 1917. At that time my own State, Georgia, received, in round numbers, $134,483 Federal aid for the construction of public highways. Under the provisions of February, 1919, however, this allowance was very substantially increased, and as a result for the fiscal year 1920-21 the State will receive

$2,697,140.96. Under the rules of distribution it is assumed that Georgia fares neither better nor worse than any other State. The present bill authorizes an appropriation of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year and Georgia will receive about $2,800,000.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. ROSE. How much of that $2,800,000, or how much more than the allowance under the present bill, is paid by the State of Georgia? I had in mind the State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania, which pay anywhere from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 and receive a very small proportion in comparison with a number of Southern and Western States.

Mr. LARSEN. I am informed that the expenditures by the State and counties for 1919 was $6,000,000. Our State and county convicts are worked upon such public roads, and this does not include hire of them. I regret that I can not give the figures in detail to the gentleman for 1920, but I can assure him of this fact: The appropriations made by the State of Georgia and the various counties for the improvement of its rural public highways is very liberal and compares favorably with that of other States, especially in the South. Considering its population and wealth, I believe it compares favorably with the remaining States of the Union.

Mr. ROSE. I would not have the gentleman under the impression that I do not favor Federal aid in road building, as I have always favored the construction of good roads throughout the country and have already voiced my approval of the Sells bill now on the calendar. I might say that I am not in full sympathy with the present method of distribution of the funds made available for aid to the several States.

Mr. LARSEN. I am in favor of the present bill not because it provides exactly what I desire but because I believe it substantially meets the present demands and is a long step toward the accomplishment of the desired purpose. My own idea is that in the interest of economy it would be better if the appropriation were for a period of from four to five years. I believe such period would be conducive to cheaper road construction, and I am of the opinion that all highway departments and those who are best informed as to rural highway construction entertain the same view. The present bill at least commits the incoming administration to a permanent road policy. The Democratic Party has already gone on record; through its splendid achievements we have had four years of Federal aid. Therefore I take it that by the present bill both parties will be thoroughly committed to the Federal-aid highway program. In this respect the bill will at least satisfy every legitimate demand of the people throughout the entire Nation.

We have had the present Federal-aid system for a little more than four years. If I may be permitted, I will attempt to give you some of its results. First, I will speak of bridges. On January 1, 1921, the plans approved for construction of bridges were 1,849. The estimated cost of these bridges was $21,882,555, and the proportion of the Federal aid allowed was $9,941,044. Thus it will be seen that the several States wherein bridges have been or are now being constructed have contributed more than 50 per cent of the cost and that the Federal Government is contributing less than 50 per cent. Federal aid is allowed in the construction of no bridge less than 20 feet in length or with a minimum capacity of less than 10 tons. Future constructions, I am told, will require a minimum capacity of 15 tons. A major portion of the bridges have been and are to be of reinforced concrete construction. Some of them are of steel, and in a few instances of lumber, but the major portion are of reinforced concrete. Therefore the bridge work, generally speaking, may be considered as permanent.

January 1 of this year 817 road projects had been completed. They included a total mileage of 4,312 miles. They were constructed at a cost of $63,956,932, of which amount there was contributed from Federal aid $28,317,237. There are 234 projects, with a total mileage of 17,218 miles, in course of construction, the estimated cost of which is $286,170,153. The Federal aid to be allotted for the construction of this mileage is $121,365,870. It is estimated that of the work under construction 45 per cent has been completed. Therefore the estimated aid of Federal expenditures for work completed and in course of construction is as follows:

Work completed	$28,317,237
Work in course of construction	55,315,045
Total	83,632,282

There has been completed under the Federal-aid system 12,000 miles of rural public highways. Of this, 4,000 miles are of macadam, brick, sheet asphalt, or other high-class materials; 8,000 miles are of low-grade materials. The total cost for Federal aid in roads and bridges completed and in course of construction is $149,683,107.

In addition to this under State highway supervision there has been constructed during the Federal-aid period, in round numbers, 80,000 miles of rural public highway. Of this, 8,975 miles have been of high-grade material, such as macadam, asphalt, brick, and so forth. There are estimated at this time 2,500,000 miles of rural public highways in the United States. Upon these roads 9,000,000 motor vehicles, 900,000 of which are motor trucks, are engaged in the transportation of this country. It is estimated that for the last year the annual tonnage over these rural public highways was 1,200,000,000 tons, and of this amount 350,000,000 tons were farm and vegetable products. It is estimated that 2,000,000 motor trucks and motor vehicles will be constructed during the present year. When we consider that motor transportation has increased in this country since the period of Federal aid 5,500,000 vehicles we will hardly consider that the estimation of truck and other motor vehicle construction is at all excessive. It is said that during the Federal-aid period motor transportation has increased upon the public highways in rural sections at least 500 per cent, and that in our large centers of population the increase is something like 1,000 per cent.

It is very evident that the water and rail transportation facilities in this country are not sufficient to meet its demands. It is highly necessary for the good of this country, for the protection of its people, both in the rural districts and in our larger cities, that these rural highways should be improved and maintained. As a matter of national defense they should not be overlooked. I believe we all agree that the freedom of France and Belgium from German rule to-day is largely due to their splendid highway systems at the beginning of the war. [Applause.] May we profit by the lesson.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHINDBLOM). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LARSEN. May I have a minute more? I will ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] for the time.

Mr. SLEMP. I yield the time to the gentleman.

Mr. LARSEN. In conclusion, may I call attention to and voice my approval of a bill introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS]. It provides for the transfer from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture of one thousand 5-ton motor trucks and five hundred 10-ton motor trucks for allocation among the States, to be used in the construction of rural public highways under supervision of the State highway departments. This bill was passed by both branches of the Congress just before the close of the session last year, but failed to receive Executive approval, and still remains inoperative. Mr. REAVIS has again introduced the bill, and I trust Congress will pass it.

I have heard it suggested that the War Department purchased the motors under contract providing they should be used only for military purposes. If so, this may account for failure of Executive approval. Granting such to be the case, I do not believe such contract should have been made. If it were, I believe such provision contrary to public policy and, therefore, of no binding force or effect.

We have bought and paid for the property and the delivery has been made. It will probably soon be out of date and of little or no value for war purposes. If so, we should disregard any unauthorized stipulation in the contract of purchase which will prevent a use for the public good.

If the contract be of binding force and effect in the respect indicated, then proper authorization should be given by the Congress for cooperation by the War Department with the State highway departments and the allocation of trucks to be used in the construction of such roads for military purposes. [Applause.]

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

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I have permission to revise and extend my remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LARSEN. I thought the gentleman from Oklahoma had gone. [Laughter.] I wish to say to him that the matter to be inserted is statistical in character.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is withdrawn, and unanimous consent is granted.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. EAGAN. I thought it was 30 minutes. Will five minutes be sufficient for the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. MILLER. I would like to have the full amount promised, but as the gentleman is so kind, I will not object.

Mr. EAGAN. I yield five minutes additional to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am glad to have this opportunity of laying before the committee and the House some thoughts and suggestions regarding the defenses of our Pacific seaboard.

I know anything looking toward the strengthening of these defenses is of infinite interest to us. It is our earnest hope that the Congress will immediately make provision for us on the Pacific coast as you have already for the Atlantic, and on a somewhat similar plan.

I shall attempt to show you the situation from our point of view.

PACIFIC STATES AND CITIES COMPARED.

On the Pacific coast there are 3 States; on the Atlantic, 15; while the length of the coast line, exclusive of Alaska, is approximately as 5 is to 7. The Pacific States are States of great areas. The smallest of the three exceeds by 3,000 square miles the area of the entire six New England States, while the coast line of California alone if placed on the Atlantic would reach from Maine to the Carolinas. In area she is equal to 19 Massachusetts. Oregon is larger than New York and Pennsylvania combined. I make these comparisons simply to give you an idea of the geographical magnitude of these States. And we are not without population. California is now the eighth State in the list, Washington the thirtieth, and Oregon the thirty-fourth.

The cities there are many, and of great commercial and financial importance: Los Angeles the tenth, San Francisco the eleventh, Seattle the twentieth, Portland the twenty-fourth, Oakland the thirty-first, Tacoma with her 96,000 people, and San Diego with her 74,000. The banking capital of these, as well as the general wealth, far exceeds per inhabitant the cities of the Middle West and South. To illustrate: The banking capital of San Francisco far exceeds that of any city of its class throughout the country, while that of both Seattle and Portland each exceeds that of Indianapolis or Kansas City. That gives the importance of these cities from another angle. But it is the geographical location of them that is the individual feature of the Pacific coast. In making the sea from Seattle and Puget Sound ports a ship passes within 4 miles of British soil, while San Diego is 18 miles from the Mexican frontier. The distance to be covered in coordinating a defense of these three coast States alone exceeds that from off the coast of Maine to Georgia. If one of these cities lay 300 miles south of the British soil and the other an equal distance north of the Mexican line, we would not have the problem we have to-day. It is this extreme of distance on the Pacific coast that makes the coordination of military and naval forces so difficult.

THE ATLANTIC SITUATION.

On the Atlantic coast there are four major exposures, or more properly termed strategic areas. The others are secondary. The major areas are now well covered. The situation at each of these points is well in hand from the strategic and defensive angles. The existing fortifications in these areas would seem adequate to meet the test of attack, especially when strengthened by our modern mobile coast defense. The secondary points can readily be strengthened by this latter element, and thus the coast at all points be locked without the aid of other defensive elements. This would leave the Navy in practically a unit—one unit—to combine with the land defenses in the protection of the one superarea or free to operate at any other point on the coast which may be the objective of an enemy. This is evidently the general plan of defense.

It is easy to observe that the outstanding, dominating feature of this plan of coordinated defense is the one-unit idea of defensive naval operation. It is further a fact and of great strategic value that the superexposure is approximately the mileage center of the four major exposed areas. The value of this naval-unit plan of operation was never more emphasized than in the World War when Great Britain's grand fleet—her unit—occupying a highly strategic position off the coast of Scotland and later off the Orkneys held Germany's Navy behind the defenses of Kiel and Wilhelmshaven and thus kept open the oceans of the world.

History simply compounds this emphasis.

Let us now look at the Pacific.

THE PACIFIC SITUATION.

If there is a national menace to-day, it is the Pacific. If there is a national exposure to-day, it is the Pacific coast. There is no need of mincing words about it; there is no need of being timid. I know there are some who would speak of it only in whispers and then, too, in dark corners. This ill becomes real men and women of a great Nation, and no others are worth while. We might just as well meet the matter squarely in the face, as Americans always have and always will meet such situations. I shall attempt to do so.

There are four major exposures or areas on the Pacific coast. I shall give them in their order as they impress me. The Strait of Juan de Fuca and Puget Sound, San Francisco Bay, Los Angeles or San Pedro, and San Diego. The others are secondary and can be protected easily and quickly.

THE SAN DIEGO AREA.

Three of these areas are at present positive, fixed, and, I might say, dangerous exposures. The Strait of Juan de Fuca is by far the greatest, and San Diego by far the least. It might be said without doing great violence to the situation that San Diego is a secondary exposure. This is due to its geographical location, its surroundings, and its absence as a war-necessity producer. Then, again, the deep-sea channel there is so located as to give the maximum effect to her well-located and recently strengthened land batteries.

Point Loma, with its surroundings, is naturally a dominating defensive location.

It must be borne in mind that the purpose of all war is to inflict the maximum damage upon the enemy with the minimum loss or exposure. The waging of a campaign or any military operation, which, though it be successful, yields nothing substantial from the military viewpoint, is unthinkable in the intense and serious game of war. The energy as well as the hazard of an operation is never exercised or assumed except upon those objectives which yield advantages from the military viewpoint. San Diego is landlocked with its railroad and highways leading to the north out of commission. The topography of the terrain in that direction is such that the defensive positions are too many and too strong to be overcome. An enemy would find itself landlocked and bottled up. Out of our mobile coast artillery sufficient could be held in any emergency to strengthen the present defenses so as to make San Diego the safest city on the coast. The likelihood of it becoming an objective of an enemy approaching from the sea is small, very small, when compared with the other cities of the coast. The fact that it is the first Pacific port north of the Panama Canal would add little to its strategic value in the hands of an enemy.

No one in these days, except the German or those of the German school of military operation, destroy private property without there is present a military necessity requiring such destruction.

THE LOS ANGELES OR SAN PEDRO AREA, SANTA CATALINA ISLAND.

Nineteen miles west by south, broad off the coast of San Pedro Bay and San Pedro Hill, is Santa Catalina, so popular with the Pacific coast tourists. The intervening water is known as the San Pedro Channel. This islet, some 18 miles in length and some 7 in width, lying west-northwest and east-southeast, attains an extreme height of over 2,000 feet. As a landfall it can be seen upward of 50 miles at sea. It is admirably adapted to fortifications either fixed or mobile. Its use for this purpose in connection with the present defenses would easily and readily render San Pedro Bay impregnable, and thus Los Angeles, a highly strategic point, and the tenth city of the Union—of the Pittsburgh-Baltimore class—would be as safe from attack from the sea as the city of Omaha.

Los Angeles and its vicinity are producers of war necessities of many kinds, which, together with the local wealth, makes it a strategic point well worth an enemy operation.

Though there are many naval activities there, it is not a naval base, but the railheads as well as the many industrial plants add to its otherwise high military value. The back-land topography, unlike that of San Diego, holds a comparatively few highly defensive positions.

Santa Catalina in topography as well as in coast line is bold, rocky, and in places precipitous. Curious, opposite ocean coves, reaching in from the east and west, with a low-lying portage called "The Isthmus," divide the island into two areas of elevations. On that part south of "The Isthmus" and on its east side is the delightful resort known as Avalon Bay. Approximately one-eighth of the area of the island lies north-northwest of this "isthmus," where an extreme height is attained of over 1,700 feet. It would appear that this portion is more adapted to military uses, as it impresses one that greater range and more effective positions can be obtained here than elsewhere and at the same time permit of closer coordination with the present off-channel mainland batteries. It would also seem that from this position on the island an enemy fleet operating against San Pedro would be exposed to a simultaneous longitudinal and transverse fire. The advantageous location of battery positions on the island, however, is purely a matter of military engineering. The point I wish to emphasize is that this strategically located island is wonderfully adapted to military uses, strikingly so for heavy, long-range mobile guns. From elevated positions, either fixed or mobile, batteries arranged around the western-northern end would command a remarkably effective range of fire. The hydrography of the island shows the 20-fathom curve close inshore in places not to exceed one-fifth of a mile and in one or two within 50 yards.

This island, occupying this wonderful strategic position, has never been fortified nor has any movement ever been undertaken in that direction. At present it serves no other purpose than a place of entertainment for the idle and the curious.

Modern fortifications on this island so located as to coordinate with the present defenses on the mainland would eliminate the necessity of any substantial naval units at San Pedro and thus be a great factor in sustaining the one-unit naval idea in the Pacific waters.

SAN FRANCISCO AND OAKLAND AREAS, THE FARALLON ISLANDS.

Twenty-three miles almost due west off the Golden Gate is the southeast and principal one of six rocky islets known as the Farallones de los Frayles. The largest and southernmost of these is three-fourths of a mile long in its longest direction and three-fifths of a mile wide in its widest point, and attains a height of nearly 350 feet. The course of the group is a general west-northwest and east-southeast direction and extends for over 7 miles, and if we should include the menacing Noonday Rock and other bayonet rocks adjacent the distance would be 9½ miles. These are very dangerous waters. The nautical charts abound in warnings. The dangers of this group, together with the peculiar horseshoe-shaped banks off the Gate make the deep sea channel well defined to the very entrance of the Gate.

A solitary lighthouse on this southeast Farallon now stands as the only evidence of our national dominion over this idle sentinel of one of the Pacific coast's major strategic points.

Every ship, coastwise and overseas, passes within range of this rocky islet.

HELGOLAND AND KRONSTADT.

One naturally thinks of Helgoland, that once citadel of German strength. Likewise rocky, isolated, desolate, standing some 36 miles out in the North Sea, off the mouths of the Elbe and the Weser. Admittedly one of the blunders of British diplomacy was when in 1890 Great Britain ceded this dominant location to Germany in exchange for a worthless strip of land in Africa. Germany obtained it, fortified it, and during four long years of the greatest war amongst men it stood a complete barrier to the combined navies of the world, and the great cities of Hamburg up the Elbe and Bremen up the Weser were as safe from the sea as Berlin and Posen.

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

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I have always understood that the harbor of San Francisco was impregnable; that it was fortified in such a way that an enemy fleet could not injure the city of San Francisco. Now, the gentleman would have us believe that that is not true, and that we must fortify this island.

Mr. MILLER. This late Great War, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, has taught not only this country but all others many lessons. Time was when it was thought that such fortifications as those constructed at Verdun and those on the frontier of Belgium were the most formidable types of defense in the world, and yet every one of them fell in six hours.

Again we are reminded of what Russia did in her useful times and before the coming of her evil days. I cite you to the little island of Kotlin in the east end of the Gulf of Finland. Likewise rocky, isolated, desolate. She erected there a veritable Gibraltar—her Kronstadt. In its day the strongest fortress of northern Europe and still sufficient in the World War to stand at bay the German Navy which at all times held the master hand in the Baltic, and Petrograd beyond it was safe.

And here stand the Farallones as if waiting to be of similar use to the great Republic of the West. The Farallones not fortified, did you say? Yes. Never have been and no move has ever been made in that direction. It would truly seem that nature not only constructed but has preserved this rocky islet with the hope that some day America would awaken and make of it the guardsman of that precious seven-eighths of a mile of water we call the Golden Gate.

San Francisco, the eleventh city of the Union, greater than Buffalo, and, like Los Angeles, in the Pittsburgh-Baltimore class, and Oakland, with her 216,000 people, lay broad upon the bay. Each of these cities have their great railheads, magazines, shipyards, dry docks, explosive works, and a thousand and one industries on or near the water's edge. These cities are producers of war necessities. The oil fields of the State feed into them, where adequate facilities exist for fueling vessels of every kind. Here, too, is a great navy yard at Mare Island, into which the Nation has poured its millions, and upon which a fleet operating to the south or to the middle north must base. A million people find their homes on the shores of San Francisco Bay.

It must be remembered that a naval force can not maneuver at will off the entrance to the Gate. The shoals, especially the 4-fathom bank—that crescent-shaped menace—defines the channel to and from the sea. But as it is now an enemy fleet could stand out at sea beyond this bank and take its time and pleasure in operating against the present defenses. The fortifications defending the Gate are of the solid, stationary, open-battery type, anchored to the soil. We may have to read again and possibly endure the fate which met the Belgians in the World War when they relied upon their stationary fortresses on the German frontier.

Verdun, lost to the French in 1870, was saved in the late Great War by dismantling her stationary defenses and adopting the shifting, semimobile plan. When this latter is impracticable, other and additional resources must be available. The topography of the terrain at this point is such that it would be difficult to strengthen the present defenses on short notice by the addition of mobile batteries. Here at the Farallones, as at Catalina, a hostile fleet in any operation would be exposed to a transverse fire.

To undertake the problem of rendering San Francisco Bay impregnable from the sea one finds the only solution in modern fortifications on the rocky heights of the Farallones. By this improvement San Francisco can be made eternally safe, and the naval units otherwise required would in emergency be released to form the one-unit fleet in the Pacific, as it is now in the Atlantic.

By this, or some similar plan, the Panama Canal would truly come into its own.

THE STRAIT OF JUAN DE FUCA AREA.

Here, to a layman's eye, is the superexposure on the Pacific seaboard.

North of Vancouver Island, which forms the northern bank of the strait, lies the great Alaskan Archipelago. For a distance of some hundreds of miles north and south and upward of a hundred miles east and west these islands, nearly 2,000 in number, stud the sea. Deep channels cross and criss-cross angle and zigzag amongst them. A similar forest of islands exists at no point on the Pacific coast between Cape Barrow and The Horn. Sheltered from the sea, hidden from the eyes of the world, a hostile fleet could hide amongst these islands until the opportune time to spring, and all the while be within 20 hours' striking distance of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the entrance to Puget Sound. It could be located in these waters only through the Air Service and there is not now an aviation base in the entire Pacific Northwest. The sea here is open the year round notwithstanding this archipelago is over 1,000 miles north of the ice-bound port of Vladivostok on the opposite or Siberian coast. Unimak Pass, the North Pacific entrance to Bering Sea, closes in winter, as does Bering Sea, but everything to the east and southeast is open. There is no such thing in these waters as an ice-bound port. This surprisingly mild climate of southeastern Alaska and its included archipelago, is caused by the phenomenon of the ocean currents.

It would make us shudder to think of a similar archipelago on the Atlantic coast, comparatively uninhabited, without ade-

quate communication by cable or wireless, where a hostile fleet could hide and be within 20 hours' striking distance of one of the Atlantic's principal seaports.

And not a gun on the Strait of Juan de Fuca. There never was a gun there, and so far as I can ascertain no movement has ever been made to place one there.

There is such a thing as a navy hiding and then springing to its attack. Just the same as the sally or surprise attack by an army on the land. The element of surprise is present in each case. From the earliest times all down through the years this element of surprise has been as effective as it is to-day.

THE STRAIT.

The entrance to the Strait of Juan de Fuca is 12 miles wide. The land outrigger on the south, or American side, is Cape Flattery, and on the north, or British side, Cape Bonilla. From abreast these points there is a straightaway east for 45 miles with a uniform width of 11 miles. At this latter point there is a pinching to 8 miles for a distance of 5½ miles, maintaining the same eastern straightaway. At this latter point it changes its direction to northeast by east for a further distance of 32 miles. Within this latter distance it expands to 18 and 20 miles in width, including what is known as the Gulf of Georgia.

The strait is terminated on the east at Whidby Island, where it pinches into Admiralty Inlet, the entrance to Puget Sound. From the ocean to Whidby Island the midchannel distance is 83 miles. The depth of the water throughout the strait is remarkably great, no bottom being found with a 150-fathom line in its deepest parts, while the 10-fathom line runs close in shore—not a rock nor bar nor shoal.

One would search in vain on the nautical charts—certainly in American waters—for an equal to this inland sea where such freedom from hidden dangers exists and where there is a like freedom, of course, to the very shore. All away from the immensity of the sea.

There is not in all American water another such ideal naval battle ground. A fleet can form and reform, evolve and maneuver, attack, withdraw, or adopt any tactics known to naval warfare. The sea room is ample for any sized force however great. Railheads at many of the shore towns and cities are wide open over which landing parties can be shifted direct to the great cities of Puget Sound. And not a gun on this expanse of water!

Am I not speaking the truth, therefore, when I say this is the master exposure on the Pacific coast? There are no accommodating strategically located islands off the entrance of the Strait of Fuca. The chief defense, therefore, of these waters now, as always, and especially in time of war, must be a naval force. It is one of those places, and they are few, which, in case of emergency, would immediately call for the presence of a fleet. The batteries at Admiralty Inlet or elsewhere could at best but be supporting factors. A fleet operating against these latter would not be exposed to the fatal coincident longitudinal and transverse fire so dreaded by every man of the sea. The situation here is such that it can not be completely remedied and the location held secure by land batteries alone. In addition, an attacking fleet upon the present land batteries would have that inestimable advantage of a close offshore position with a shaded background of dense forests of standing timber. It was this latter element that wrought so against the British in the naval battle off the coast of Jutland.

ADMIRALTY INLET.

Admiralty Inlet extends from the eastern terminus of the strait in a general southeast by east direction for a distance of some 22 miles. The average breadth of the inlet is about 3½ miles. The channel, slightly curved, is deep and the current swift. There are no elbows in Admiralty Inlet as there are in the Dardanelles. Soundings of 100 fathoms are found in midchannel, while the 10-fathom line runs close inshore.

At this inlet are the only defenses which guard that still greater inland sea of Puget Sound.

I am not underestimating the value of these defenses but am questioning their effectiveness in the very nature of things when subjected to the awful test of modern war. They would make as gallant a defense as human brains, brawn, and courage are capable, but, however gallant may be the defense, finite men can not perform the impossible. Thermopylæ was a pass in the mountains; this is a pass in the sea. The history of the world is full of the tragedies of unequal contestants and here some day will be another.

SEATTLE, TACOMA, AND PUGET SOUND.

Puget Sound is an inland American sea of some thousand of miles and upward of coast line. It would strike one, if viewed from the sky, as a gigantic network of navigable channels and natural canals. Upon this body of water are the railheads of every transcontinental line either American or Canadian save two. Here are the Union Pacific, the Northern Pacific, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, and the Great Northern. The Burlington and Canadian Pacific come in over leased lines or by operating arrangements, while the Grand Trunk Pacific is connected by steamship with Prince Rupert, its ocean terminii. The Southern Pacific and Santa Fe are the only absentees. Here is the naval base of the northern Pacific. The entire North Pacific Fleet, in case of emergency, would necessarily be based upon the Puget Sound Navy Yard. Not only when operating in the North Pacific, south of Cape Flattery, but any and all operations in the immense expanse of Alaskan waters covering 4,000 miles of coast line to the north and northwest.

ALASKAN WATERS.

In these Alaskan waters, lying open as the sky, are the greatest gold-producing mines in America, if not in the world, to-day. The great fishing industry is here. Canneries, salteries, oil, and nitrate plants, beside the enormous deposits of copper and coal now just coming under production. Here also is the Alaskan Government Railroad, upon which the Nation has spent so many millions, leading directly to the very source of supply of coal and copper. These are prime necessities in war, and their acquisition and subsequent production by an enemy would be a master stroke. These necessities, all lying wide open to the sea, and thus falling into the hands of an enemy without the firing of a shot, would from any point of view furnish a strong stimulus for the early occupation of these waters. This condition necessarily associates itself intimately with the wonderful strategic position of an enemy in its major plan of operation that I have elsewhere in this address attempted to point out. The double purpose is present with all of its inducement. The secondary results almost equal those that are essentially primary.

I have linked the Alaskan situation to that of Puget Sound, for, under any strategic or tactical plan of North Pacific defense, they would of necessity be a single area.

THE STORY OF THE CRIMEA.

It may be strange to some that this extreme northwest point of the Nation, the very finger tip, so to speak, should be the point of anxiety. But a nation is not bound together on the mileage basis. Far stranger facts than the future battle of the Strait of Fuca lie buried in the pages of history. It was no less strange a fact, indeed, that once upon a time when four great European nations became involved in war events and situations so twisted themselves that a little, obscure peninsula in the Black Sea became the theater of one of the world's great wars. England, France, Turkey, Sardinia, and Russia rushed hither and the Crimea first came before the world. There is no law governing such events. The field of strategy is world-wide. Napoleon's conquest of Egypt came to its tragic end by an event that took place in the little muddy Bay of Abukir. Who amongst us laymen would have thought that when our war cloud with Spain was lowered that the first gun would be fired in the far-off Philippines? Who would have anticipated that the strategy of the day would have brought the British and the French in collision at the little Bavarian town of Blenheim? On the contrary, it was inevitable that there should be an Antietam and a Gettysburg somewhere, and all hands pointed to the soil of Maryland. The strategy of the situation here defined the zone. Subsequent events fulfilled the prophecy, except that the one is 5 miles beyond the line. From the same basis I say that the battle of the Strait of Fuca is clearly within the world's future.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SEATTLE AND TACOMA.

Here on Puget Sound are great railroad and steamship terminals, the most extensive on the coast. Here are docks, grain elevators, and warehouses of unsurpassed excellence stocked with grain, all coordinated with the railheads. This is the heart of the lumber industry, not only of America but of the world. Here are smelters, shipyards, dry docks, and explosive works. Flouring and lumber mills abound, together with all the thousand and one other activities found in great commercial and industrial centers. A half million of people live on Puget Sound.

Seattle itself, chief city and port, now of the Kansas City-Minneapolis class, is truly from any angle the marvel of the

great Northwest and of the coast, and, broadly speaking, of all America. While I may be pardoned for the local pride I have in my own home town, I would be derelict in my duty as a Representative in this body did I not point out in the broadest way the dangers which may so easily be theirs. Dangers which would come not only to them but to others in similar position. I would not be fulfilling my duty did I not speak for them and likewise warn the Nation of their peril. It must not be forgotten that in 1918 the customs district of Puget Sound was second in importance only to that of New York.

THE COAL FIELDS.

Over and above all these, however, great as they are, there remains to an enemy the enormous prize of gaining access to the great coal fields of Puget Sound. Coal in all quantities is mined fairly at tidewater and finds its outflow through Seattle and Tacoma. Bear in mind, gentlemen, that here is the only present supply of American coal on the Pacific coast or in the Pacific States. This of itself is sufficient to make Puget Sound the chief objective by an enemy of any Pacific coast operation. It takes no strategist to appreciate the dominating importance of this factor in connection with a major naval operation. An enemy fleet operating off the Pacific coast would of necessity be far removed from its base, so that its only hope of a fuel supply would be access to acquired fields gained in the course of the operation.

From what I have said, is it not plain to the mind of an ordinary person untrained in naval strategy that the Strait of Juan de Fuca and Puget Sound are the supreme and master exposures of the Pacific seaboard?

All that I have said and every idea I have attempted to give bears directly upon the one point, that our Pacific coast defenses should be so planned and constructed with the dominant purpose in view of making it possible that in emergency the Pacific Fleet be kept practically in one unit. An enemy would certainly so come to assail us. Such, as I understand it, is the major plan for the Atlantic defense.

As I see it, every strategic point on the coast outside of the Strait of Fuca—the Alaskan exposure—could, at a comparatively small expense be made impregnable. It only awaits utilizing the natural situations and positions now existing, and these are principally found in fortifying the Santa Catalina and the southeast Farallones.

AIDS TO THE GOVERNMENT.

The people of Puget Sound are apprehensive, for they are sensitive of their exposure in case war should suddenly break upon the Pacific. We have not stood with folded hands and called for protection. We have undertaken at all times through our community spirit to assist the Government. Years ago, when there was not a man within 200 miles wearing the uniform, the public-spirited citizens of Seattle, by their personal contributions, purchased in the suburbs of that city the site for an Army post. The Government accepted it, and we now have a little band of soldiers at Fort Lawton. Before the Great War the citizens of Tacoma and Pierce County, Wash., by a general bond issue purchased a tract of some 80,000 acres of land, at an expense to themselves of $2,500,000, and presented it to the Government. I challenge all America to equal this act of self-sacrifice and patriotism. That tract is now known as Camp Lewis, one of the best, if not the best, located Army camp in the country. Recently Seattle and King County, at public expense, have purchased a large acreage at Sand Point for an aviation base and have tendered it to the Government. We hope it will be accepted. The joint congressional committee, which last fall visited the coast, has so recommended. Locally, we have done our part in good, rounded measure.

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Four minutes.

Mr. EAGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. For a very short question.

Mr. EAGAN. Has the gentleman any suggestion to make as to the method of fortifying the Strait of Fuca and Puget Sound?

Mr. MILLER. I certainly have—first by the installation of fortifications at Flattery; and, second, by the installation of mobile defenses along the south bank of the strait; and, third, by strengthening the batteries at Admiralty Inlet. And by the way, I may say in passing that it is impossible to mine the channel of Admiralty Inlet. It never has been mined. It can not be mined to-day with any kind of a mine now known to military engineering. There must be some new character of mine developed before it can be mined.

Mr. TILSON. What is the reason for that—a strong current?

Mr. MILLER. A strong current, about 4½ miles an hour, and the channel is very deep.

Mr. SLEMP. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MILLER. For a short question.

Mr. SLEMP. The department of seacoast artillery made an investigation during the last year and they thought they could mine that channel.

Mr. MILLER. They thought they could then, but they did not know, and they do not know now. A 100-fathom line will not touch the bottom in places in midchannel, and the 20-fathom line runs close inshore. With the combination of the excessive depth of the channel and the tremendous current there is no known mine now that will meet the situation. I hope sincerely this unfortunate combination may be overcome.

WHY THE PACIFIC COAST IS INTERESTED.

Now, you ask why we on the Pacific coast are deeply concerned? Why are we asking for the strengthening of the defenses along the shore of the Pacific? The answer is to be found in the events as they come to us day after day from across the waters. We are not frightened nor are we timid. We are just ordinary, practical, everyday Americans like you, prompted by the same motives, responding to the same influences, reading the same signs. Every day of the world we hear the rattle of the saber from across the Pacific. The rattle is louder on the coast than it is here, for we are 3,000 miles nearer the Empire of the Rising Sun. We read and we hear that there shall be no movement toward disarmament until Japan has completed her eight-battleship-eight-cruiser program. It should take no sage to interpret what this means. It means preparation for war unless the cool-headed statesmen and diplomats of Japan curb the demogogues, jingoes, and junkers that now appear to have the public eye and ear. There seems to be a national swagger over there. Only the other day our public press carried photographic reproductions of a scene in Japan, where students were publicly discussing the advisability of war with the United States. Curt answers and snubbish bearing toward Americans have already become popular in Japan. Not so, it is true, with the thinking and responsible people, but many a nation better poised than Japan has been led to war by the clamor and jazz of her thoughtless class. France was so led in 1870. There will be no war with Japan unless she makes it, but it might just as well be understood now better than at any time in the future that our Pacific Coast States will not and shall not become an "unredeemed Japan." Japan need have no fear of aggression from us. We are not colonizing her soil, but her subjects are undertaking to and are colonizing ours. We shall reserve unto ourselves at whatever cost the right to say who, when, where, and how the alien shall come to us and settle amongst us. This is the sovereign right of an independent nation, and America, at whatever cost, at whatever hazard, at whatever sacrifice, will continue to exercise this inherent right of sovereignty. [Applause.]

Mr. EAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that no quorum is present.

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

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes additional to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, very recently my colleague, Mr. BLANTON of Texas, sent a communication to the press of Texas which, in my time, I desire to have the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BLANTON APPEALS TO THE NEWSPAPERS—WANTS HELP TO KEEP DOWN CONGRESSIONAL SALARY RAISE APPROPRIATION.

Congressman BLANTON of Texas has directed the following "hurry-up" message to the newspapers of the country. The appeal is made in the form of a letter from Washington under February 7 date line, and the letter is directed to the editor of each newspaper personally:

"I need your prompt help to prevent a wrong proposed against the public. There is a determined effort now, both in the House and Senate, to pass before adjournment a measure to increase the salary of Congressmen and Senators at least to $10,000, and to $12,000 if possible. The influence greatest of all in controlling congressional action is public sentiment crystallized and quickened by the editor's page of our public press. Won't you help to prevent this wrong?

"For three years I have been forced to remain on the floor of the House constantly to prevent this proposal from being attached as a rider on appropriation bills. By making timely points of order, I have kept it off of appropriation bills, and I have kept it from coming up as a separate legislative proposition solely by threats that I would force a record vote. The fear of going upon record has thus far held the matter in abeyance. Both in the Sixty-fifth as well as the present Congress, the Members having in charge the matter have urged me either to absent myself at the proper time or else let the matter be decided without a record vote, and I have made enemies through my determined stand.

"Senator SHERMAN is insisting on an increase to $12,000 and has charge of the matter in the Senate, while Congressman CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania now has charge of it in the House. As an amendment, he recently tried to force it on the supply bill, but I had it stricken out on a point of order. As it must be passed by March 4 to be in effect next session, Members are becoming bold and will likely brave a record vote to pass it. It must be defeated.

"Congressman LANGLEY and his committee are also trying to pass a bill to spend millions furnishing each Senator and Congressman with a luxurious apartment to live in. Such proposal is outrageous. During this crucial period of reconstruction, when our Government is facing a deficit of $3,000,000,000, if Senators and Congressmen are not willing to make sacrifices and serve on their present salaries, they should resign and let others take their places. The expense of this appeal to the press is paid by myself.

"THOMAS L. BLANTON."

Gentlemen of the committee, this is to me not a very pleasant service but one I feel that somebody in this House ought to render. The picture which the gentleman from Texas, who sits in front of me, wants the people of Texas to have of this Congress and of my colleagues from his State is that we are four hundred and odd men too cowardly to face him, and that, if he had not been here night and day during the last three years, this gang of freebooters would have raided the Public Treasury. [Applause.] And that he is the only man here that has got the nerve to do it. Think of putting me and my colleagues from Texas—sturdy, strong men that they are—in a position, now when my State is not prospering, where we would be willing to make our people increase our salaries, and he knows that there is not a word of truth in it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; I will not.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I raise a question of personal privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not raise that now.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, do not take it out of my time; I will take care of myself. That is the picture which the gentleman from Texas wants the country to see. He is not mistaken about the effect of what he is saying. The picture which the gentleman from Texas wants the country to see is this body of men, sent here by the sovereign people of a great Nation, standing down here on Pennsylvania Avenue trying to get at the Public Treasury; and for three long years he has stood there and fought back the hungry bunch of hounds from the Treasury of the country.

I may be mistaken—the gentleman from Texas may be an exception—but I never have seen in my life, with the possible exception of the gentleman from Texas, a man with great integrity of purpose who did not want other people to believe in his fellow men. [Applause.] I never have seen, with the possible exception of the gentleman from Texas, a man in my life, who put other than a commercial value on his own reputation, who would attack the reputation of his fellow men without justification of facts.

No, I do not like to do this sort of thing, but I do not propose to stand in my place in the House and let any man say that about me to my constituents. [Applause.] I would suffer that right arm torn from its shoulder this day—and I believe it is true of the other brave men from my State—before we would undertake at this time to increase our salary, and, in my judgment, the gentleman from Texas does not know of a single man from Texas who would vote for it. Then why did he send it to Texas? Why appeal to the editors of the little country papers and the big papers of Texas carrying the imputation that he needs them to compel me to do my duty? If there was a real effort of that character here, why did he not send it to the press of the Nation? There could be but two motives on the part of the gentleman from Texas: One was to prevent a wrong and the other was, under the guise of the effort, to do himself a benefit.

Ah, gentlemen, if only myself and my colleagues were involved I might have bided my time and fought it out in my own State. You folks are laughing at what the gentleman from Texas is doing. I tell you that he is doing harm to public opinion in this country and the trust of this country in its Government. [Applause.]

I want to read you this. It is a little clipping from a paper from the district of my friend and colleague, Mr. RAYBURN. It says:

United States Congressmen and Senators are making a desperate effort—

Where is the effort and who is doing it?—

making a desperate effort to increase their respective salaries to $10,000 and $12,000. Representative BLANTON, of Texas, is making a fight against the raise, and says that the Members having the matter in charge have urged him to absent himself at the proper time so they could tack this salary grab onto the appropriation bill and get it through.

"Absent himself." We had a pretty good chance if we wanted to slip that over to get by with any sort of a bill when we passed the apportionment bill, and the gentleman from Texas was hitting it up to New York or somewhere else. [Laughter and applause.] He was not here. [Applause.]

Here is the trouble:

It is just such things as this that disgust the common people—

That is, the belief on the part of the country that you and myself in this crucial period of this country's history, when the great public is under the burden of taxation, that we are willing to take money out of the Public Treasury and increase our salaries. This paper says:

It is just such things as this that disgust the common people and cause them to lower their estimate of the Government—

That is the hurt. Oh, they say that all is fair in politics, and some people seem to believe it, but I want to tell you that no man on the face of this earth has a right to play politics to the hurt of his country. [Applause.]

cause them to lower their estimate of the Government under which they live, which means reduced patriotism. And when patriotism is sufficiently reduced it means bolshevism or some other form of anarchy.

That is the trouble. Here is a man standing in his place here, who has taken an oath with the people of my Nation to support and defend its institutions, who over his own signature sends a statement to Texas that is as false as hell. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I deny that, and I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has his remedy, if he desires to have the words taken down, and that is the only remedy.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; and we will vote on them.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Let us see what the record is in this case. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] makes a statement that he has been compelled to stay here three years and prevent by timely points of order this increase of salary from being put on different bills. That is the truth or it is not the truth. What does that mean? If it were necessary for him to stay here for three years to do that, then there was not another man in this whole House that he could have swapped time with for a little while. Is not that right? You can not get away from that proposition. If there was another man in this House who could have been trusted to stand on watch for a day or a year, then that statement is not the truth. [Applause.] He says that Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania has charge of this "desperate" movement. Mr. CAMPBELL has a right to offer a bill if he wants to; but every man in this House knows that that is merely one of the three or four thousand bills that are introduced here which go to sleep. Every man present to-day knows that if you could take a vote by the most secret ballot possible on such a proposition there would not be 75, there would not be 50 men in this whole House that to-day would vote to increase the salary to $10,000.

When this matter came up in the Congress before this, in the Sixty-fifth Congress, Mr. BLANTON wants the people to understand he was the man who kept it from becoming a law. If he does not want them to understand that, why did he make that statement? But it seems there was another man here who could be trusted for at least 15 minutes. [Laughter.] I refer to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. In the Sixty-fifth Congress, the Congress before this, the matter went out, not on a "timely point of order" made by this one guardian of the Treasury, this keeper of the conscience of the Congress, but it went out on a point of order made by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There have been but two Congresses in the last three years, the Sixty-fifth and the present one. The matter came up again on January 11, 1921, and whose point of order put it out then? The RECORD shows that the point was made by Mr. WOOD of Indiana, who had charge of the bill at the time, on which it was attempted to place this amendment, and he was the man whom the ordinary Member of the House, interested only in results and not in trying to advertise himself, would expect to make the point of order. Mr. WOOD made it the very minute that the amendment was offered. Ah, the gentleman from Texas, after Mr. WOOD had made the point of order, got up and made it also. And why? We used to have an old coon dog—and I mean no invidious comparison—who was no good to trail a coon and who was no good to fight a live one. When you shot a coon out of a tree and he was dead, and when every dog in the neighborhood knew he was dead, then this old coon dog of ours was the fightenest dog in the world. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, those are the only two times in so far as I can discover when the matter has ever been on the floor of this House. At one time it went out on a point of order made by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, and the other time it went out on a point of order made by Mr. WOOD of Indiana. So it seems—thank God for the recruits—that there are three men, two others besides the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who can be trusted for a little while to make the point of order, and it may not be necessary after all for the country papers in the State of Texas to come up at this session of Congress and strengthen and hold up the hands of this Moses or Aaron or whoever that fellow was who led his people out of the wilderness. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, as I said a moment ago, in so far as myself and my delegation are concerned, the men who represent the great State of Texas, if merely the question of their own political considerations had been involved, might well have permitted this to go by, but a different question is presented when a Member of this Congress, over his own signature, puts into circulation such a statement as would justify an editor in saying:

> It is just such things as this that disgust the common people and cause them to lower their estimate of the Government under which they live, which means reduced patriotism, and when patriotism is sufficiently reduced it means bolshevism or some other form of anarchy.

A man from the Congress of the United States who will bring that sort of a charge without justification of fact against a great representative body of his Nation can do more hurt to his Nation than all the soap-box agitators who ever held forth on the street corners of the United States of America. And that in an hour like this—my God, my countrymen, think of it—in an hour like this, when the very foundations of governments and civilizations are breaking about us, and any man who can look into the future can see that the supreme test is yet to come to my country, and every man who knows the situation, knows that this hour these forces of disorganization are now moving in the world, that if we are to save the world from chaos this country must hold when the forces of disorganization that are now in movement strike the far-flung lines of our national strength. [Applause.]

Ah, they say all is fair in politics. My God, all fair in politics in an hour of the world's peril when my Nation stands upon the highest pinnacle ever reached by a nation in the world's history and holds in its hand the hope of the ages! The idea that a man who has been intrusted by the people with the right to come to the National Congress sends the word back to the people of my State that "If you, the country press, do not get busy and save the situation these men here are so lost to every sense of honor and responsibility and every sense of gratitude to a tax-burdened people that I am beating them back as best I can from the Treasury of the United States, but if I do not get help soon I am afraid they are so hungry they will face a roll call [laughter]; but up to this good hour they have been too cowardly to do it, and I, only I, am left." [Laughter.] Ah, but he put this in at the tail end of it, "I am paying for this." Ah, yes; getting more political advertisement in Texas for the cost—I do not know whether he even stamped the letters or not—getting more political advertisement in the State of Texas for just a few stamps than he could get for $5,000, and the country is paying for it, paying for it in the loss of the confidence of the people in the integrity of their Nation, and whenever the masses in this country cease to trust the men who represent them at the seat of the National Government then you have got nothing else to build around; you have got nothing else to hold to; and this man who is doing this, who is he? Is this being done by some anarchist? No. Is it being done by some irresponsible man standing on the street corners saying that the whole Congress of the United States, he himself excepted, is trying to get into the Treasury? No. Is it some irresponsible personage who holds no position of prestige who is saying, "for three years I have stood alone"? No. Who is doing it? It is a man who by the suffrage of the people of the United States sits in the highest legislative assembly in the world, and he says this thing about his own colleagues, men whose integrity he knows, and men whose courage he knows; with not even the excuse of a mistake, not even the excuse of misinformation, with not even the excuse of a lack of knowledge of the record, he makes the statement which he wants the country to understand represents the facts in the case. He is the man who is doing this.

Now, gentlemen, I am a peace-loving sort of a fellow. [Laughter.] I do not like to scrap.

Mr. RAYBURN. How about the Langley bill?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I thank my colleague. I believe he [Mr. BLANTON] does not say so directly, but I gather the impression from the language that he thinks this is a matter that will last over until the next Congress. This Langley bill, a bill introduced by Mr. LANGLEY to appropriate a certain amount of money, I understand, to borrow a certain amount of money—I do not know much about it. I did not pay much attention to it because he did not seem to pay much attention to it. I never heard of anybody in favor of it, and I do not know anything about it. But, as I say, I do not imagine that is the thing that is so urgent. The great, big, vital, dangerous thing now is to beat back this bunch of cowardly, hungry hounds who are trying to get into Uncle Sam's smokehouse. [Laughter.] That is the big job now. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of privilege.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of privilege. What does the Chair rule?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that you can not rise to a question of order in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the speech of the gentleman from Texas——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. SNYDER and Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the time has been allotted and is in control of the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, if the membership of the House want to keep me from giving the facts——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure my colleagues do not want to——

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BLANTON. I want to give you the facts, if you will let me do so.

Mr. VENABLE. Am I recognized, Mr. Chairman? I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the House, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] control the time.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman give me five minutes?

Mr. SLEMP. I have not the time to yield.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the gentleman from Texas proceeding now if I do not lose any of my own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMPBELL] is present. He will bear me out in the fact that when he proposed this amendment to increase the salary to $10,000 I was the first man on my feet making a point of order against it. Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania is present, and he will bear me out that he importuned me personally to absent myself from the room when the vote on this matter should come up.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. I never asked the gentleman seriously to absent himself. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Did you do it at all? Did you ever ask me to absent myself?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. I never asked you to absent yourself from the House.

Mr. BLANTON. You did.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. I say he did, and now he goes back on it. I say this, that the Senate has already placed upon the bill an amendment increasing the salary of the Vice President to $15,000 and the salary of the Speaker to $15,000. Senator SHERMAN's amendment is now pending to increase our salary to $12,000. The bill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMPBELL] is still pending to increase our salary to $10,000. And during the last session the distinguished gentleman from

Kansas [Mr. STRONG] asked me if I would not agree to let this matter come up and go by without a record vote, and I told him then I would not do it.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely untrue.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I told him that I would force him to a record vote every time he brought it up in the House. And I have told every other Member that has brought this matter before the House that whenever this salary question was settled it was going to be on a record vote.

The present trouble is simply this: The newspapers of Texas are reporting that my colleague [Mr. SUMNERS] is to run for the United States Senate next year. [Loud applause, the Members rising.] And without any authority from me, the newspapers, unfortunately for me, it seems, have also said that I might be a candidate against him. [Laughter.] That is the secret of his attack upon me on the floor of the House. He is trying to get me out of the way as a possible candidate in the political field. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. BLANTON. That is the reason he makes the attack upon me, but if I should run against him, I will then meet him at Philippi.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. STRONG].

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I do not need a minute. I simply want to say that the statement attributed to me by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is untrue. [Applause.]

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL].

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the last gentleman who spoke said he expected to meet his senatorial opponent on the battle field of Philippi. I understand that those words were once in the mouth of Brutus, who stabbed his friend, and I presume that the man who said it here will get the same kind of licking, if I understand the people in Texas, that Brutus got. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman used to be from Texas, but, thank God, he is from New York now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] is recognized.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, since all the Texas differences have been settled I hope we will get back now to some business of the House. At the outset I want to say that the bill which has been reported to the House by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] is a good bill, one that, in my judgment, the House can pass without amendment, if you expect to economize, for I believe they have cut it down to the last dollar. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] is a splendid legislator and investigates carefully every item in the bill intrusted to him. If that bill now is subject to criticism at all, it is that it perhaps carries less than many people would believe it ought to carry. But, gentlemen of the committee, one thing is certain, that the fortifications, of all the war activities, can wait the longest.

I did not rise, however, for the purpose of discussing the items in this bill, but I want to call the committee's attention to a matter that I am very much interested in, and in which I know all the country is interested. Every small farmer in America is very deeply interested in this item, which is in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which is now in conference.

If the Republican majority in this House really desire to help the country, this is their opportunity. The United States Senate has done its duty. It is now up to the House, and when the legislative bill comes before this House, as it will in a few days, the House will go on record, and the country will then know where it stands.

I trust, because it is a nonpartisan question, that we may have a perfectly nonpartisan consideration of it. I introduced a bill some time ago to appropriate $100,000,000 out of the Treasury for the purpose of carrying the farm loans that might be executed by the Farm Loan Board. The Senate has seen fit and proper to put the provisions of that bill on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill in the form of an amendment. Now, the opportunity that this House has, irrespective of party, to enact some legislation that will be really beneficial to the country, is to pass that amendment to that bill. [Applause.] It will not, in my judgment, cost the country one penny. It is nothing more nor less than a loan to the distressed agricultural interests of the country.

And may I again appeal to my Republican colleagues, irrespective of whether you live in the city or live in the country—may I not appeal to you for your support of that legislation? Because you get that instantaneous relief from the distressed conditions in which we now find ourselves, because the moment that the agricultural communities are able to pay their land loans, that moment the smaller banks are able to pay their loans to the great centers.

But that is not the chief reason why you need it at this time. The moment you can relieve the distressed farmer of the loan which he now has and defer the payment for a number of years, instantly the bank is relieved, and you are able then to finance the farmer for the next year; and that is the thing that we most need; and if the Congress is looking for some opportunity to really benefit the country's condition, this amendment will do it. You Republicans are in the majority. Will you disappoint the country in this hour of need?

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. TILSON. What I wish beyond most other things is that we may have plenty of food and cheaper food in this country. What will be the effect of this loan? Will it enable larger crops to be put in in the approaching crop year?

Mr. SISSON. Unquestionably.

Mr. TILSON. And that will tend to the greater production of food?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly. Take the great western country, for example. Go and consult with the people in Kansas, in Nebraska, in Texas, in Mississippi, and in the other agricultural regions of the country, and you will find they are distressed, and say that they will be compelled to reduce their acreage unless they can get this relief.

Now, I would not for one moment increase the appropriation unless I realized that you would get it back manyfold. I believe my colleagues on the committee and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will tell you that I have been an economist in the expenditure of public funds, and I believe that every colleague of mine during this Republican Congress, in the various committees on which I have served, will tell you that I have cooperated most heartily with them in bringing out the best bills we possibly could and that I stood by them in their every effort for economy. I have not made it a partisan proposition, nor is this a partisan proposition.

I want to call your attention now to the fact that the conferees on the part of the House have agreed that this item shall come back to the House and that we shall have a vote on it on its merits in the House.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman is discussing a Senate amendment on the legislative bill?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. As I understand it, it provides that the Government shall buy for the next two years $100,000,000 of Federal farm-loan bonds?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is because the matter is now pending in the Supreme Court, I think?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is it not expected that that decision of the Supreme Court will be rendered before the 1st of July, and certainly before the end of two years?

Mr. SISSON. Well, we have been expecting, I will say to my friend from Illinois, that the opinion would be rendered for quite a number of months. They evidently reached a point where the court was divided, or for some reason or other ordered the case reargued. That has been done, and for several months we have been waiting on the decision of the court. It seems inexcusable in the court to so long delay their decision on the matter, which is of so much importance to the country.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Of course, this provision would not be effective until after the 1st of July, I believe?

Mr. SISSON. I do not think it would be unless the item is made immediately available.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That item provides for two fiscal years, and names the years.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman is right about that. It names the two years.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Now, if the Supreme Court holds the provision valid, there is no necessity for this, is there?

Mr. SISSON. In my judgment there is no necessity in that case.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the Supreme Court would hold that this provision of the law is invalid, would it then be necessary or desirable for the Government of the United States to furnish all the money for these loans?

Mr. SISSON. I do not believe that a contract, made prior to the time that the court should act, would be in any wise affected, because the contract between the parties would be binding.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. When we authorized the Government to buy the bonds before, that question was raised. That has already been done. I am sympathetic with the idea if it can be done.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that I have made some investigation and talked to lawyers about it, and in my judgment if the loan is made by the Federal Government—that is, if the bonds are purchased by the Federal Government prior to the date that it is declared constitutional—that would be valid as between the parties.

Now, the very fact that this amendment passes would in my judgment instantly relieve the situation. The Federal Farm Loan Board, with which I have been in communication, favors the enactment of this measure; and, by the way, they prepared the amendment, or it was prepared in their office. I asked them to do that.

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

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes if the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EAGAN] will yield him 5.

Mr. EAGAN. Have I any time remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. No time remains on the gentleman's side.

Mr. SLEMP. How many minutes have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Four minutes and a half.

Mr. SLEMP. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. SISSON. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Now, gentlemen, in my judgment, this amendment ought to be adopted because this is an opportunity for the Congress to demonstrate its friendliness toward the suffering agriculture of the country. This farm-loan law was attacked once, and Congress appropriated $250,000,000 because the matter had just then commenced, and that money was not used because instantly the loan sharks withdrew the suit, and the bonds then were sold in the market.

Now, I am very much interested in this, and I do not believe that the Government of the United States will lose anything by the adoption of this legislation, because the overhead charge is now going on at the expense of the Government. I have introduced a bill that provides for this very legislation, but the Banking and Currency Committee has not acted upon my bill. But that will not be necessary if the House will adopt this amendment. This is the hour in which our farmers all over America have the right to expect Congress to act, and if this House was Democratic I could pledge the country that that amendment would have been the law long ago. Will this Republican House now fail them? If you do, can you expect the farmers to trust you with power again? Gentlemen can not fail to vote for this amendment on the ground of economy, for all the expenses of the office are going on now. Why? Because they must take care of the business that they now have on hand.

I want to present this to the committee to-day so that all the Members of the House may know that when the bill comes back there will be a vote upon that, and so that everybody may have notice of it and investigate the matter and determine how he will vote on a matter of that importance.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GREEN of Iowa). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLEMP. I ask for the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

FORTIFICATIONS AND OTHER WORKS OF DEFENSE.

ENGINEER DEPARTMENT.

For construction of gun and mortar batteries, $300,000, together with not to exceed $300,000 of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1921.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Virginia what is the intention of the department with reference to the fortifications at the entrance of Chesapeake Bay?

Mr. SLEMP. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that they would begin some work on Fort Storey during the coming year, and that that is in accordance with the program worked out by the department.

The Clerk read as follows:

For protection, preservation, and repair of fortifications for which there may be no special appropriation available, and of structures for the submarine-mine defense of the United States and for maintaining channels for access to submarine-mine wharves, $300,000.

Mr. GARD. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question regarding the bill. I notice that on page 4 of the report there is contained an item for coast artillery war instruction, maintenance, which is the third item, but which is not carried here. I was wondering whether that omission had been inadvertent, or whether the committee had desired to leave it out.

Mr. SLEMP. That item is for a little amount of matériel at the Coast Artillery camp at Fortress Monroe.

Mr. GARD. I was wondering why the item appeared on page 4 of the report and did not appear in the bill.

Mr. SLEMP. It appears in the bill at another place and not in the order in which it appears in the report. It appears on page 3 of the bill which we are considering, at the bottom of the page.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNDER THE CHIEF OF COAST ARTILLERY.

For construction of fire-control stations and accessories, including purchase of lands and rights of way, purchase and installation of necessary lines and means of electrical communication, including telephones, dial and other telegraphs, wiring and all special instruments, apparatus, and materials, coast-signal apparatus, subaqueous sound and flash ranging apparatus, including their development, and salaries of electrical experts, engineers, and other necessary employees connected with the use of coast artillery; purchase, manufacture, and test of range finders and other instruments for fire control at the fortifications, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals, $175,000.

Mr. GARD. I move to strike out the last word. In reading the hearings on the bill and the consideration of last year's bill, I note that last year's bill carried a total of $770,000 for this item under the head of Chief of Coast Artillery, with a specified item, including purchase of lands and rights of way, of $48,755. I wish to inquire whether there is in contemplation at this time any additional purchase of lands or rights of way.

Mr. SLEMP. I will say to the gentleman that there is not. No estimate was submitted for that, and none is contained in the bill and none is appropriated for.

Mr. GARD. What is the necessity of retaining the language authorizing it?

Mr. SLEMP. In order that it may be used at some future time when it may be desired. It is simply for the purpose of retaining the phraseology of the bill.

Mr. GARD. But at this time there is no intention of using any of this sum for the purchase of land.

Mr. SLEMP. Absolutely none, and, as a matter of fact, the committee reduced the total for this entire paragraph to $175,000, and the department decreased the amount of its estimate. No money is appropriated for the purchase of land.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For alteration and maintenance of the mobile artillery, including the purchase and manufacture of machinery, tools, and materials necessary for the work and the expenses of the mechanics engaged thereon, $600,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell as soon as possible after the approval of this act, upon such terms and under such conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the best interests of the Government, 2,000 of the tractors owned by the War Department.

Mr. GARD. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. IRELAND. I reserve a point of order on the clause.

Mr. ANDERSON. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. GARD. I reserve a point of order against the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved on the proviso.

Mr. GARD. I reserve a point of order on the proviso for the purpose of asking information of the chairman of the subcommittee regarding what is intended to be done, and that the Committee of the Whole may be more fully advised concerning the number of tractors which the War Department has, and how they are to be distributed. It would seem to me that in the matter of Government-owned automobiles and tractors, of which there are a great number undoubtedly since the war, there should be some definite plan of apportionment and some consideration by a duly authorized committee of the character

of matériel on hand, and that there should be some intelligent apportionment of it, rather than to say in one bill that two automobiles shall be given to one department and one to another department, and that 2,000 tractors shall be given to this, that, or the other. I do not desire to make the point of order for the purpose of embarrassing the operation of that which would be the best economy to the Government, but I am reserving the point of order so that the gentleman may advise me; and I trust that he will follow me in my desire that some permanent arrangement be made for the distribution of this surplus war matériel, if it be surplus now, in the hands of the War Department.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that none of the tractors now on hand by the War Department are in surplus; that there are now on hand in the War Department nearly 7,000 tractors; that of the 7,000 tractors about 1,000 are issued to troops and about 1,000 are used at various utilities at various posts of the Army, making a total of about 2,000. That leaves a balance of between 4,000 and 5,000 tractors.

This item was a difficult one to work out. The appropriation for the maintenance of Field Artillery prior to the war was $45,000 a year. In 1912 it was $45,000; in 1913, $45,000; in 1914, $45,000; in 1915, $45,000; and in 1916, $50,000. Last year for upkeep we gave $2,000,000, and one of the large items in the maintenance of Field Artillery is this tractor item. If full allowance is made for the repairs necessary to keep the various tractors running that are now used by the department, it will take almost $1,000,000, as they estimate that it will require $400 in repairs to keep one tractor going throughout a year, not taking into consideration the general depreciation of the tractor.

It was the desire of the committee to curtail the use of the tractors for the various utilities not absolutely needed in the Field Artillery service. We have a surplus of about 5,000. It was the testimony before the committee that these are a type of tractor that is going out of date; that in four or five years they will be superseded by a better class. These tractors are being held in reserve for an emergency. The War Department prefers to retain all the tractors as a part of their preparedness for future emergency. They claim that we would not have tractors on hand to meet an emergency if we get into another conflict. We do have on hand all that is needed for motorization. The committee thought it was safe in taking the 2,000 away and selling them. The motorization is now arranged for, and, as I say, in four or five years they will have no use for these, and they might be used in agriculture, and so we put this provision in in the interest of economy.

Mr. GARD. Are these tractors a type that would render them useful for agricultural pursuits?

Mr. SLEMP. We are informed that they are, that they will go over miry ground, and that they are well adapted to agriculture.

Mr. GARD. I understand it is the statement of the gentleman that if these 2,000 are taken there will still remain 5,000 on hand.

Mr. SLEMP. Nearly 5,000, after the motorization is taken care of.

Mr. GARD. But, concerning the distribution of these motors, there is no determined policy.

Mr. SLEMP. Not beyond the 1,000. A certain number of regiments of Field Artillery and Seacoast Artillery have been motorized, and that takes up the thousand.

Mr. GARD. That is under the control of the War Department—what I mean is that assuming this is surplus material, which is rather a violent presumption, because the War Department claims that they are not surplus——

Mr. SLEMP. The War Department's attitude is that they are a part of the war reserve and that they have not a sufficient number even now for a full war reserve requirement.

Mr. GARD. It would appear to me, in view of the War Department claiming that they are not sufficient, in view of the fact that the tractors may be used to advantage in other ways, that there should be a determination upon some permanent policy for the distribution of the tractors under the War Department, and if they are really surplus some additional policy of distribution should be made.

Mr. SLEMP. The War Department is not satisfied with these tractors that they have. What they desire is a 2½-ton tractor for the division, an 8-ton tractor for the corps, and a 15-ton tractor for the Army. That is what they are leading up to, and none of these tractors fit that policy.

Mr. GARD. I understand that the War Department is opposed at this time to the distribution of any tractors.

Mr. SLEMP. To be absolutely fair with the gentleman, I must say that this does not meet with the approval of the War Department.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of any particular policy for the distribution of tractors, I think I will make the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I was going to make a point of order, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANTHONY. The committee investigated these tractors, and 5,000 of them are stored in the storehouses that the Army will never use. This type of tractor is going out of date and will not be of any value in a few years. If sold now, they will bring a substantial sum to the United States Treasury, because they can be used on farms. They ought to be turned into money.

Mr. GARD. Why does not the committee go ahead?

Mr. ANTHONY. We are trying to do it here, but we run up against gentlemen of the House who make points of order.

Mr. GARD. I hope the gentleman does not insinuate that I made a foolish point of order. I do not desire to make a point of order and will not make it if the gentleman can convince me that this is an effort to dispose of surplus property unnecessary for the War Department.

Mr. ANTHONY. The War Department, for some reason or other, wants to keep these tractors, as well as much other property. They refuse to declare as surplus hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property that they claim should be kept on hand for the purpose of military preparedness. We know that these tractors will be out of date in two years. We were told by the Ordnance Department officer that that was so, and it seems good business to get rid of them now.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman think from the investigation of the subcommittee on Military Affairs that these 2,000 tractors can be disposed of with advantage in this particular provision?

Mr. ANTHONY. We thought we would set the bill a rolling and provide that these 2,000 should be sold. The committee has no real knowledge what they will bring, but we know that they are of a type useful for agricultural purposes.

Mr. GARD. Has there been any investigation by the committee as to the probable revenue to be derived from the sale of the tractors, and how many will be sold?

Mr. ANTHONY. With 5,000 of them for which the committee could see no real use, we thought we would be safe in ordering 2,000 sold, and we also took into consideration the fact that there are bills pending in the House which provide for a distribution of some of them to the States and other bureaus of the Government for good-road work.

Mr. GARD. Does not the gentleman believe there should be a regularly considered bill showing what would be surplus, and then have them distributed in that way, rather than by piecemeal distribution?

Mr. ANTHONY. The department absolutely refuses to take any action whatever on this material, and we were afraid if we waited for affirmative action by Congress they would simply rust away in the storehouses.

Mr. GARD. There would be 5,000 of them, according to the gentleman's own statement, in that same condition.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Unless there is some definite policy of selling at least 5,000 are going to be rusted and not of any use.

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, no; the Army is using 2,000. There are 7,000 altogether. That leaves 5,000 remaining, out of which we thought 2,000 might be sold, and we assume that if Congress wants to make other distribution of some of them it could safely go ahead and dispose of a thousand or two more.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Are these the character of tractor that can be used for road building and things of that sort?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think they can be used for all traction purposes in the matter of road building and farming.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I had an inquiry from a road-building concern asking whether they could buy tractors—and I think they named the character of them—from the War Department for road-building purposes.

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

Mr. GARD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. IRELAND. I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] if it is not true that the War Department is endeavoring at the present time to motorize all of their field

artillery and also to provide motors for the National Guard under the act of June 4, 1920, but that the allotment now in hand is insufficient to provide for both, even in peace time?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is undoubtedly the intention of some people in the department to motorize all of the artillery, but, in the opinion of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs who have studied it, that would be a very unwise thing to do.

Mr. IRELAND. Is it not also true that these machines in their present state are not applicable, without great repairs and replacements, for anything else than military work?

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, no. We are informed that they are the regular types of tractor, mostly of the caterpillar type, made from a common design.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes; I know that; but my information is entirely to the contrary, and I am sure that the gentleman is misinformed on that point.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] a question. The tractor provision which has just gone out on a point of order was carried in the paragraph appropriating $600,000 for the alteration and maintenance of the mobile artillery, and so forth. Is the maintenance or alteration of these tractors paid out of this appropriation?

Mr. SLEMP. That is what I am informed.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If we should dispose of these tractors, I take it that we might somewhat reduce the appropriation which covers the maintenance.

Mr. SLEMP. That is true.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN of Illinois: Page 5, line 14, strike out "$600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$590,000" and the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell, as soon as possible after the approval of this act, upon such terms and under such conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the best interests of the Government, 2,000 of the tractors owned by the War Department."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, paragraph 2 of Rule XXI provides:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendments thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

My amendment proposes to comply with that provision of the rule. It proposes to reduce the amount of money covered by the bill. It proposes to reduce the appropriation from $600,000 to $590,000, because that reduction can be made if we sell a part of these machines, which are now maintained at an expense to the Government. The amendment is certainly germane to a provision providing for their maintenance.

My amendment simply complies with the rule. It provides for reducing the amount carried by the bill and, as a corollary to that, provides for disposing of property which is to be maintained out of the appropriation carried in the bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, the rule which the gentleman has invoked in a very strained sense, and I say that with the utmost respect, is the application of the so-called Holman rule in respect to a reduction of expenditures. In so far as the reduction of the amount is concerned I concede that the rule is properly invoked, but there is a twofold purpose in the amendment. One purpose is to reduce the amount from $600,000 to $590,000, and that is a completed thing. Apart from that, there follows a proviso in the gentleman's amendment which is entirely separate and distinct from the first part of the amendment, just as much so as is the original proviso separate and distinct from the language contained in lines 11 to 14 on page 5 of the bill.

In other words, it is an effort on the part of the gentleman from Illinois to obtain action upon that which the Chair has previously ruled out of order by reason of its being legislation upon an appropriation bill and new legislation upon an appropriation bill, which has been held to be out of order times without number in the different rulings which have been invoked ever since these appropriation bills have been considered in the House. Therefore I call the attention of the mind of the chairman again to my own idea about it, namely, that there being two particular parts to this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois, the one being good and the other with relation to a proviso, and the proviso being in no way connected with the first part, not being germane even to that which is contained in lines 11 and 14, for the purchase and manufacture of machinery, tools, and materials necessary for the work and the expenses of the mechanics engaged thereon—the language of the proviso is not that there shall be purchased, that there shall be alterations and maintenance, but that there should be sold as soon as possible by the Secretary of War 2,000 of these tractors upon such terms as he may deem advisable—so that to my mind it is not alone not germane to that which has gone before, but it is clearly unassociated with the application of the reduction of $10,000, which is, of course, offered for the purpose of evasion—and the reintroduction of the amendment can be for no other purpose—and to my mind the entire amendment is offered for the purpose of coming in an evasive way under the cloak of legislative parliamentary law and substitute that which the Chair a moment ago has ruled out.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Suppose in the gentleman's amendment after the word "*Provided*" he had inserted the following words, "That for the purpose of reducing the amount carried by this bill for the maintenance of mobile artillery the Secretary of War is directed to sell," and so forth. Would that change the views of the gentleman?

Mr. GARD. It would not change my views a particle. I do not think it would make the least bit of difference.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not think it would myself, but it simply shows just what the purpose, object, and effect the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois would have, namely, to reduce the expenditure in a specific way.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the Chair care to hear further argument in support of the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois, or is the Chair prepared to rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] further.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] said this was an evasion of the rule. Why, this is a compliance with the rule. The gentleman invokes a technical rule of the House which prohibits legislation upon an appropriation bill. That rule was applicable to the provision which was brought into the House in the bill, but the very rule which the gentleman invokes provides that legislation shall be in order when accompanied by a reduction of the amount of money covered by the bill. That is an absolute compliance with the rule. The rule, of course, is technical. I have complied with the technical provisions of the rule and with the spirit of the rule. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] stated that this provision of the bill carried an item of appropriation for the alteration and maintenance of those tractors, so that any provision relating to those tractors is germane to the provisions of the bill. Now, the amendment which I have offered proposes to reduce the amount of the bill, and thereby be able to dispose of some of the tractors. Of course, it is legislation, but it is legislation authorized by the language of the rule, and I think clearly authorized by the decisions. Shortly after this rule was adopted in the Democratic House 10 years ago on the Post Office appropriation bill I offered an amendment making a slight reduction in the amount in one item of the bill and providing that mail stations and post offices should not be opened on Sundays for the delivery of mail. A point of order was made. I read the rule. I had complied with the rule, and the two cases are identical and are on all fours. The point of order was overruled in that case, and it has been the law ever since, because it was enacted into law. Of course, offered without the provision made by the rule it would have been subject to a point of order; offered under the terms of the rule it was not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Legislation to be in order under the Holman rule must be directly instrumental in a reduction of expenditures. This identical question was raised on an appropriation bill. On January 25 of this year, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] in the chair,

an amendment was offered and sustained making a reduction, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON to the original Anderson amendment: Strike out "$208,500" and insert "$150,000," and add the following: "*Provided*, That at any time during the fiscal year 1922 or thereafter, when the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine that the interests of the Government will be subserved thereby, he is hereby authorized to appraise the buildings, machinery, marine equipment, kelp harvesters, boats, leasehold or contract rights, and all other property of whatever nature or kind appertaining to the experimental kelp potash plant of the Department of Agriculture situated at Summerland, Calif., and to sell the same at public or private sale"—

And so forth.

It appears to the Chair that the amendment just read raises identically the same question involved in this amendment, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to follow the proviso just offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANDERSON to the amendment offered by Mr. MANN of Illinois: At the end of the Mann amendment insert: "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to transfer and deliver to the Secretary of Agriculture for distribution among the highway departments of the several States for use on roads constructed in whole or in part by Federal aid 1,250 tractors owned by the War Department."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that that is not in order; that is legislation and does not come within the rule.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thought the Chair had just held that the paragraph to which this is an amendment is legislation, but notwithstanding the fact it is legislation that it is in order on this bill.

Now, it certainly is in order to amend that provision by a germane amendment, and all that I am offering is a germane legislative amendment to a legislative provision.

The CHAIRMAN. This amendment, it occurs to the Chair, is clearly legislation. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was an amendment which did in fact reduce the expenditures and came within the Holman rule. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GARD. Will the Chair hear me a moment on that, simply discussing the point of order, because if this is to be expending I am emphatically in favor of the proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON]? The gentleman from Illinois said the reason his amendment was in order was because it reduced the expenses, because in selling this number of tractors the expense of maintenance was decreased thereby, giving the authority for a decrease of $10,000 in the appropriation for maintenance, and so forth. Now, this goes one step further and provides for the additional separation from the department of these tractors. On the theory of the gentleman from Illinois, it can decrease the expenditure, and therefore, under the same ruling, it would seem to me, would be in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reoffer the amendment, and in addition I move to strike from the amendment "$590-000" and insert "$580,000," with the proviso to follow.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANDERSON to the amendment offered by Mr. MANN of Illinois: Strike out "$590,000" in the Mann amendment and insert in lieu thereof "$580,000" and add the following:

"*Provided further*, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to transfer and deliver to the Secretary of Agriculture for distribution among the highway departments of the several States, for use on roads constructed in whole or in part by Federal aid, 1,250 tractors owned by the War Department."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not germane.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I submit if it is a reduction of expenditures to dispose of 2,000 tractors, it is a greater reduction of expenditure to dispose of a greater number.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as amended by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase, manufacture, and test of ammunition, subcaliber guns, and other accessories for mountain, field, and siege artillery practice, including the machinery necessary for their manufacture, $145,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read a telegram addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 14.*

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLETT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Admission of vermin-infested persons to this port is disgraceful. One of two things must be done. Either an embargo must be placed upon immigration from infected ports or immediate facilities must be furnished to clean up the aliens before they are permitted to land. Immigration authorities should return to steamship companies any persons found infested with vermin. New York City Health Department can not and will not permit admission to this city of vermin carriers.

ROYAL S. COPELAND, M. D.,
Commissioner of Health.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That telegram to the Speaker was referred to the House Committee on Immigration and a telegram was sent by the chairman of that committee to Commissioner of Health Copeland in New York asking for further information, which brought the following reply, which I will ask the Clerk to report.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 17, 1921.*

ALBERT JOHNSON,
Chairman Committee on Immigration,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

This morning we stopped 125 vermin-infested persons who had been passed by port of Boston. Philadelphia port lacks equipment. Ten per cent of persons who are admitted to this port through Ellis Island are vermin covered. Federal quarantine at all eastern points is disgracefully ineffective.

ROYAL S. COPELAND, M. D.,
Commissioner.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have asked permission to address the House to call attention to these two telegrams, and to say that I think it is unfair for the commissioner of health for New York City, or for the head of the Immigration Service at Ellis Island at this late day to undertake to "pass the buck" to the United States Public Health Service. As far back as the first week of this session of Congress, in December, typhus-afflicted persons were arriving in the United States. That was known to the authorities at Ellis Island and to the public health authorities, and on the floor of this House. December 13 last I called the attention of the Members of the House to the arrival of the steamship *Adriatic* with a case of typhus from Cherbourg. We were voting on the immigration suspension measure that day, and reports from our consular agents abroad were presented by your Committee on Immigration to show that we might soon expect just what is now happening.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the Public Health Service on January 19, this year, called the attention of the State Department to the necessity of taking advantage of the quarantine laws which have been in existence many years in an effort to stop the sending to the United States from certain ports in Europe of not only actually diseased but dangerously dirty and lice-infected immigrants. The State Department took notice of that complaint, which was dated January 19, and on February 1 issued orders to consular officers at certain ports forbidding the departure of ships without clean health manifests. That order, to prevent the coming of immigrants from diseased places in Italy, Poland, and elsewhere in central Europe, caused protests to come from New York. Business must not be interfered with. Immigration must not stop. To even check immigration is cruel, inhuman. Those were the cries. New York knew of the danger. The under employees at Ellis Island knew. The United States health officer at Ellis Island knew. He sent in protest after protest to the Surgeon General. Let us look at the list of arrival of disease-bringing ships for the past few months at the port of New York for the six months beginning August 1 last and for a few days in February:

Ships bringing one or more cases of typhus.

Date of arrival.	Name of vessel.	Sailed from.
Aug. 1	La Savoie	Havre.
Aug. 12	Niagara	Bordeaux.
Oct. 5	Noordorn	Rotterdam.
Nov. 14	New Rochelle	Havre.
Dec. 11	Adriatic	Cherbourg.
Feb. 1-3-9	Presidente Wilson	Trieste.
Feb. 10	San Giusto	Do.

Ships bringing one or more cases of smallpox.

Date of arrival.	Name of vessel.	Sailed from.
Sept. 28	Mobile	Liverpool.
Oct. 11	Roma	Lisbon.
Oct. 12	Nieue Amsterdam	Rotterdam.
Dec. 15	Ferdinand Palasciano	Naples.
Dec. 22	Duca d'Acosta	Do.
Jan. 5	Braga	Do.
Jan. 22	Patria	Do.
Feb. 9	Providence	Do.

You will note the *Presidente Wilson* is reported as attempting to dock on three different dates—February 1, 3, and 9. That is because she brought 19 typhus cases—4 in cabins and 15 in steerage. The four in the cabins were landed, as were 400 other cabin passengers. Then the cases were discovered in the city of New York, and New York City and State health officials began to get busy. They issued charges and complaints as if the United States Public Health Service was to blame. Not so, gentlemen. In my opinion, New York greed and the desire for the immigration traffic, which is a traffic for gain just as was the slave traffic in the early days of this Nation, is to blame primarily.

But, thoroughly alarmed, the New York authorities threatened to stop the immigrant ships from docking in their port. That threat was followed by the steamship people at once transferring their places of debarkation of many of their ships to Boston, Providence, New London, Philadelphia, and elsewhere, and that caused a protest in New York. That city seems to want the business, my friends; it wants the ships to come in and wants the immigrants; but when a disease happens they want to unload the whole thing on the United States and pass the buck and pass the expenses on to the United States, and complain in the newspapers that the United States is trying to make New York pay the bill. It is the old cry that we have heard for many years when the New York City officials complain that their hospitals have become filled with the insane, the demented, and the mentally weak; and they come to Congress and appeal to us and ask that we, speaking for the whole people, have the Treasury pay the bill.

You have that situation here.

We are paying New York $1,500,000 for their quarantine station at Hoffman Island. We ordered that a year ago. The Department of Justice is still wrestling with the title, but I presume the matter will be closed with a rush now. We will pay the million and a half. We will run the quarantine. The steamship companies are supposed to pay the bills, but who thinks they will? If I am not mistaken, each ship I have named is liable to a fine of $5,000, and probably more, for each additional case per ship. Let us try to collect some of it. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I secured permission this morning to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some statements taken in the hearings of the investigation committee. This medical situation was known long before it became public. I have a report from Dr. Kerr, health officer at Ellis Island, which I will put in the RECORD. It is his report as a result of a trip to central Europe, from which he returned in January, where he made a survey of the health conditions and predicted what was bound to happen if the United States left its bars down. That report was offered to another committee in another branch and refused unless it could be condensed into a few paragraphs, which could not be done. I ask Members to read it.

Also, I call attention to the fact that in the six months ending December 31 at the Port of New York alone over 10,000 persons were certified by our health authorities as being physically diseased or disqualified from earning a living, and out of that number over 9,000 were admitted to the United States. Is it any wonder that these Public Health Service officials become tired and complain, and feel that their task is almost hopeless? [Applause.]

The statement of Dr. J. W. Kerr follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, January 25, 1921.

The SURGEON GENERAL UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with your request, I have the honor to transmit herewith two advance copies of my report on the medical aspect of the immigration problem in Europe. On account of the haste in their preparation, they are subject to criticisms and additions.

On returning to New York the original copy of this report, together with a description of my itinerary while in Europe, will be submitted.

Respectfully,

J. W. KERR, *Surgeon.*

REPORT ON MEDICAL ASPECTS OF THE PRESENT IMMIGRATION SITUATION BASED ON EXPERIENCES AT ELLIS ISLAND, N. Y., AND OBSERVATIONS IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

JANUARY 18, 1921.

In the absence of additional legislative restrictions, an increased immigration from European countries was to be expected following the war. By reason of the disturbed international relations from 1914 to 1918 there had been a damming back of the alien tide from all countries, which in 1914 had reached 1,218,480, to 110,618 in 1918.

The continuance of the passport control system and the lack of available ships operated further to keep down any considerable increase until 1920. Since then it has been so rapid as to attain in the last few months almost prewar figures. This is shown in the following table:

Number arrived in 1920.

January	25,000
February	20,000
March	30,000
April	40,000
May	45,000
June	45,000
July	55,000
August	55,000
September	70,000
October	70,000
November	60,000
December	70,000

VARIATIONS IN ORIGIN OF EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION.

On account of disturbed social and economic conditions throughout the world due to the war, a modification of the origin of immigration as compared with prewar years was also thought probable.

As shown by the reports of the Congressional Immigration Commission (Report of the Immigration Commission No. 4, 1910: S. Doc. —), a vast change had already occurred between 1882 and 1907. Whereas during the former year 86.9 per cent of the total immigration from Europe had come from the northern and western countries and only 13.1 per cent from the southern and eastern countries, in the latter year 19 per cent came from northern and western and 81 per cent from southern and eastern countries. (The northern and western countries comprise Belgium, Denmark, France (including Corsica), German Empire, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales), and United Kingdom not specified. The southern and eastern countries comprise Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro, Greece, Italy (including Sicily and Sardinia), Poland, Portugal (including Cape Verde and Azores Islands), Rumania, Russian Empire (including Finland), Spain, and Turkey. In 1914 this proportion had further increased, about 15.3 per cent of the total immigration from Europe having come from the northern and western countries and about 84.7 per cent from the southern and eastern countries (including Turkey in Asia).

Since a definite resumption of immigration did not begin until the latter half of the fiscal year 1920, it would be preferable to take the total figures for the calendar year 1920 for comparison in order to show by races the present trend of immigration from Europe. However, the statistics from July 1 to December 31, 1920, are not available.

It became necessary, therefore, to take the statistics for the fiscal year 1920 for such comparison as is possible. From July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, the total number from the above-mentioned European countries was 246,295, or 34.7 per cent, from northern and western countries and 65.3 per cent from southern and eastern countries.

The following table presents, by races or peoples, this immigration from Europe during the fiscal year 1920, as compared with the fiscal year 1914:

Race or peoples.	Fiscal year 1914.		Fiscal year 1920.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Bohemian and Moravian (Czecho)	9,928	0.85	276	0.11
Bulgarian, Servian, Montenegrin	15,084	1.3	808	.32
Croatian and Slovenian	37,284	3.2	415	.16
Dalmatian, Bosnian, Herzegovinian	5,149	.44	60	.02
Dutch and Flemish	12,566	1.1	11,144	4.5
English	51,746	4.4	25,044	10.2
Finnish	12,805	1.2	744	.3
French	18,166	1.6	7,878	3.2
German	79,871	6.84	4,131	1.7
Greek	45,881	3.99	13,168	5.3
Hebrew	138,051	11.8	9,564	3.8
Irish	33,898	2.95	10,963	4.5
Italian	296,414	25.4	95,183	38.6
Lithuanian	21,584	1.9	53	021
Magyar	44,538	3.8	109	.044
Polish	122,657	10.5	1,151	.47
Portuguese	9,647	.8	14,558	5.9
Rumanian	24,070	2.1	594	.24
Russian	44,957	3.9	566	.23
Ruthenian	36,727	3.1	18	.007
Scandinavian	36,053	3.1	13,650	5.5
Scotch	18,997	1.6	9,094	3.6
Slovak	25,819	2.2	3,735	1.5
Spanish	11,064	.9	19,035	7.7
Syrian	9,023	.7	164	.06
Turkish	2,693	.23	76	.03
Welsh	2,693	.22	908	.39
Other peoples	2,558	.....	3,206	1.3
Total	1,167,230	.....	246,295	.....

As will be seen, there is a striking disproportion in the percentage of arrivals of certain peoples during the last fiscal year as compared with the fiscal year 1914, although the figures indicate that, on the whole, the percentage of immigration from northern and western countries has been somewhat larger during the past year than before the war. This is easily accounted for by the greater facility of persons from northern and western Europe to secure transportation.

During the six months ended December 31, 1920, there has been an undoubted greater increase in the number of immigrants coming from eastern and southern Europe, so great in fact that these aliens are believed to form the bulk of the steerage passengers on practically all ships arriving from European ports, except Scandinavian and Spanish.

Numerous factors are undoubtedly responsible for this exodus, including economical and social conditions in the countries of eastern and southern Europe from which immigrants come as well as the reestablishment of transportation facilities by land and sea between those countries and United States ports.

Furthermore, public health conditions were probably a factor. From the standpoint of the medical examination of immigrants at home ports, therefore, it is important to know the geographic distribution of endemic diseases as well as the occurrence of epidemics of the quarantinable diseases in foreign countries from which these aliens come.

It is also desirable to have knowledge of the potential emigration from these countries, as arrivals in large numbers are bound to have a bearing on the possibility of the introduction of quarantinable diseases as well as to exercise an important influence eventually on the sanitary habits and physical development of our people. At present one guess is as good as another as to prospective immigration, provided it is large enough. There is abundant evidence that great numbers desire to leave Europe, and as soon as conditions in Russia and countries to the south permit these numbers will be augmented many times. This has importance from the standpoints of sanitation and race development which it would be difficult to overemphasize.

PREVALENCE OF CERTIFIABLE DISABILITIES AMONG IMMIGRANTS AND THE PEOPLES FROM WHOM THEY COME.

To what extent the diseases coming within the meaning of the immigration law have been increased or extended in Europe in consequence of the war it would be difficult to estimate. The subject has been constantly borne in mind in connection with medical inspection of aliens at Ellis Island since the war. Opportunity has recently been had also to make personal inquiries in certain countries and ports abroad which were visited in company with the Commissioner General of Immigration between November 17, 1920, and January 5, 1921, the object being "to devise additional measures whereby the immigration laws and regulations may be given greater force and work less of a hardship on prospective emigrants."

Since the resumption of active immigration in March, 1920, special effort has been made to detect cases of malnutrition, war neuroses, tuberculosis, and venereal diseases, since these afflictions have been reported to have been unduly prevalent among either the military or the civil population of countries of war. The following table presents by months the total passengers arriving and the number of each class of disease mentioned:

Month.	Alien passengers.	Nervous and mental diseases.[1]	Dangerous contagious diseases.[2]	Tuberculosis.	Loathsome contagious diseases, including venereal.[3]
1920.					
January	25,057	18	3	2	9
February	22,118	11	8	.....	8
March	29,098	14	11	9	25
April	40,135	5	9	2	13
May	47,750	4	8	3	23
June	49,786	10	13	4	43
July	56,105	13	28	6	61
August	57,874	9	32	5	52
September	70,052	14	27	5	69
October	74,665	22	29	1	84
November	62,451	10	23	4	37
December	67,310	34	49	3	45
Total	602,401	164	240	44	469

[1] The nervous and mental diseases comprised insanity, idiocy, imbecility, feeble-mindedness, epilepsy, constitutional psychopathic inferiority, and organic diseases of the central nervous system.

[2] The dangerous contagious diseases comprised trachoma.

[3] The loathsome contagious diseases comprised favus, leprosy, ringworm, yaws, and venereal diseases, including gonorrhea, chancroid, and syphilis.

NOTE.—In addition to the above, 10,002 persons were certified for disabilities affecting ability to earn a living.

While the numbers detected during the calendar year 1920 would not indicate any marked prevalence of these diseases abroad, it should be remembered that prospective passengers in Europe became aware of the provisions of the immigration law as relates to physical and mental disability, by reason of the medical examinations to which they are subjected at ports of embarkation. Furthermore, steamship companies are liable to penalties for bringing such cases, and therefore take active measures to exclude them, the bulk of all immigrants being subjected to repeated examinations by company physicians. Furthermore, arriving passengers have not until recently presented the appearance of belonging to the so-called refugee class. Many of them have been repatriated soldiers returning under the provision of the congressional resolution of 1918; others coming from Spain have been mostly males and represent practically a new immigration. It is the opinion of the medical examiners, nevertheless, that recently the physical type of aliens has not been up to the normal of prewar days. Many of them present evidence of the stresses to which they have been exposed by reason of the war and the hardships of prolonged travel.

In the case of children arriving in recent months it is the consensus of opinion that many of them are undernourished. While the ages as given on the manifests are practically unreliable, many of these children are undoubtedly undersized for their ages and present evidences of rickets and malnutrition, some of them markedly so.

In order to form an opinion of the influence of war on the health of populations special efforts were made to secure mortality statistics. Their accuracy, however, was vitiated by the prevailing conditions, and in the countries which undoubtedly suffered most these conditions operated practically to prevent the recording of any reliable records.

The following table furnished by the Commission for the Prevention of Tuberculosis in France (International Health Board) is highly significant. Acknowledgment is due and here made for these and other data received from this source.

General death rates in various European cities from 1906 to 1919.

[Rates per 1,000 population.]

Years.	London.[1]	Paris.[2]	Brussels.[3]	Vienna.[4]	Prague.[5]	Amsterdam.
1906	[6]15.7	17.6	.....	.....	.....	13.54
1907		18.6	.....	.....	.....	13.33
1908		17.7	.....	.....	.....	13.33
1909		17.7	.....	.....	.....	12.96
1910	13.7	16.8	13.6	.....	.....	11.93
1911	15.2	17.2	13.9	16.6	.....	12.20
1912	13.8	16.5	13.5	15.8	.....	11.00
1913	14.3	15.7	12.2	15.9	14.9	11.11
1914	14.6	15.8	14.9	16.4	14.3	11.29
1915	16.8	15.1	13.3	18.2	15.1	11.23
1916	14.7	15.2	14.7	18.5	15.2	11.88
1917	15.7	15.5	18.3	22.7	17.7	12.16
1918	19.2	17.5	21.0	25.4	18.6	15.55
1919	13.4	16.0	13.1	20.2	.....	12.37

[1] From Registrar General of England and Wales (annual reports).

[2] From Annuaire Statistique de la Ville de Paris.

[3] Years 1910–1913 from Mortality Statistics, U. S. Census Bureau, years 1911, 1914, 1914–1919 from report of Dr. Rene Sand, "Industrial Medical Reconstruction in Belgium."

[4] From chart issued by central sanitary office, city of Vienna, February, 1920. Rates doubtless higher because Austrian population probably flocked to city.

[5] From a report of Prof. S. M. Gunn on Czechoslovakia.

[6] Average 1901–1910.

In all the cities mentioned there were increased death rates, especially during the last two years of the war. In all probability much of the increase in 1918 was due to the pandemic of influenza, but there is evidence that other factors were also present.

General death rates compiled from various sources by the above-mentioned commission indicate an irregular increase in certain European countries, including Belgium, France, Holland, England and Wales, Prussia, and Italy from 1914 to 1918, inclusive, as compared with the previous two years. In 1919, the above records, available data from Belgium, Holland, and England and Wales indicate a marked downward trend. This will be referred to later.

TUBERCULOSIS.

Certain of the data relating to tuberculosis are especially significant. The following death rates for tuberculosis are abstracted from a table compiled from various sources by the Commission for the Prevention of Tuberculosis in France (International Health Board). Through lack of time and opportunity not all the sources cited by the commission have been consulted by me.

Tuberculosis death rates in European countries, 1910–1919 (incomplete).

[Rates per 100,000 population.]

Year.	France.	Belgium.	Holland.	England and Wales.	Prussia.
1910	215	97	155.8	143.4	151
1911	217	101	157.7	146.7	151
1912	211	93	154	137.2	145
1913	269	.....	142	135.2	136.5
1914	271	.....	139.9	136	138.7
1915	281	.....	144	151.4	142
1916	269	.....	167.2	152.9	156.4
1917	266	.....	181.8	162.4	205.7
1918	278	.....	202.5	169.4	240
1919	.....	.....	174.1	.....	.....

Year.	Switzerland, all forms.	Alsace-Lorraine.	Bohemia.	Moravia.
1910	226	203	284	.....
1911	216	194	284	351
1912	202	180	286	349
1913	199	176	263	324
1914	193	174	262	319
1915	187	172	290	353
1916	188	176	322	378
1917	202	208	314	368
1918	196	234	.....	410,191
1919	.....	.....	.....	.....

During the occupation of Belgium no reliable statistics were available for that country as a whole. Dr. M. Velghe, president of the permanent committee of the International Office of Public Hygiene and the Director General of Public Health of Bulgium, reported to the permanent committee that the deaths from tuberculosis in 1918 in greater Brussels (an area for which statistics are available) increased 118 per cent over 1913. This great increase, which prevailed to a more or less degree in respect to other diseases, is attributed by him to reduced resistance of the organism on account of the hardships of war. In a subsequent report to the permanent committee he noted a marked decrease in 1919.

In England and Wales (annual report of the chief medical officer, 1919–20) the deaths from tuberculosis in 1919 also showed a remarkable decline over the previous year.

This latter report further states that "the rise in tuberculosis mortality between 1914 and 1918 was due to war conditions." The increase was greatest among females from 15 to 45 years, being associated with more extensive employment in industrial occupations under

conditions of an exceptional strain and often associated with unsatisfactory housing conditions.

As showing the falling death rates years before the war and the marked rise during the war in five countries of Europe, the following chart and table abstracted from data from the commission for the prevention of tuberculosis in France (International Health Board) are presented. By reason of their method of collection, statistics from France during the same period are said to be not comparable:

Crude death rates—Tuberculosis, all forms.

[Rates per 100,000 population.]

Years.	England and Wales.		Holland.		Prussia.		Spain.		Alsace-Lorraine.	
	Rate.	Per cent of 1913 rate.	Rate.	Per cent of 1913 rate.	Rate.	Per cent of 1913 rate.	Rate.	Per cent of 1913 rate.	Rate.	Per cent of 1913 rate.
1906	165.4	122	177.9	125	171	125	.....	.....	.....	.....
1907	161.7	119.5	172.7	121.5	170	125	.....	.....	.....	.....
1908	159.5	118	161.7	114	163	119	.....	.....	.....	.....
1909	153.7	113.5	161.3	113.5	155	114	.....	.....	.....	.....
1910	143.4	106	155.8	109	151	111	.....	.....	.....	.....
1911	146.7	108.5	157.7	111	151	111	157	103	.....	.....
1912	137.2	101.5	154	108	145	106	144	94	180	102.3
1913	135.2	100	142	100	136.5	100	153	100	176	100
1914	136	100	139.9	98.5	138.7	101.5	154	101	174	98.9
1915	151.4	112	144	101	142	104	159	104	172	97.7
1916	152.9	113	167.2	118	155.4	114.5	164	107	176	100
1917	162.4	120	181.8	128	205.7	150	171	112	208	118.2
1918	169.4	125	202.5	142.5	238.4	175	202	132	234	133

Compiled by T. J. Duffield, statistician, commission for prevention of tuberculosis in France:

For England and Wales, from the Report of Registrar General, year 1917, page 20, and advance copy of 1918 report.

For Holland, from "De toeneming der tuberculosesterfte," C. Dekka in "Tuberculose," September, 1919, page 130 (Dutch).

For Prussia, 1906–1912, from Report Registrar General of England and Wales, 1915, page 79, Report of Minister of Interior to President of Rhine Province, December 29, 1918, and Weekly Bulletin, chief surgeon's office, American Expeditionary Forces, No. 48, March 10, 1919.

For Spain, from "Annario Estadistico de Espana, 1918."

The figures below, taken from a table compiled by the Commission for the Prevention of Tuberculosis in France, are presented to show the influence of war on tuberculosis death rates in various European cities:

Tuberculosis death rates in various European cities, years 1912 to 1919.

[Rates per 100,000 population.]

Years.	London.[1]	Brussels.[2]	Vienna.[3]	Prague.[4]	Amsterdam.[5]
1912	171	.....	315	.....	157
1913	165	169	317	472	154
1914	177	177	306	557	180
1915	199	179	385	637	152
1916	189	223	475	682	189
1917	211	350	578	744	203
1918	214	359	568	733	231
1919	142	196	522	.....	195

[1] From registrar general of England and Wales (annual report).

[2] From report of Dr. René Sand, Industrial Medical Reconstruction in Belgium.

[3] Vienna rates compiled by T. J. Duffield, based on census and information from chart furnished by the central sanitary offices of the city of Vienna. "Rates are doubtlessly high, because population of Austria probably flocked to city."

[4] From report of Prof. S. M. Gunn (to commission), including so-called "nonresidents."

[5] Official.

The above mortality figures, although necessarily accepted with reservation, certainly imply a greatly increased morbidity as well. Furthermore, the unanimous opinions of physicians and sanitarians consulted was that tuberculosis had increased in all European countries affected by the war.

According to the director general of public health of Italy, tuberculosis mortality was much increased in that country during the war on account of the return of the prisoners of war and the poor food and excessive work of portions of the civil population.

In some countries, including Poland, Serbia, and Russia, which suffered the greatest hardships, the disease was believed to be highly prevalent. Any other conclusion seems unavoidable, since tuberculosis is almost invariably associated with underfeeding, overcrowding, and prolonged physical strain.

While the reports from Belgium and England and Wales for 1919 indicate that the disappearance of war conditions will quickly react favorably on tuberculosis death rates, personal observations in some of the countries most affected confirm the belief that such results can not soon be expected therein.

From a public-health standpoint war conditions in Europe have imposed on large populations a forced demonstration of the influence of underfeeding on the incidence of tuberculosis. Until food supplies become adequate, evidence will accumulate as to their value in the reduction of this disease.

DISEASES OF CHILDREN.

The hardships of war fell heaviest on children of invaded countries unless they have been previously removed. Whenever practicable, therefore, inquiries were made as to the morbidity and the mortality among this class of the population. Opinions were obtained from health officials, Red Cross workers, and others that in Poland and Austria child morbidity was greatly increased and hygienic conditions among the poor were in many areas deplorable. No reliable statistics were obtained in confirmation of these statements, but there is visible evidence there of destitution and unemployment.

As showing the effects of the war on the future of the race, the following is a free translation of a report by Dr. Velghe, president of the permanent committee of the International Office Public Hygiene and director general of public health of Belgium, from a communication of Dr. De Moor, professor of the University of Brussels, to the Academy of Medicine, based on observations by him in Belgium:

"During the years of the war (1914–1918) the growth of children was progressively retarded. The weight of children of all ages was diminished. And at the end of the four years (1914–1918) the defect was greater than the normal development of two-thirds of a year. The average height of children of all ages was reduced in quantity equal to the normal growth during a third of a year.

"The total loss of development among boys and girls from 1914 to 1918 for all ages between 7 and 14 years corresponded approximately to one year in weight and in height to one-half year among boys and one-seventh year among girls.

"These phenomena were particularly evident among both the male and female population of schools in the quarters of the poor. The resistance was greater among boys than girls.

"In the populous schools the losses were manifest in 1915 and 1916 and much more so in 1917 and 1918. In the communal schools, whose population suffered less, the lessened development was not manifest in reality until 1917, after which time it was very rapid, and by July, 1918, the difference between the two groups had practically disappeared.

"The war was thus responsible for a serious retardation of growth of children. Notwithstanding all the efforts made to maintain intact the health of the young (and the result obtained was very important), their growth has been progressively retarded; the children from 6 to 14 years were actually very inferior to what they should have been in view of their birth and the state of their development in 1914.

"What are the remote consequences of this situation? It is difficult to say positively at this time.

"Finally, without exaggerating the bearing of the conclusions deduced from this study, we are able to say:

"During the years of the war, slowly during the first two, much more rapidly during the last two, the development of children was retarded and modified. Our young generations are thus retarded by the action of a cause that was long operative on their organisms in process of evolution. In what measure this organic depression will disappear and the children be able to recover this time lost we are ignorant.

"What will be the future generations in view of the actual conditions of the children of to-day? We are unable to say."

As stated above, some children arriving at Ellis Island from war countries have shown evidence of undernourishment, but their condition on arrival as bearing on the situation abroad is of little purport because of the small numbers involved. Some children undernourished from one cause or another arrive in ordinary times; besides the immigrants arriving until recently have certainly not belonged to the classes in Europe lowest in the economic and hygienic scale. Some of those coming recently from devastated areas, however, have shown evidence of malnutrition, including rickets.

That in many places in middle and southern Europe there is an inadequate supply of proper food for children is certain. Furthermore, there is visible evidence of undernourishment of children in these localities, a statement affirmed by many. In traveling through devastated countries, as Poland, for instance, one is impressed with the practical absence of cows or other animals to supply milk and other nitrogenous food. The lack of food suitable to their years must react unfavorably on the health and development of children, as in many instances also does the lack of warm, comfortably ventilated homes. The cold and dampness of public buildings, trains, and dwellings are hourly impressed on the traveler or sojourner throughout continental Europe.

VENEREAL DISEASES.

The general opinion prevails that venereal diseases were greatly increased during and after the war. In the absence of notification of such diseases, it is impracticable to secure definite figures. Dr. M. Velghe, president of the permanent committee of the International Office of Public Hygiene, reporting to the permanent committee, stated that this increase in Belgium had reached "frightful proportions."

As acutely manifested, these diseases are not common among alien steerage passengers arriving at Ellis Island. It is the practice to examine many aliens undressed, and it is the general observation that such diseases, at least in the active stages, are not prominent among the steerage classes. This may be due to the restrictive provisions of the law, which are well known, and to medical examinations before embarkations, but the habits and the customs of the peasants (from whom steerage immigrants mostly come) must also be important factors.

Among sailors, on the other hand, venereal diseases are notoriously common, and certain foreign ports have established bad reputations as centers of infection for this class of the population. In such ports the organized work of philanthropic agencies, such as the Young Men's Christian Association, should tend to the prevention of these diseases among sailors. One such agency in Havre was found to be doing highly practical work to this end.

COMMUNICABLE DISEASES.

By reason of prolonged military operations, the forced migration of vast numbers of the civil population, and the adverse sanitary conditions to which they have been exposed, communicable diseases have increased. Even on arrival at Ellis Island scabies and other skin infections are now very common among immigrants, and cases of smallpox and typhus fever have from time to time reached the quarantine station at Staten Island. In some sections of middle and southern Europe typhoid and paratyphoid are said to be very prevalent, and typhus fever is widespread over an extensive area east of Germany, Switzerland, and Italy.

Cases of the latter disease were being reported throughout Poland and numerous places in Jugo-Slavia.

However, aside from emphasizing the undesirability of immigrants from localities so squalid and insanitary as to harbor typhus fever and its carriers, the louse, the disease has little practical bearing in relation to the immigration law.

Necessary measures against it are properly taken under the quarantine law. These measures are already well known to the bureau, which receives regularly from the Consular Service and offices of the United States Public Health Service abroad further reports of the progress of the disease.

As long as conditions remain unsettled in central and southern Europe typhus will continue to be a menace to western Europe, and

cholera may become so, but the likelihood of any extensive prevalence will depend on the economic and sanitary status of the people among whom the disease is introduced. Transportation companies should be prohibited from embarking lousy immigrants or at least landing them in the United States.

On the whole, it may be concluded that in consequence of the war many European countries have had their birth rate greatly reduced. Many lives have been sacrificed, the health of multitudes has been undermined temporarily at least, and enormous public debts have been incurred which future generations will be called upon to pay. It is the purpose of vast numbers by emigrating, if possible, to escape the effects of these conditions. The extent of the reduction of vitality and its effects on the future race can not be accurately estimated.

NERVOUS AFFECTIONS.

Opinions in respect to the occurrence of war neuroses among civil populations were varied. In some countries there was a decrease in the number of admissions to the insane institutions, and in certain instances the insane were evacuated and the institutions used for war purposes. In England a great increase of tuberculosis among this class is recorded for 1918.

The United States immigration law of February 5, 1917, by reason of its provisions to debar illiterates, has operated to reduce greatly the number of feeble-minded arriving at Ellis Island.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS AT PLACES OF ORIGIN.

Intending emigrants are required by transportation companies and in some countries by their Governments to be medically examined before leaving their respective localities. On the part of the steamship companies this is done in self-defense.

In Jugoslavia, for instance, the prospective passenger must have a medical certificate before applying to his Government for a passport. In addition the steamship companies employ local doctors to examine passengers prior to departing in order to avoid rejection and the expense of returning them. At Zagreb, Croatia, one company also houses its passengers in barracks until time to send them forward in groups to particular ships. In case of the rejection of an emigrant later on it is said the doctor who made the original examination and thus aided departure would have to pay the expenses of return. The activities of transportation companies are carried on in many countries under concessions granted them by the respective Governments, but the extent of surveillance for the protection of health appears to be limited. In Czechoslovakia it is the expressed policy to regulate emigration. Laws are in preparation, therefore, to regulate health during egress. In Jugoslavia, as stated above, medical examinations are already required. In Poland, on the other hand, passports are said to be freely granted to refugees to leave the country, and, so far as could be learned, without medical restrictions.

SURVEILLANCE OF HEALTH OF ALIENS EN ROUTE.

At most ports of embarkation, except Italian, Scandinavian, and Spanish, the bulk of the emigrants at present are not nationals of the countries in which those ports are located. These emigrants are, therefore, known as transmigrants, and the countries through which they pass have little interest in them except to get them out.

With the exceptions mentioned, the bulk of all emigrants at present, from whatever port, are originally from middle and southern Europe. They filter through the western countries over every line.

According to Passed Asst. Surg. J. H. Linsom, of the emigrants passing through Danzig about 90 per cent are Hebrews and the remaining 10 per cent Lithuanians, Czechslovakians, Ukranians, and Germans. While waiting for passage they live in "the Troyl," and emigration camp outside the town. Most of them, however, have previously come from Warsaw, where they lived for varying periods in the poorer quarter. In this quarter the overcrowding and poverty were evident.

Transmigrants en route through Holland must enter the country by way of Odenzaal on special trains and at special times, or by way of Rotterdam on vessels from Danzig. They are not medically inspected on entry, but under special surveillance. According to Consul General George E. Anderson, the total departures from Holland may be expected to be from 1,500 to 1,700 weekly, 90 per cent of whom will come from Poland.

Transmigrants through Belgium come over various railroads from the east, the bulk of them at present originating in Poland or other eastern countries. In case they come via Basel or Modane they may be deloused and their baggage fumigated, but there appears to be no official systematic medical inspection on the border. Transmigrants through Germany may not while en route leave the special train in which they travel.

A letter from the director of the Netherlands Emigration League (Dec. 9, 1920) states that transmigrants are inspected and disinfected at Odenzaal, presumably for typhus fever.

Transmigrants through France enter by sea at Marseille or by train over the eastern frontier. They come mostly from the Levant, Poland, and other central European countries and are taken by way of Paris to the seaports. Those entering Marseille are subject to inspection, bathing, and fumigation of their effects. This is also said to have been the practice at Basel and at Modane on the frontier. These precautions are, of course, to exclude the quarantine diseases.

Transmigrants through England, although not coming under the provisions of the emigration law of the Kingdom, are excludable by the ministry of health for public health reasons. Practically verminous persons are said to be forbidden entry and sent back by the port sanitary officer unless British subjects, in which case they are sent to a local hospital to be deloused. By a system of records of ingress and egress knowledge is had of any disabled emigrant who might be left in the country. Shipping companies are bonded by the Government for their removal; even so a few are said "to be left in the country to become a burden on the rates."

Passengers intending to embark at Liverpool are housed in company hotels. Those embarking at Southampton congregate at hotels in London and proceed by special train on the morning of sailing. In order to observe the character of these passengers and the method of handling, the trip from London to Southampton was made by me on their special train leaving London at 6 a. m. on the day of sailing. It was composed of the ordinary third-class compartment cars in use in England, which were clean. Immediately on arrival of the train on the dock the medical inspection was undertaken by the ship's surgeons.

According to information obtained from the ministry of health, considerable trouble has been experienced at London in quartering transmigrants in buildings which easily become insanitary. The establishing of company quarters was accordingly under consideration.

During actual travel over the Continent some emigrants traveling in parties are under special conduct by company representatives, and in case of serious illness they would be referred to municipal hospitals of the country of embarkation. But oversight of all travelers en route appears to be mainly for police rather than sanitary purposes. Some of the immigrant trains were not heated or lighted and were badly overcrowded. While this class of population appears inured to hardships, it is easy to see how their health might in some instances be affected by the method of travel and subsequent housing. Frequently persons were seen who had been days and weeks away from their starting places. They had been quartered in unheated barracks while awaiting embarkation.

PROVISIONS FOR HOUSING EMIGRANTS AWAITING DEPARTURE.

In some countries, as Poland and France, prospective emigrants, on arrival at or near the seaport, are cared for by the philanthropic organizations in special barracks pending sailing. One such place in Paris was visited. It was badly overcrowded and ill adapted to its use. One saving feature was its location in the heart of a great modern city, which in case of an outbreak of disease would have to assume active control of preventive measures.

In fact, most emigrants at present have to pass through the countries of western Europe, and oftentimes remain therein for days and weeks pending sailing, which is a measure of protection to America against the quarantinable diseases. In view of the insanitary conditions in which some of them live, however, there is the possibility that this advantage is more than offset. At the Tyrol emigration camp, at Danzig, for instance, according to Passed Asst. Surg. Linson, the buildings were previously used as a prison barracks. Because of insufficient coal and their faulty construction, these barracks are very cold at the present time (December 13). Men, women, and children are huddled together, sometimes as many as 160 in a single room. In some ports, including those of Belgium, Italy, and, as previously stated, England, waiting emigrants may stay in local hotels and go and come as ordinary residents. In those ports they are under the sanitary surveillance of the city, and in case of illness would be cared for in municipal hospitals.

In Belgium emigrants are under the emigration department. While in the country they so remain. During their stay in licensed hotels they are inspected three times weekly by a medical officer of the department, who also inspects the hotels and controls their sanitation. Five of these private hotels housing waiting emigrants were visited by me. With the exception of one, all were old private houses converted to their present use. The one exception was a large hotel (Amerika). All were capable of cleansing. The number of occupants allowed and the ventilation are controlled by the Belgium emigration department. The maximum official capacity of those visited were as follows, 63, 68, 83, 82, and 650. In most of them were small rooms which could be had by individuals and families on the payment of a small extra sum. On inspection, all of these buildings were very old and had been converted to their present use by enterprising proprietors. They were as clean as their construction would permit.

In the management of outbreaks of infectious diseases and the prevention of their introduction aboard ship the above method has certain advantages over housing in single large barracks. Aliens are practically segregated from each other in relatively small groups, and responsibility for the protection of their health is shared by the city health authorities.

In the German and Dutch ports the trans-Atlantic companies maintain well-equipped hotels wherein all steerage passengers may be housed.

In French ports waiting emigrants are variously housed. At Cherbourg a hotel to accommodate 1,000 has just been opened, and a modern hotel and bathing and fumigating compound are about to be built. This is intended to accommodate all passengers of the Cunard and International Mercantile Marine Cos. At Havre one company maintains two sets of barracks. One of these was inspected and the sanitation was found bad. Steps were under way, however, looking to enlargement and improvement. Other companies, especially the newer ones, were not so fortunate in having specially fitted-up quarters.

In Italian ports passengers on arrival are housed in hotels approved by the governmental authorities. Their stay is generally short, during which time they have the liberty of the city.

Practically all passengers from these ports are natives of Italy, because the Italian authorities have discouraged transmigrants from the countries farther east. There are, however, occasional parties, small in number.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS AT PORTS OF EMBARKATION.

The medical examinations of passengers by company physicians vary somewhat in different places. According to Dr. Linson, at Danzig, the examinations consist mainly in a more or less careful scrutiny for favus and trachoma. Evidence of other disease is apparently ignored, in most cases. The delousing of passengers there and examinations to detect quarantinable diseases are conducted under the direct supervision of Dr. Linson.

At Hamburg some transmigrants leave for embarkation at British ports. Arrangements were completed for their medical examination by a local physician before crossing the Channel. Only a few passengers have embarked from this port direct for America. In view of the expected larger emmigration from Hamburg, an officer of the Public Health Service has been detailed there to oversee delousing and inspections of passengers for quarantinable diseases. This physician reports that the facilities for the handling of large numbers of immigrants are excellent and that the medical inspections from an immigration standpoint will undoubtedly be taken up.

On arrival at Rotterdam all transmigrants are required by regulations of the city to be taken to a local disinfection plant, where they are freed as far as possible from vermin, and they are required to take a bath and have their baggage fumigated. Thereupon these passengers are taken to so-called "dirty barracks" of the Holland-American Line at Lachaven, where they are further freed of nits. The average stay at this barrack is 10 days, after which time they are removed to one of the hotels (barracks) adjoining the Holland-American docks, Gentiles being kept in one hotel and Hebrews in another.

Before departing from Lachaven passengers are inspected in the presence of a medical officer of the United States Public Health Service. On arrival at the clean barracks they are held pending embarkation, during which time they are medically examined.

The hotel for Gentiles accommodates approximately 850 people. It is well kept. The barracks in which the Jewish passengers are kept has a total capacity of about 1,100. Adjoining these barracks is a

small hospital. At Rotterdam medical examinations are conducted twice weekly in anticipation of the sailing of vessels. These inspections are made by two local physicians, specialists in their lines. In addition, the company employs a full-time physician on shore to take care of the sick persons and to vaccinate and delouse passengers. An examination of several hundred immigrants was observed. One specialist examines for favus of the scalp and nails and another for trachoma and other diseases of the eye. Perfectly patent cases of other diseases and disabilities, such as imbecility, exophthalomic goiter, and tuberculosis would be detained by them for subsequent examination. The examinations of the scalp were fairly adequate; some cases were passed, however, which at Ellis Island would have to be referred to the hospital for microscopic examination. The examination of eyes was carefully conducted, and it is understood a record is kept of suspicious cases who may be passed in order to see what becomes of them on arrival at Ellis Island. There is no examination for mental defects and practically no account is taken of physical disabilities affecting ability to earn a living, except as above stated. Finally, all passengers are inspected before they go aboard the vessel, at which time their inspection cards are stamped as to compliance as to vaccination requirements.

Aside from the examinations to which passengers may be subjected before they leave their places of origin, no medical inspection is made of them until they arrive at Antwerp. On arrival they are required to take a bath and have their baggage fumigated. This is done at the disinfecting plant of the Stuyvenberg Hospital, whose authorities issue a certificate to each passenger so treated. Passengers who present evidence of scabies are given a hot bath for 15 or 20 minutes. A solution of calcium sulphate is then applied and left on for another 20 minutes. This is followed by a soap and water bath. The high character of the hospital lends assurance. For the large amount of work to be performed at a port of the size of Antwerp, however, the facilities are inadequate.

In order to increase these facilities the Red Star Line intends to construct a fumigating plant and barracks at the dock.

After bathing and fumigation passengers are housed in private immigrant hospitals. A full-time medical officer is employed by the steamship company who is in charge of the medical examinations prior to embarkation. He examines regularly between sailings immigrants from the various hotels, having them come to rooms adjoining the dock set aside for the purpose.

The passengers are first vaccinated and inspected for vermin. Based on this officer's certification as to vaccination and the certificate of the medical authorities of the Stuyvenburg Hospital as to bathing and fumigation, the American consulate stamps the card which every immigrant is required by the United States quarantine regulations to present on arrival.

After vaccination the immigrants are examined medically from the standpoint of the United States immigration law. Through a local arrangement all cases of favus and trachoma are referred to local specialists. Diagnosis of the former disease is said to be controlled by microscopic examinations. Uncured cases are refused passage.

Judging by the methods followed, it is believed these inspections are adequate to prevent the embarkation of persons afflicted with quarantinable diseases, favus, and trachoma.

While the inspections include disease likely to affect ability to earn a living, this phase of the work is not as thorough; the detection of insanity and mental defects is not entered into to any extent.

At Southhampton passengers arrive just prior to embarkation and are examined by the ship surgeon in the presence of a medical representative of the British Immigration Service. The medical officer of the British board of trade is also present. The eyelids of each immigrant are everted. Some attention is paid to the detection of cases of favus, and plain cases of other diseases contemplated in the immigration law would be detained. Examinations for insanity and other mental defects can not be thorough with the methods followed. A medical officer of the American consulate examines all passengers for evidences of vaccination, vaccinating those who require it.

At Havre, passengers are taken to the dock on the day of sailing for a medical examination. An examination of several hundred passengers intending to proceed via Compagnie Transatlantic Generale was witnessed. The inspection is conducted in a large room on the second floor of the dock. The immigrants enter this room one by one. They are vaccinated, one attendant scarifies the arm, and another applies the vaccine. Other attendants examine each immigrant for evidences of venereal diseases, and still another for vermin.

One physician examines for trachoma and another for favus. This part of the examination is orderly and thorough. No special examination is made for mental defects and physical disabilities affecting ability to earn a living, although perfectly plain cases would be detained. During these inspections an officer of the United States Public Health Service witnesses the vaccinations and looks out for cases of quarantinable diseases. He is occasionally consulted regarding other diseases, but has no authority for the medical inspection of aliens.

In case of illness, immigrants are sent to the city hospital. From 1,000 to 1,500 immigrants are constantly in barracks awaiting sailing. They stay on an average of six days, and in case of illness would have the services of a full-time physician of the company.

During the month of November the Compagnie Transatlantic Generale embarked 3,745 third-class passengers from Havre and 1,658 second-class passengers. Seventy-one second-class and 313 third-class passengers were rejected. The large number of these rejections were on account of vermin and were temporary, although between 50 and 100 were on account of "maladies specials" (venereal diseases). At Cherbourg the inspection of groups of steerage passengers of two lines was witnessed. The vaccinations and inspections for vermin are observed by an officer of the United States Public Health Service.

The examinations for diseases coming under the immigration law are made by two physicians, one of whom is a representative of the French Immigration Service. They comprise a close scrutiny for favus and trachoma, and perfectly plain cases of physical or mental disability are excluded.

At Naples and other Italian ports medical examinations of departing aliens are conducted through a local immigration commission: (1) inspector of emigration; (2) officer of office of captain of the port; (3) secretary of the captain of the port's office; (4) doctor of the port; (5) police officer. The ship's doctor and a representative of the company may also be present. The above commission inspects all parts of the ship just before the embarkation of passengers as to sanitary conditions, food, and other requirements outlined in the Italian immigration law. Under this law only the American consul may be present at these inspections. This operates to exclude officers of the United States Public Health Service.

The above-mentioned board examines all passengers with the object of excluding such cases (1) as may be harmful to the health of other people, (2) as may be liable to exclusion under the United States immigration law. This board also conducts disinfection of baggage, which, however, does not include personal baggage nor clothing worn by the alien. At this port aliens are not bathed before embarkation. A medical officer of the consulate is on board the vessel just prior to sailing to observe the passengers as they come on the gangplank.

The medical examinations as outlined above are believed to be representative of those conducted at practically all ports. It is necessary to add, however, that a number of new lines have been established since the war which have not the facilities for the examination and embarkation of passengers that are available to the old-line companies. In some places these new companies are experiencing great difficulties in securing facilities. On account of lack of experience, also, their examinations are not as effective as some of the older companies. Furthermore, some passengers rejected by other lines appear to resort to less particular lines.

On the whole, the examinations witnessed may be said to be generally thorough as relates to trachoma, and fairly so as relates to favus. This is undoubtedly due to the special care taken for years in respect to these diseases at United States and Canadian ports of arrival, and to the former rigid enforcement of the immigration law relating to deportations. In a few ports examinations for active manifestations of venereal diseases were carefully made. In a few ports more or less general attention was paid to diseases affecting ability to earn a living. At none of the ports were special tests made to detect mental defect. The degree of attention that may be expected to be paid in future will depend on the thorough enforcement of the immigration law at home ports.

There is special need, therefore, of standardizing and improving various aspects of the medical examinations as conducted abroad by steamship companies.

En route to and from Europe opportunity was taken to inspect thoroughly the steerage quarters aboard ship, as well as the hospital facilities and methods of preparation and serving food. The conditions were good; far better, in fact, than this class of passengers is accustomed to when traveling abroad.

The steerage accommodations aboard ships having large passenger lists are always limited. On this account and because of seasickness, from which many persons suffer, as well as other obstacles, it has always seemed to me inadvisable to advocate the inauguration of any official system of medical examinations aboard ships en route. The attempt to conduct such work under the conditions that would necessarily prevail would be demoralizing to the force on whom it devolved. Furthermore, it would result in dissipation of effort and would not relieve aliens from losses, financial and otherwise, in case of rejection at United States ports.

On arrival at New York all vessels carrying alien passengers or crews are subject to medical inspection under the immigration law, and any disabled aliens are cared for in the hospital at Ellis Island. For these purposes the United States Public Health Service maintains a medical staff of 42 full-time physicians and 9 consulting physicians.

The cabin passengers and crews are examined aboard ships, 13 medical officers being assigned to this duty. These examinations are undertaken immediately after vessels pass the quarantine inspection. The methods are varied, depending on facilities available and the origin and condition of passengers to be examined. These examinations can not be as thorough as would be the case were the persons to be examined removed to the examination rooms at Ellis Island. In view of the changed character of alien passengers traveling in the second class of many ships since the war, it would be desirable to remove this class, as well as the third class to Ellis Island for thorough examination.

On account of the congestion at the port of New York, however, the tendency has been to undertake the examination of steerage as well as other passengers aboard some ships. This tendency is to be deplored as examinations can never be as satisfactory aboard ship because of the lack of facilities and presence of other obstacles; and the fact that they are undertaken aboard encourages the physically and mentally disabled to travel in ships thus excepted in order to escape the detection of these disabilities.

In the case of crews it would be desirable to combine the medical inspections required under the quarantine and immigration laws and perform them while the vessels remain in the quarantine anchorage. The expected transfer of the quarantine station at New York from State to Federal control should render this practicable. Time would thereby be saved on the part of both medical and immigration inspectors, commerce would be facilitated, and the examinations would be more satisfactorily performed.

At present second-class passengers are inspected as the vessels proceed to their docks. Cases in which diagnoses of disabilities affecting ability to earn a living can be made immediately or certified to aboard. All other cases are referred to Ellis Island for secondary examination or observation in hospital as may be required.

It is the practice generally to remove third-class passengers to Ellis Island for examination. They are first subjected to a primary line inspection, each passenger being seen by two medical officers. The first officer looks specially for physical disability and mental defects. The second officer examines the eyes and looks out also for mental defects. About one out of six of all these passengers are detained for secondary examination. For this purpose they are taken into the medical examination rooms and partially disrobed.

The system has been developed as the result of many years' experience, and is similar to, though more thorough, than medical inspections generally at ports throughout the world. By reason of the large numbers of aliens arriving, the conditions aboard ship, and the magnitude of the immigration problem as affects the United States, increasing numbers should be subjected to secondary examinations. All steerage passengers should be freed of their baggage before inspection, and both steerage and second-class passengers should be brought to Ellis Island for medical examination.

In order to do so, however, the facilities must be increased, additional medical officers provided, and rearrangements as to space made whereby secondary examinations will be as rapid as primary inspections. These added facilities should include a small dispensary and laboratory in the medical division, a dark room for ophthalmologic work, and special appliances for examinations and measurements in large number.

Through Ellis Island our population receives accretions annually of about 1 per cent. Aside from questions of assimilation, these vast numbers give rise to problems affecting the public health which should be thoroughly considered. Routine examination should accordingly be supplemented by special methods which would throw light on growth, physique in relation to national defense, and physical types as affecting racial development.

It should be made a punishable offense for aliens to give false information as to age and condition of health. At present the ages of children, for instance, are oftentimes falsely stated on the manifests. This vitiates the vital statistics and not only nullifies accurate observations but encourages violations of laws regulating school attendance and child labor.

From every standpoint the people of the United States have a right to all necessary information relating to the physical and mental status of its prospective citizens, particularly when they are arriving in such vast numbers as to speedily influence the type of the future American.

Arriving immigrants, regarding whom a diagnosis can not be immediately concluded or who require medical care on account of illness, are referred to hospital. For this purpose the hospitals at Ellis Island are believed to be well adapted. They have a capacity of 650 beds and are well equipped. There is need, however, of a central kitchen and a nurses' home to lessen congestion. The staff includes about 18 medical officers, 9 consultants, 65 to 70 nurses, and necessary administrative assistants and attendants.

On account of the congestion at Ellis Island, and the growing practice of permitting treatment of the diseases excludable under the immigration law, the hospitals are filled to capacity. On January 18 there were 647 alien patients on hand. The prompt and thorough enforcement of the law with respect to deportation would relieve the hospitals of congestion both by removing the diseased aliens from hospitals and discouraging the embarkation abroad of persons suffering from excludable diseases.

In any event aliens of the unassimilable classes should not be permitted to remain permanently in the United States nor should other classes be permitted to come in greater numbers than will permit of their assimilation. Otherwise, the problems of the public health will be increased and diverse physical and mental types will be perpetuated. From these aspects there is urgent need of dealing vigorously with the immigration problem. While they may not be immediately the most important, if neglected they will react unfavorably on the future development of our country and people.

From medical and public health standpoints this need can be met by (1) increasingly thorough medical examinations at United States ports; (2) the prompt and thorough enforcement of the immigration law at United States ports as relates to physical and mental defects and disability; (3) the requirement that transportation companies shall refuse absolutely to embark persons excludable under law by reason of such defects; (4) the granting of authority to United States consulates to decline to visé passports or other permits to excludable aliens or to grant bills of health to vessels embarking passengers who have been denied the visé or similar permit.

Thorough medical examination at United States ports can not be dispensed with in any event. The question has arisen whether these inspections should not be supplemented by further examinations either aboard ships en route at ports of embarkation or places of origin of emigrants. In my opinion examinations aboard ship would be impracticable for the reasons previously stated.

Should the visé control system be continued and extended or a system of individual permits established, it would be highly desirable from the standpoint of all for specially qualified medical officers of the United States Public Health Service to be assigned to duty at selected consulates to cooperate with and advise consular and immigration officers in matters affecting the health and physical fitness of departing aliens. These officers would regularly inquire into the occurrence abroad of diseases excludable under the immigration law, study the movements of alien groups destined to America in relation to physical and mental fitness, cooperate with transportation companies in standardizing their medical inspection, and, as stated above, advise and cooperate with consular and immigration officers in the enforcement of all laws relating to the selection or rejection of immigrants for medical and public health reasons.

Independent of the practicability of extending official control methods abroad, no examinations should be undertaken by medical officers of the Government which would tend to absolve in the least the transportation companies or the emigrant personally from full responsibility as to physical and mental fitness before embarkation. In view of the reasonableness of the medical requirements, these parties should be able in practically every instance to determine in advance whether they will be able to conform to them.

The Commissioner General of Immigration, Mr. Caminetti, has also warned the country. He made a report recently, and his "feet were on the ground" when, on his return from Europe, he described conditions. He has been alive to the situation all along. He has protested against the admission of the diseased and the insane and the vicious, but his protests have not been heeded and his deportation rulings have been thrown into the wastebasket by those higher up, who now boldly mock our immigration laws, which if enforced might prevent some of our present troubles.

Mr. Chairman, the United States will do all that it can to stamp out typhus at once. The United States will not put the burden on any State; but, Mr. Chairman, I repeat statements made by me before that the bulk of the present immigration is undesirable. More than that, it is dangerous. It brings death and disease. It brings great financial burdens to our Government. It brings the wrong people to the wrong places, and they come in ever-increasing numbers, when there is neither work for them nor opportunity to succor and save them. Let the steamship companies continue to unload them at various places by diverting the routes of their vessels and the typhus louse will be spreading his deadly fever germs from New Orleans to Boston before many weeks, I am afraid; but if so, I do not propose to let the blame lie against the United States Health Service or this House of Representatives if I can prevent it.

Neither do I want to see the deficiency money that we will appropriate go as the million dollars for deportation of revolutionary aliens went.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Philippine Islands, $50,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to inquire of the chairman in charge of the bill whether the bill provides for any more money being expended on the fortifications of the Philippine Islands than is necessary to keep them up and maintain them?

Mr. SLEMP. No.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Approximately how much is being expended on the Philippine fortifications in this bill?

Mr. SLEMP. It is purely a maintenance proposition there.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Something between $50,000 and $150,000?

Mr. SLEMP. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is not of importance; it is merely for maintenance?

Mr. SLEMP. That is right. My impression is that, taking all the armament together, we cut out over a million dollars altogether in the islands.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is the question I wanted to propound.

I want to commend the committee heartily for so doing. In the first place, I think it is very doubtful, to say the least, whether any fortifications alone in the Philippine Islands can protect those islands in the absence of an army or a navy that is able to prevent the landing of a hostile force.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SLEMP. For the information of the gentleman, I will say that the War Department during the past year has sent quite a lot of new mobile guns over there and quite a lot of ammunition, which will give such protection as the surplus supplies in the United States will warrant.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am glad to hear the gentleman's statement. The gentleman is aware of the fact that there is a movement on foot to separate the Philippine Islands from this country.

I do not desire to discuss the question and, of course, it would not be in order to discuss that question; but if those islands are separated from this country, we ought not to spend money in the manner we have heretofore been spending money on the fortifications in the Philippine Islands. And I want to say at this time, going perhaps a little past the proper line of debate, that if the Philippine Islands are ever separated from this country, I trust it will not be done—and I believe it will not be done—without an understanding, and especially without any agreement, that we are not to protect the islands in their territorial integrity and independence. I have noticed and gentlemen have noticed a continuous propaganda kept up, as I have thought, in behalf of certain interests in favor of separating the islands from this country. Without determining that question, I wish that there was some way by which notice could be served on the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands of what I believe to be the unanimous sentiment, or almost the unanimous sentiment, of the American people that if the islands are ever separated from this country we will no longer be responsible for them. We could not properly do so if we wished, and I want to say, for my part, that we should not if we could.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Suppose we had come to an understanding that we will not be responsible for the safety of the Philippine people on their own account. What would the gentleman say to the proposition that we may have to retain an interest in the islands, even after they have been separated, on our own account?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am aware that the gentleman may properly raise that question; but it seems to me that our interests in that quarter of the globe are now largely dependent on the fact that we are holding those islands.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask for half a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks for half a minute additional. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will simply say in that half minute that I see the discussion is going outside the limits I intended, and I do not want to delay the passage of the bill. I withdraw my pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BARRACKS AND QUARTERS.

For continuing construction of the necessary accommodations for the Seacoast Artillery and for temporary cantonments for oversea garrisons in the Philippine Islands, $75,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There are a number of items appearing in this bill for the expenditure of money in the Philippine Islands—one of $50,000, one of $65,000, and several $3,000 items, and then this large item which has just been read.

In view of the fact that the President of the United States has recommended our turning the Philippines back to their own people and that the Congress seems to be of that attitude, I want to ask the chairman of the committee what is the necessity for continuing this appropriation, which is for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922?

Mr. SLEMP. We had estimates of considerably over $1,000,000—$1,118,000, or something like that.

Mr. BLANTON. If under the policy of the incoming administration the Philippines should be turned back, as they ought to be, all of this money would be unnecessary.

Mr. SLEMP. We felt that we had to maintain the existing structures that are there now, but the committee declined to authorize further expenditures, rather along the line suggested by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has not understood that it was going to be the policy of the incoming administration to hold these islands?

Mr. SLEMP. We have no information on that subject, but we just declined to appropriate over $1,000,000 for the Philippine Islands that was asked for next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the Hawaiian Islands, $2,500.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The other day in the general debate I understood the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] to say that we carried an item in this bill for the unexpended balance of $600,000 for the Air Service for the next fiscal year. Perhaps I misunderstood him, and perhaps I misunderstand the provision in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. That is on page 6.

Mr. SLEMP. That is contained at the bottom of page 6.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But I find that that language only provides that the amount there mentioned shall remain available until June 30, 1922, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed prior to June 30, 1920. I want to ask whether that will take care reasonably well of the Air Service for the next year? They could not buy anything new at all unless it was covered by contracts already executed.

Mr. SLEMP. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the seacoast defense aviation is at the present time confined to a field on Staten Island, one at San Francisco, and a portion of the expense at Langley Field. This had its origin in a war appropriation of $8,000,000 for the establishment of eight stations. There was a considerable controversy last year over the question as to whether the eight stations would be continued or not, and the committee last year recommended that only three stations be retained for seacoast defense aviation, one at Staten Island, one at San Francisco, and to assist in defraying the expenses at Langley Field. Now there had been set aside out of other funds known as war funds about $3,000,000 in addition to the $8,000,000 referred to. It was out of those funds that contracts were made for airplane material. A portion of the $8,000,000 was returned to the Treasury. Over $3,000,000 will be returned by the 1st of July.

That does not furnish any material in completion of aviation, but just these seacoast stations. Out of the $3,000,000 war funds referred to, contracts were entered into for certain airplanes, and those airplanes were to be delivered by the 1st of July, but it was found that they will not be delivered by that date. The airplanes are nearly completed and will be completed some time during the next fiscal year, and to carry out contracts and obligations made in good faith and to provide for the delivery of these airplanes this appropriation mentioned in the bill was carried over.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Who is at the head of the Air Service in the War Department?

Mr. SLEMP. Gen. Menoher.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is this under him?

Mr. SLEMP. He appeared before the committee and advocated it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I know; but this is in the fortifications bill. What I want to know is whether the appropriation for Air Service under the fortifications bill and under the Army bill are expended under the same supervision in the War Department?

Mr. SLEMP. That is my information.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I wanted to know whether it was another—not duplication—quadruplication?

Mr. SLEMP. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unobligated balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1921, for the establishment, construction, enlargement, or improvement of aviation stations for use in connection with the seacoast defenses of the Hawaiian Islands, including the acquisition of land or any interest in land by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise, and the preparation necessary to make the same suitable for the purpose intended, is continued and made available for the same purposes until June 30, 1922.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am interested in these items for the Air Service as they appear here and as they appear on page 6. This particular item on page 9 is the unobligated balance of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1921 and is for the unobligated balance of appropriations of $1,300,000.

Mr. SLEMP. That is correct.

Mr. GARD. Can the gentleman inform the committee what is the balance remaining unexpended?

Mr. SLEMP. My information in that respect is that only a small amount of money had actually been expended as of the 1st of January, 1921, but that nearly all of it had been obligated. Now, the authorities in Hawaii contend that there are very few contractors over there, so that it is rather difficult to let the work by contract, and very expensive, and they felt that if they kept their own organization going, without being forced to let the work by contract, they could do the work for about 25 per cent less than it could be done otherwise, and that would be a saving to the Government of about $300,000, and under those circumstances they were not aggressively pushing the construction of that station there.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman know how much money is unobligated?

Mr. SLEMP. A very few thousand dollars unobligated.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman means not contracted for?

Mr. SLEMP. Only about $11,000 that has not been set aside.

Mr. GARD. So all the money except $11,000 is obligated by some contract?

Mr. SLEMP. It is allotted; it is very difficult to get the information about it. The information was not furnished to the committee. The committee asked for the information again during the sitting of the committee to get more complete information, but we did not get the information desired.

Mr. GARD. What was the additional information desired?

Mr. SLEMP. Practically the information which the gentleman asks for—exactly the amount of money that had been spent, the amount obligated, and exactly the amount that was allotted.

Mr. GARD. This bill provides for the expenditure of $688,277 in one item for aviation of seacoast defense, and something like $11,000 of this item for new enterprises. Does the gentleman think that those sums of money, which do not seem to be very large in the general expenses of aviation throughout the world, will be sufficient to protect our defenses?

Mr. SLEMP. I will say that in the continental United States the War Department only asked for money to purchase land on which to establish stations, but nothing for equipment. They say the purpose was to improve the fire control only. The War Department stated that all the money to be expended will be sufficient to take care of what they have there now. That will correspond to the number of troops they may have.

Mr. GARD. How much money was expended for land?

Mr. SLEMP. There was no money expended for land. It is a little field on an island owned by the Government. This is

the only place where we have the Army and the Navy aviation working together. The Army and the Navy are both in the same field.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Virginia a question. The gentleman refers to the air station. I suppose he refers to the one at Pearl Harbor, Fort Island, owned jointly by the Army and the Navy. How many stations are there in Hawaii?

Mr. SLEMP. That is the only one; there are some balloon stations.

Mr. HICKS. Of course, as the gentleman well knows, there is a great deal of discussion in regard to aviation for the Federal Government, and especially its cost. In the naval bill recently passed there was reported a grand total for aviation, including not only material but pay and subsistence and many other items not hereto so designated. In the Army bill there was so much for "aviation," which did not include pay and subsistence, and I presume the various items in this bill for aviation are separate and in addition to the amount appropriated by Mr. ANTHONY's committee.

Mr. SLEMP. The gentleman is correct; $19,200,000 carried in the Army bill, and we only carry a reappropriation.

Mr. HICKS. But you must add $20,000,000 to that if you want to compare it with the Navy, for this $20,000,000, approximately, represents pay, subsistence, and so forth.

Mr. SLEMP. I will say that that depends upon the number of enlisted men and officers assigned to the Air Service. I presume it will be about 8,000 men and 1,000 officers.

Mr. HICKS. That would bring the pay and subsistence up to $20,000,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. We never figure the pay and subsistence in the aviation. The Army bill carries $19,200,000 for the Air Service, and that is for purchasing new machines and the operation of the air activities, outside of the pay and subsistence of officers and men.

Mr. HICKS. The Appropriation Committee Navy subcommittee very properly insisted upon bringing forward the fact that $23,000,000 was appropriated this year, which included the pay and subsistence. Does not the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, think that we should get both the Army and the Navy on the same footing, so far as expense is concerned?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is no question about the fact that money has been appropriated for aviation under three or four different bills and that the individual committees have had absolutely no knowledge of what the other committees have been doing in this respect.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman means the same committee.

Mr. ANTHONY. One committee has had no knowledge of what the other was doing.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But it is all the same committee—the Appropriation Committee.

Mr. ANTHONY. I am talking about last year.

Mr. HICKS. Is it not the proper thing for the Appropriation Committee as a whole to bring the two services together, so far the total expenditures are concerned? That is, the basis for estimates should be the same in both the Army and Navy.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman is right. I want to point out that last year in the fortification bill there was $11,000,000 carried, of which I do not believe a single member of the Military Committee knew anything about. There was not a thing said by an officer of the Air Service or any suggestion that they were going to get a single dollar from any other source for aviation.

I was surprised and dumfounded when I sat in the hearings of this committee and found that they had received about $11,000,000 for aviation and had constructed several tremendous air posts in the country that I did not know were on the map, which cost $1,600,000 each.

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

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTHONY. And we found that the aviation bureau had entered into contracts for the delivery of a large number of airplanes, mostly of the bombing type, for which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] makes provision in this bill, in the extension of time within which the appropriation shall be available. To come down to the specific point upon which the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] rose, namely, the question of air forces in Hawaii, the War Department this year asked for an appropriation of over a million dollars for building of barracks and quarters there, for the establishment of a squadron of air forces in addition to the squadron already in Hawaii. The committee felt that the squadron of Air Service now there, stationed at a post which was going to cost over a million dollars in construction, and with the station of the Naval Air Service immediately adjoining, which, I understand, has cost a large sum of money and for which the gentleman's committee is making provision, was enough air force for Hawaii, and we refused the $1,300,000 which was asked for for additional construction there.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to get this information, because there is a very great deal of confusion in the minds of people as to how much aviation is costing the Government. Unless we can include the amounts provided under fortifications and under the Army, we will not know what aviation is costing the Government. Has the gentleman from Kansas any opinion to express in respect to what aviation in the Army, including the fortification appropriation and including all items which can be charged to aviation, is going to cost the Government this coming year?

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say that it is going to cost the Government about $40,000,000.

Mr. HICKS. Including pay and subsistence and everything that goes with aviation?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Why include pay and subsistence as a part of the charge against an activity in the Military Establishment?

Mr. HICKS. I never included it myself when reporting from the Naval Committee. It was included by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] the other day in his appropriation bill.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That same personnel might be shifted into various other activities. Nobody thinks of specializing on Field Artillery or anything of that kind. The overhead is constant throughout all of the activities of the military service.

Mr. HICKS. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], when the naval bill was under consideration, figured up the total cost of aviation, and included the pay and subsistence, and there was an item also for medical treatment, if I recall, amounting to $169,000. That is, the grand total of the men in aviation was compared with all the men in the naval service and the proportion or ratio was figured in the cost of maintaining our medical office, and the part that aviation could be reasonably supposed to utilize of the whole amount was charged against the Aviation Service, which was a very unusual thing to do and unfair to aviation, for the same plan was not followed in figuring the cost of the other activities.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The overhead, pay and subsistence, is the only constant factor in the Army. The transfer of the personnel from one activity to another is fluctuating, and it may from time to time increase or decrease the personnel in any one activity.

Mr. HICKS. I agree with the gentleman, and if he will refer to the RECORD of a few days ago he will find that I rather criticized the gentleman from Michigan for having made those charges against aviation, including pay and subsistence and medical attendance.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of War is authorized to proceed with the installation of guns and howitzers in such order of priority as he may deem expedient, at places for which appropriations have been, or hereafter may be, made for emplacements for such guns and howitzers.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on section 6 for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of the bill just what this particular section means, and whether or not it has the approval of the Secretary of War or is in fact inserted in the bill at his suggestion?

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, it was put in the bill at the suggestion of the Secretary of War. He sent a communication to the committee indicating that it was desirable to change the location of the installation of certain guns.

Mr. GARD. Of course, it is new legislation.

Mr. SLEMP. It was strongly recommended by the War Department.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That so much of the fortification appropriation act approved July 5, 1884, as pertains to the appointment of a board for the purpose of testing rifled cannon is hereby rescinded.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on section 7 likewise for the purpose of finding out just what this board for the purpose of testing rifled cannon is.

Mr. SLEMP. The War Department requested that this language be inserted, stating that there was an old board which was organized, I think, perhaps in 1884, but which has been defunct for a great many years. No action is taken by the War Department under it, and other officers and individuals are doing the work in the War Department that was formerly done by this board. This is just to clean it up and get rid of it.

Mr. GARD. Is there in fact no such board now? That is, the board has no personnel?

Mr. SLEMP. It has no personnel.

Mr. GARD. It is intended by this to nullify the act and get rid of the fiction of the board entirely?

Mr. SLEMP. The gentleman expresses it correctly.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling of the word "more," in line 11, on page 12 of the bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Automatic rifles, 1919, $23,000,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This and the succeeding paragraphs cover the return of unexpended balances of appropriations that were made mostly during the war for various items in the bill, by virtue of which the committee is turning back into the Treasury some $233,000,000 worth of appropriations which have not been expended and which were eligible to be expended, some of them up to June 30 next. Many of them ran indefinitely. I want to say at this point that the recovery of the $233,000,000 to the Treasury is largely due to the industry of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] in investigating and making a report to the committee, in conjunction with officials of the War Department, and the committee feels under many obligations to the chairman of this subcommittee for doing this fine piece of work. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordnance stores, ammunition, 1917 to 1919, $9,000,000.
Ordnance stores, ammunition, 1919 and 1920, $35,000,000.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of obtaining information from the chairman about these very large items in reference to ordnance stores and ammunition, 1917 to 1919, and the two following years, which aggregate the sum of $44,000,000. Do I understand the committee has made investigation and determined that there is no existing necessity for the continuation of these appropriations?

Mr. SLEMP. I will say the gentleman from Ohio expresses the situation correctly, and that the War Department officials came before the committee stating this could be done, and representatives of the Claims Board came also, and the Chief of Finance of the War Department made a recommendation and accompanied it with a statement that there are on hand sufficient moneys retained to settle all outstanding claims against the Government incurred in any obligations or arrangements entered into by the War Department in any respect whatever.

Mr. GARD. Do I understand the chiefs of the divisions of the War Department are in entire accord with the gentleman's committee in this action?

Mr. SLEMP. That states it correctly.

Mr. GARD. And upon their suggestion, and the investigation of the committee as well, that these very large sums of money which Congress voted for the Military Establishment for the defense of the country are happily no longer necessary and the money is to be returned?

Mr. SLEMP. Yes; and I thank the gentleman for the opportunity of saying that the War Department should be commended for its activity in this direction. There were quite large sums of this money that were available for expenditure and had been available for expenditure during the past two years, but they have not been expended by the War Department, and I feel especially the indebtedness of myself personally, and I think the committee does, to Gen. Lord's activity in this regard. He has been very energetic, active, and helpful.

Mr. GARD. In reference to the preceding paragraph under the title of arms, uniforms, equipment, and so forth, for the National Guard, does the gentleman think that can be safely done?

Mr. SLEMP. That can be safely done.

Mr. GARD. It is the policy of the War Department to increase the efficiency of the National Guard?

Mr. SLEMP. It is the policy to increase it, but they have plenty of supplies by which it can be done without incurring additional expense.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] on the very able way in which he has presented this bill to the committee and the way in which he has led it through the committee proceedings. In saving the amount of money which he evidently has done by covering back into the Treasury some $233,000,000, I venture the opinion that even the gentleman from Wyoming ought to be satisfied with this bill. [Applause.]

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inland and port storage and shipping facilities, 1918 and 1919, $4,000,000.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Virginia in regard to these port storage and shipping facilities. I understand that this item turns back a considerable sum that was originally appropriated for port storage and shipping facilities. What is being done now with the large amount of matériel that was manufactured in this country and that was brought back from France?

Mr. SLEMP. That has been sent to various places like——

Mr. TILSON. Rock Island Arsenal?

Mr. SLEMP. No; another one out there.

Mr. MACGREGOR. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state to the gentleman that if he refers to the hearings before the committee on investigation he will find a statement as to all places in the country in which these ordnance stores are placed.

Mr. TILSON. My question was leading up to a response that might give the assurance from the gentleman that this matériel was being brought together in certain places where it might be stored safely and at the same time as inexpensively as possible.

Mr. SLEMP. I think that is true, I will say to the gentleman. I would like to add also that the gentleman's inquiry is pertinent especially because the committee rather thought a lot more money could have been returned to the Treasury, inasmuch as there is an item of about $58,000,000 of Government money apparently still tied up in this storage business. But inasmuch as there are some outstanding claims, the nature of which are not fully determined, the financial department did not want to yield any more money than this $5,350,000, and stated that in his opinion many more millions would revert. I call attention also to the fact in the Army appropriation bill the estimate that was originally made called for $10,000,000, but that was stricken out, and inland and port storage for the coming year will be paid out of moneys on hand; that assumes about $9,000,000, and I should think next year at least, perhaps, $10,000,000 will be recovered additional from this item. But the committee did not have complete information on which to make any further return other than the $5,350,000.

Mr. TILSON. Just one more question——

Mr. MACGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. One more question and then I will yield, and that is in regard to the port-storage plant which was started in South Brooklyn.

Mr. SLEMP. If the gentleman will excuse me, this bill carries no item in any way for storage matters. It relates only to the coast defense. We thought that having gotten into this cold-storage business we might get a little money to turn back into the Treasury and that is a very fruitful field of investigation further.

Mr. TILSON. We had a very great plant started there. To what point it had advanced I do not know.

Mr. SLEMP. I am sorry I can not inform the gentleman.

Mr. MACGREGOR and Mr. CHINDBLOM rose.

Mr. SLEMP. I yield first to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. I wondered whether your subcommittee had taken into consideration this proposition: The Ordnance Department has on hand stores amounting in cost value to $1,176,000,000, of which $50,000,000 is to be declared surplus. Now, it occurs to me, although we have not gone into the proposition carefully, that a great amount of this will be perfectly useless and it will be taking up storage and using personnel. Is there any program arranged to have a lot of this material scrapped and reduce the cost of storage and personnel?

Mr. SLEMP. I am sorry that I do not know of any special plan myself that is in operation in regard to that. Take, for example, the guns, and there are a lot of them. They are held

as our national reserve, on the theory of national preparedness. If we wanted to sell them, there are no buyers, and we are not trying to scrap them or make new ones, but we are trying to keep them in good condition as an element of national preparedness.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Under that program you would have a lot of material which would be kept for years on the possibility of war in the future.

Mr. SLEMP. I think the question of the maintenance of this material is a difficult one to solve, but expenditures in that regard ought to be less as the years go by.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Did I understand the gentleman to say that some of these supplies were in the warehouses at Savanna, Ill.?

Mr. SLEMP. I have a statement in the RECORD, under the Army bill, that gives a notation of all of these. We did not go into the subject very much in this one. There are some at Rock Island; Savanna; San Antonio, Tex.; Erie, Pa.; and Boston.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It has only relation to the money balances that are unexpended?

Mr. SLEMP. Certainly; not the material.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It will not affect the material?

Mr. SLEMP. It provides an expenditure of money for other material and returns that to the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total appropriations to be covered into the Treasury, $233,555,760.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to direct the attention of the committee to the fact that this action in covering back $233,000,000 into the Treasury is a very commendable one, and I desire to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] and all the other gentlemen who had anything to do with it. But back of all that it ought to be written in the record that this is $233,555,760 that the War Department has had the opportunity to spend, some of it for two years, some three years, and some for one year, and has not spent it. We have gotten in the habit here of reaching the conclusion that anything that was appropriated for the War Department was very promptly spent, and usually wastefully spent. In the face of that habit which has grown up here, I want to emphasize now that this great covering into the Treasury has only been made possible because the War Department has declined to spend a quarter of a billion dollars which has been put at its service and which it has had the opportunity for some years to spend.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I am very much interested in what the gentleman has said, and I approve of the prudence, thrift, and patriotism that has been displayed on the part of the committee in turning back certain sums of money into the Treasury; but I can not read into that act such a degree of credit for the War Department, that has had this money and has not spent it, as my good friend appears to discover. The fact is that the War Department had this money year after year, had not spent it, knew it had not spent it, and still came before the committee and made the same foundation estimates in its testimony and requests and asked for more.

Mr. CARTER. I would like to ask the gentleman if the committee did not still appropriate the money?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Because we did not know that this money was in reserve.

Mr. CARTER. The committee ought to have found it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It ought to have found it; and if the people who asked for the money had told explicitly what they had at the time on hand, or responded to the questions that would have revealed the information, we would have found it; in other words, to use a parlance the gentleman from Oklahoma is not familiar with, if they had "laid their cards on the table"——

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

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman will admit that while they did not lay their cards on the table, they did not spend the money when they had it, and the Committee on Military Affairs did not have the acumen to find that out.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think that is a rather poor commendation for one part of the outfit, to say that the fact that one set of people did not reveal their mischief is to their credit, while the fact that the other people did not find it out is due to their stupidity. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLEMP. I want to make this one observation, that last year there was returned to the Treasury $800,000,000. Now, in order to prevent any further expenditure by the War Department the committee required the department to submit estimates, and be bound by them subsequently, under which they proposed to spend money for another year. In some way we did not then get this $220,000,000, but the department, in a way, bound themselves to be limited to the amount stated before the committee, which then did not include this amount. This year we get this additional amount.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, 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. DOWELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 16100) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, 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. SLEMP. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SLEMP, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 15275, commonly known as the emergency tariff bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 15275, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. TREADWAY. I object.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will withhold it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman wish to have the bill sent to the committee?

Mr. TREADWAY. I certainly do.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Can I not compromise with the gentleman? If I withdraw my request, will the gentleman withdraw his objection?

Mr. TREADWAY. If it still lies on the table, I will do that. If the bill is called up and unanimous consent is asked for a conference, I shall object. I think it should go to the committee. There have been no end of changes made in the bill, which the committee has the right to have considered by the committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to discuss that with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I will withdraw my request.

Mr. TREADWAY. As the matter stands, it is not up. If the gentleman desires to leave his request, I will leave my objection. They can stand together.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TREADWAY. Very well. I will withdraw my objection.

RECORD ESTABLISHED IN PASSAGE OF APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if I may be privileged to do so, I wish to announce that the House has this day established a record in the prompt and early passage of the appropriation bills. The last appropriation bill has passed the House at an earlier date than at any short session in the last 25 years. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WOODYARD (at the request of Mr. ECHOLS) for three days, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. CLARK of Missouri, for to-day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. RAINEY of Alabama, for 10 days, on account of important business.

POINT OF NO QUORUM.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that 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 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until to-morrow, Friday, February 18, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV,

416. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on survey of the lower Columbia and Willamette Rivers, below Portland, Oreg., with a view to securing a channel 35 feet deep (H. Doc. No. 1009), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed with maps.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (S. 3451) authorizing and directing the United States Shipping Board to adjust and pay the claims of the wooden-ship builders arising out of the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1334), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2929) for the relief of Capt. Edward T. Hartmann, United States Army, and others, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1333), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 16116) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the marine hospital site in the city of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16117) for the relief of the Philippine Scouts officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 16118) to amend section 6 of an act approved January 17, 1914, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes,' approved February 9, 1909"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 16119) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the marine hospital reservations and improvements thereon at New Orleans, La.; Memphis, Tenn.; St. Louis, Mo.; and Cleveland, Ohio, and to acquire suitable sites and erect thereon modern hospitals in the same localities for the treatment of beneficiaries of the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 16120) to provide and adjust penalties for violation of various navigation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Resolution (H. Res. 688) authorizing the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to employ technical and clerical assistance; to the Committee on Accounts.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the duty on lumber imported from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to an appropriation to give Federal aid to the States in road construction; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RIDDICK: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting that Congress pass S. 4529, a bill for the erection and maintenance of a dam across the Yellowstone River in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PETERS: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Maine, favoring a forest experiment station on the White Forest National Forest in New Hampshire; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 16121) granting a pension to Gabriela Montoya de Perea; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 16122) granting a pension to John H. Stewart; 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:

5849. By Mr. BABKA: Petition of the Cleveland Grays, indorsing the Rogers bill and the Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5850. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of certain citizens of Kankakee County, Ill., praying for the immediate recognition by the Government of the United States of the Republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5851. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the city council of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., requesting that Independence Square in the city of Philadelphia be selected as a burial place for one of our unknown dead who made the supreme sacrifice during the late World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5852. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing H. R. 14461, providing for temporary suspension of immigration and favoring the enactment of immigration bill, H. R. 14186; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5853. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of Rev. Joseph Bolka and others of Michigan City, Ind., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5854. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of State Normal School, San Diego, Calif., urging the passage of the Fess bill (H. R. 12078); to the Committee on Education.

5855. Also, petition of the county agent of Placer County (Calif.) Department of Agriculture, urging that the original appropriation of $250,000 asked for the distribution of stallions suitable for the siring of Army remounts be allowed and not cut down; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5856. Also, petition of Kullman, Salz & Co., of San Francisco, Calif., urging that the original appropriation of $250,000 asked for the distribution of stallions suitable for the siring of Army remounts be allowed and not cut down to $100,000; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5857. Also petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Oakland, Calif., urging that the appropriation originally asked for by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce be allowed and not cut down; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5858. Also, petition of the Foreign Commerce Association of the Pacific Coast, of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against any reduction in the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5859. Also, petition of W. H. La Boyteaux, of 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3944, known as the Federal live stock bill, and Senate bill 4828, known as the Federal coal bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5860. Also, petition of California Cattleman's Association, urging the passage of the Gronna bill in its original form; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5861. Also petition of Northern California Milk Producers' Association, of Sacramento, Calif., urging that a tariff be placed on all foreign butter imported into this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5862. Also, petition of Woman's Club of Hollywood, Hollywood, Calif., indorsing the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5863. Also, petition of G. T. Bliss, vice president and general manager of the Lake Tahoe Railway & Transportation Co., of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 15836, a bill to amend the transportation act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5864. Also, petition of the National Forest Fire Prevention Committee, Boston, Mass., urging support of the item of $1,000,000 in the Agricultural appropriation bill to be used in forest-fire prevention; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5865. Also, petition of Frank B. Peterson Co., of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 15746, a bill to increase the salaries of the employees of the Steamboat-Inspection Service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5866. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Newton Falls, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

5867. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Holy Name Society, Holy Name Church, and St. Michael's Catholic Church, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5868. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of the Bryan Council, No. 1915, Knights of Columbus, Bryan, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5869. Also, petition of certain citizens of Van Wert County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5870. Also, petition of the Williams County (Ohio) Farm Bureau, favoring the passage of the truth in fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5871. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of Wrightstown Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Wrightstown, Pa., in favor of curtailing the Army and Navy program and the inauguration of the five-years' vacation plan; to the Committee on Appropriations.